

**MINUTES  
LANGHORNE MANOR BOROUGH COUNCIL  
MEETING OF JUNE 16, 2020**

1. **CALL TO ORDER** - The Zoom virtual meeting of Langhorne Manor Borough Council was called to order in the Langhorne Manor Borough Hall, 618 Hulmeville Avenue, Langhorne, Pennsylvania, on June 16, 2020 at 8:02 PM Eastern Daylight Time, after Zoom participants were admitted to the meeting at 7:58 PM Eastern Daylight Time by Dawn Seader, President. Ms. Seader welcomed everyone and gave instructions for the Zoom virtual meeting.

**PERSONS PRESENT** – Dawn Seader-President, Nicholas Pizzola-Vice President, Robert Byrne-Mayor, James Niwinski, Alicia Gasparovic, William McTigue, Jr., Grace Judge, Maryann Barnes, Thomas J. Profy, IV-Solicitor, and Barbara Ferraro-Secretary/Treasurer.

2. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor Byrne.

3. **CARROL ENGINEERING PRESENTATION** – Ms. Gasparovic introduced Christopher Peterson from Carroll Engineering, the Borough Engineer, to speak about the project in order to meet Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Permit requirements. Mr. Peterson stated that the Borough is currently at the end of year one of a five-year permit cycle. Mr. Peterson stated that the PA DEP stormwater permit regulates the stormwater discharges from the Borough’s Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), including the roadside swales, inlets, and storm sewers which drain to natural watercourses. The DEP developed a permit program with the goal of reducing the pollutants associated with stormwater. Mr. Peterson stated that the permit requires the implementation of a Stormwater Management Program (SWMP) which consists of six Minimum Control Measures (MCMs) and the Best Management Practices (BPMs) within each MCM to reduce and prevent stormwater impacts on water quality. The six MCMs and a summary of how the Borough has complied with the requirements are as follows:

- **MCM#1 Public Education and Outreach on Stormwater Impacts**

The Borough published and provided educational material in the form of flyers, pamphlets, brochures, handouts and fact sheets to the public through a dedicated Stormwater Management page on the Borough’s website, Borough Hall and Administration building, periodic direct mailings to Cairn University and Langhorne Gardens Nursing Home, in the quarterly Borough Newsletter, material included with all Building permit applications and public meetings. Target audiences are Borough residents, Borough employees, businesses, developers and schools.

- **MCM#2 Public Involvement & Participation**

The Borough has developed a written public involvement & participation program providing for opportunities for the public to participate in the decision-making processes associated with the development, implementation and update of programs and activities related to the Borough’s individual program. The program outlines methods of communications to groups that operate within proximity to the Borough or its receiving waters. The Borough conducts at least one public meeting per year to solicit public involvement and participation from target audience groups and presents a summary of the implementation of the program. Things the public can do to help the Borough meet their goals are: volunteer for specific stormwater projects, do not

dump into the storm sewer system, keep storm drain inlets near homes clear, pick up after pets, do not rake leaves or grass clippings into streets, use pesticides and lawn care products sparingly, wash cars on non-paved areas or car washes, repair auto leaks, use non-toxic de-icing material, attend public meetings and provide input, visit the Borough's website and review the material and links.

- **MCM#3 Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program (IDD&E)**

This has been accomplished by developing a written Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program. Illicit discharge examples are as follows: motor vehicle fluids, grass clippings, leaf litter, animal waste, sewage, restaurant waste and household hazardous waste, all either accidental or intentional. Residents should call the Borough or any of the agencies listed on the Borough's website if they observe these. No illicit discharges were observed by Carroll Engineering's Spring screening. A Borough map with all outfalls and the storm sewer system has been developed. The Borough's Act 167 Stormwater Ordinance prohibits non-stormwater discharges. The Borough's website includes telephone numbers for reporting of dry weather flows which is defined as water or fluid in the storm sewer system when it has not rained in at least 3 days.

- **MCM#4 Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control**

The Borough is relying on the DEP's statewide program for issuing construction NPDES Permits for stormwater discharges associated with construction activities to satisfy all requirements.

- **MCM#5 Post-construction stormwater management in new development and redevelopment**

The Borough is relying on the DEP's statewide program for issuing NPDES Permits for stormwater discharges. MCMs 4-6 are the responsibility of the Borough. The Borough's Act 167 Stormwater Ordinance addresses stormwater discharges and establishes BMPs in plans for development, establishes criteria for sizing stormwater BMPs and implements an inspection program.

- **MCM#6 Pollution prevention and good housekeeping for municipal operations and maintenance**

The Borough has identified all facilities and activities that are owned by them and have the potential to generate stormwater runoff such as streets, parking lots, and Borough owned buildings. The Borough has developed a written operation and maintenance program for these municipal operations and facilities. A written employee training program has been developed for Borough administrative staff, outside contractors, Council members, volunteers and law enforcement personnel. This presentation is a training session for Borough Council. The 2019 Borough MS4 Training Manual shall be provided to the administrative staff and is done on a yearly basis.

RETTEW Associates has prepared a Pollutant Reduction Plan (PRP) for the Borough to meet the requirements set forth by the DEP. The PRP can be found on the Borough's website.

The Borough's existing sediment load of 103,782 lbs/year must be reduced by 29.9% or 31,031 lbs/year and they plan to improve water quality in the short-term by reducing the existing sediment load by 10% within this five-year period.

Mr. Peterson shared the Reductions Table which is on the Borough website.

Mr. Peterson stated that the recent construction of a vegetated swale along Hill Avenue adjusts the Borough's total reduction for the permit period to 10,059 lbs/year.

Mr. Peterson stated that the proposed Cairn University project which proposed a variety of BMPs and has been put on hold due to the COVID-19 pandemic, would result in the reduction of 7,772 lbs/year of sediment which would exceed the Borough's required reduction for Mill Creek. CEC recommends the Borough monitor the situation and proceed with the BMP construction within the Neshaminy Creek Watershed in year 3 of the permit period.

The Borough has identified a variety of potential stormwater BMPs that could be implemented to achieve the required pollutant reductions over the next 5-year permit term. The options include converting existing roadside swales to a Vegetated Swale, a Bioswale or an Infiltration Trench.

Mr. Peterson shared the MS4 map which showed where the swale conversions are proposed. This map can be found on the Borough's website.

Mr. Peterson shared the BMP Table which can be found on the Borough's website.

Mr. Peterson shared the Vegetated Swale Information which can be found on the Borough's website.

Mr. Peterson shared the Infiltration Trench information which can be found on the Borough's website.

Mr. Peterson stated that the Borough should carefully consider these options for satisfying their PRP and TMDL obligations.

Ms. Seader asked if there were any questions from Council.

Mr. McTigue asked about decorative river rock on top of the Infiltration System as the current is aesthetically pleasing and wondering if it could be repurposed? Mr. Peterson stated they could look at some of the material being reused as a topper for the infiltration trench to slow down stormwater and maintain visual appeal although it may be cost prohibitive. Ms. Gasparovic stated they could use the side stones over again to make them look rock lined. Mr. Peterson stated they need to look at erosion issues when considering this.

Ms. Gasparovic said it seemed as if the Borough would get the most DEP credits if they used the Infiltration System that also filtered out more sediment than the grass systems. She stated that Mr. Peterson is steering the Borough this way but it would be looked into further with the Citizen's Committee.

Mr. Pizzola asked about a cost estimate? Mr. Peterson answered that a cost estimate was provided when RETTEW prepared the PRP plan dated 10/13/17. He stated that this is an older plan and worth being revisited. Mrs. Gasparovic stated that the two proposals that were in the RETTEW plan were about \$50,000 each and would not get the Borough to the 30% reduction

required in the 15 years. She stated that it also did not include engineering fees. Ms. Seader asked how close did this get to the 30% reduction? Ms. Gasparovic stated about two-thirds. Mr. Peterson reminded the Council that they are only responsible for 10% in this permit period and only need to pick one option, but to maximize the reduction to reach their goal.

Mr. Niwinski asked if Cairn does their construction, is this taking into consideration the two-thirds? Mr. Peterson stated that if Cairn proceeds, all the BMPs that they were proposing should meet the Borough's requirement for the Mill Creek Watershed and the Borough should address the Neshaminy Creek Watershed first.

Ms. Seader asked if we did the two options and Cairn did their renovations, would we get to the 30%? Mr. Peterson answered no.

Ms. Gasparovic clarified that when the Cairn project meets the Borough's Mill Creek requirement that it would be for the 10%. Mr. Peterson stated that was correct and that there was no TMDL and no 30% for the Mill Creek Watershed. The 30% is for the Neshaminy Creek Watershed as it is in worse shape.

Mr. Niwinski asked what the requirements are for the surrounding municipalities are? Mr. Peterson stated that it is weighted on how much area each municipality contributes to the watersheds. LMB contributes roughly 8% to the watersheds.

Ms. Gasparovic asked about the Hill Avenue Vegetated Swale that was just installed is outside of the map Carroll prepared-does that give the Borough any credits? Mr. Peterson stated that it was part of the subdivision approval in an effort to try and partner with a private developer and also to benefit the Borough. The Borough would get some reductions from the swale. Carroll has put together calculations that will be in their annual report and show that the Borough is working toward their goal. This does help the Borough towards the 30%.

Ms. Seader asked if there were any questions from residents.

James Keba-604 Hill Avenue stated that it looks like the most impactful are Prospect to Elm on both Hill and Station and asked that if the Borough goes with option 2 with a dam, how many dams are there and how much pooling happens into properties? Mr. Peterson responded that the check dams are crushed stone and are not really dams in the true sense. They are there to slow down the stormwater. They are porous and will drain in minutes to an hour. The spacing is calculated at the time of the design and is based on the slope-the steeper the slope, the more check dams would be needed to slow down stormwater and prevent erosion. Mr. Keba stated that it was likely that some properties would be more impacted than others. Mr. Peterson responded that it could be. If the Vegetated Swale option is selected they would have to look at the check dams and the properties on steeper slopes would be more impacted. Mr. Keba asked if on the western side of Route 1, is any of that impactful and where does that drain to? Mr. Peterson responded a lot of it flows to the west towards Chubb Run and there is not a lot of opportunity or Borough real estate in the rights-of-way to adequately treat the stormwater. The options are fairly limited for the Borough and the improvement options presented have the most amount of drainage area and can help the Borough meet their goals. Mr. Keba asked that although we have

an 8% requirement overall, what percent is on the other side of Route 1 which is not really impactful to the Neshaminy Creek? Mr. Peterson responded that the area is tributary to the Neshaminy but there are no controls and it is not impactful to what the Borough does on the other side.

Jay Ferraro-402 Hill Avenue asked if the infiltration bed process is contingent upon a percolation rate that would be tested prior to the operation being put into place? Mr. Peterson responded that he believes that the DEP allows the Borough to make their own determination as to whether or not to test for percolation and it would certainly be in the best interests of the Borough to determine how the system would function or they could just rely on installing the system and whatever percolation the existing soils may have without testing. Mr. Ferraro stated that an investment in a percolation test would tell the Borough what size system would have to be installed into what areas in order to get the maximum result for the dollars spent. Mr. Peterson responded that was correct. Mr. Ferraro stated that some of the properties would be impacted more than others as was brought up earlier and that the impact might not be equal on the entire run of the infiltration bed based on the percolation rate in certain areas. Mr. Peterson stated that is true and there is limited roadside area so there is not a whole lot of difference between areas that have good percolation to areas that do not because there is not enough space to put a larger facility in there. Mr. Ferraro stated that something to think about was in order to put in a larger pipe system in order to get the performance, property owners may not like the rock swales because it starts to widen that swale and it starts to increase the size of the rock in order to keep erosion from taking place and they may feel like they are losing some of the frontage on their property. Mr. Peterson stated theoretically if the Borough was to put in a wider envelope of stone for the infiltration trench, it does not necessarily mean that the conveyance above it be any wider. It only has to be as wide as the inlets provided. Mr. Ferraro stated that currently the homeowners are responsible for the maintenance of that property and he would assume that the Borough would have to have some sort of instruction on how to maintain it to make sure that the yard drains do not get clogged or filled because the Borough has a pretty big issue with residents discharging lawn clippings, leaves and other types of lawn waste against the curb line and they rely heavily on street sweeping to keep these inlets clean. It is going to have to be made clear that the yard drains are going to need a constant eye and constant maintenance to keep them from getting clogged. Mr. Peterson stated that when the plan is produced it will come with certain maintenance requirements and the Borough could proceed with a mailing program whereby each of the residents would be reminded on what their maintenance responsibilities are and when they should be completed. When Carrol does their illicit discharge inspections they could take a look at the inlets and provide a status update to the Borough and then discuss how to mitigate some of these issues. He stated that there are permanent inlet filters that can be provided to make maintenance a little easier, but there are costs associated with these types of devices.

Peter Revenidis-107 West Fairview asked if there was anything the Borough could implement like the University is doing without destroying the rock swales that we already have? Mr. Peterson responded that the Borough is in a difficult position and it comes to how much real estate the Borough has to do these BMPs and is not enough real estate for a stormwater basin. They only own the Hall, the Administration building and the rights-of-way.

Naomi Mindlin-301 Hill Avenue asked if the Borough has a plan to get to the 30% and do they need to do it in the 10% increments and wouldn't it be advantageous to do the whole thing all at once? Mr. Peterson responded that there are cost benefits to doing it all at once. Right now the PRP does not have enough alternatives to meet the 29.9% although there are enough alternatives to get us through 10 years of permitting. He stated that it's important to remember that this is an evolving permit process through the DEP, there have been a lot of changes, there may be different requirements in the future and it may be found that the Borough's burden may be less so it may be advantageous to wait on certain BMP installations.

Ms. Seader asked if Ms. Gasparovic and Mr. McTigue had any comments on next steps? Mr. McTigue stated that the residents' committee will be the way to go and there are a number of technical issues that need to be considered. Ms. Gasparovic stated that she has heard of one resident who would like to be involved, reminded everyone to contact her or Mr. McTigue if they would like to be involved and are looking for 3-5 people. She asked if the Council would appoint at the next meeting, and about the launch of the committee and the advertisement of how they would meet. Residents who are interested can come to the next meeting and introduce themselves and state why they are interested. They may also give Ms. Gasparovic or Mr. McTigue a note and they will present it. Information will also be on the website.

Christopher Croteau-608 Station Avenue asked if Mr. Peterson could provide a link on everything he said? Ms. Gasparovic stated that it would be added to the Borough's website in the dedicated Stormwater section. Mr. Peterson stated that it would be advantageous to put the PRP and TMDL on the website. Ms. Seader responded it would be.

Kevin Oessenich-301 W. Fairview asked if the calculations were based on estimates, not actual, so it really is not known what the actual sediment amounts that are going into the Neshaminy Creek are? Mr. Peterson responded that is a factor of not being able to test for that and that is how the DEP does the whole process. They have a system by which they look at the land coverages within the Borough; they look at impervious and pervious land within the Borough. Those numbers have associated loading rates in pounds per year and that is how the total loading rate is calculated for the Borough and has been approved by the DEP as the accepted method. In terms of actual loading, he does not know if anyone could determine this. Mr. Oessenich stated that he understands that the percentage determination is actually based on averages across Bucks County. Mr. Peterson said that is correct and this may be advantageous for the Borough. Mr. Oessenich asked if they know if the existing swales are actually contributing to the sediment that is taking place? Mr. Peterson responded that the swales really just convey the pollutants that have already been accumulated in the stormwater from residential properties. They are not seeing a lot of erosion there because there is substantial armoring with the existing stones so this is not a contributing factor. It is mostly pollutants from residences. Mr. Oessenich asked if the proposed system is better than the existing swale system at picking up the water because those who have properties with the swales have no water problems on their properties? He asked if they will have problems as people who do not have a system currently do? Mr. Peterson responded that they would take a look at the existing geometry and come up with an equivalent or something that would have a greater capacity than what is there now. The last thing they would want to do is contribute to flooding and lower property values. The system will have to convey to 10-year storm requirement for the DEP and would like it to convey the 100-year

storm. Mr. Oessenich stated to Council that we have historical significance and beauty in the swales. The question is there an alternative so we will not lose this in Langhorne Manor?

James Keba asked how is the Route 1 water conveyed, where does it go and how impactful is it to what is being spoken about? Mr. Peterson responded that he believes it has been pulled out.

Ms. Seader thanked Mr. Peterson for his time.

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Ms. Gasparovic issued thanks for the detail in the police report. A motion was made by Ms. Gasparovic and seconded by Mr. McTigue to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2020 meeting. No objections were presented. The motion carried.

## **5. INSPECTOR'S REPORT**

Ms. Ferraro report for May 2020:

- Building Permits - 4
- Construction Inspections - 4
- Zoning reviews - 3

Ms. Seader stated that we will be updating the permit process and fillable applications will be on the website at some point.

**6. FENCE ORDINANCE ADOPTION** – The proposed change from 4 feet to 6 feet height allowance was advertised. Ms. Seader asked for comments from Council. Mr. McTigue commented on the appearance of the Borough, what attracts people to it and that they are attracted because fences are limited, personal property notwithstanding, the appearance of the Borough should be considered. Ms. Gasparovic stated that the Borough will still require open fences and only back-yard fences. Ms. Barnes commented that she has spoken to residents who state it is not a problem to tweak an ordinance, but their concern is that people move into the neighborhood and then the Borough immediately changes an ordinance and it raises suspicions. She agrees with Mr. McTigue. Mr. Niwinski expressed concern about 6-foot high cyclone/chain-link fences. Ms. Seader read the portion of the new Ordinance Article 8, section 801(a). The only thing that changed was the allowance for 6-foot fences. Ms. Gasparovic spoke about tweaking several ordinances to clean up inconsistencies and to make a note of this for the future. Ms. Barnes asked Mr. Profy if the Borough is obligated to have a public hearing when changing an Ordinance. Mr. Profy responded no.

Ms. Seader asked if there were any questions from residents.

Richard Wagner-602 Hill Avenue asked what are the surrounding area's Ordinances? Ms. Seader responded that she does not necessarily want to do what other municipalities do. Mr. Wagner stated that Newtown and Langhorne Boroughs have charm and character and 6-foot high cyclone fences do not contribute to charm and character of the Borough.

Melissa Mather-602 Hill Avenue stated that a 5-foot rear fence with the right material could help people with their dog issue. She stated that Newtown and Langhorne have actual physical

examples to see what happens when you change from 4-feet. If you change from 4-feet in the front to 5-feet in the back, it would allow for the safety and security someone is looking for. She stated that the Borough might want to alter the cyclone fence language.

Chris Croteau-608 Station Avenue thanked Council for a great job. His neighbor wants to put a clear 4-foot fence and Mr. Crouteau doesn't want a chain-link fence across his property. He stated that the neighbor has been forced to do things now which Mr. Crouteau feels is inappropriate. He understands that Borough does not want chain-link or privacy fences, but says not to ask residents to go through hoops.

Ms. Seader clarified that residents and Council want to take the allowance for 6-foot cyclone fences out of the proposed Ordinance. Mr. Pizzola stated he was not sure Council could make this amendment to the proposed Ordinance at this meeting and it was up to the Solicitor to advise them. Ms. Seader stated that Mr. Profy nodded. Ms. Seader asked for a motion to adopt the Fence Ordinance as written, with the exception of 6-foot cyclone fences. Mr. McTigue wanted clarification as to where the cyclone fence provision is being removed. Mr. Profy stated that the 6-foot cyclone fences be removed and only allowed at 4-feet high. Ms. Seader asked for a motion to allow for 6-foot fences with the exception of cyclone fences and to limit cyclone fences to 4 feet. Mr. Pizzola made the motion. Ms. Gasparovic seconded. Mr. McTigue and Ms. Barnes opposed. The motion carried by a vote of 5-2.

## **7. POLICE REPORT**

Mayor Byrne's report for May 2020:

- Total hours-295
- Total fuel-108.1gallons
- Total mileage-803
- Total citations-1
- Total complaints-17

Mayor Byrne introduced Sergeant Kenney to discuss the Police Department. Mayor Byrne asked if anyone had any questions for the Sergeant.

Ms. Seader stated that two officers are trained in 40-hour Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) for mental health and supporting people of different cultures. She stated that it has been 18 years since they discharged a gun. They support our community as well as neighboring communities.

Mr. Pizzola stated to Sgt. Kenney and the rest of the force that he and neighbors are pleased and proud of our force. With these unsettled times police are being looked at differently and Mr. Pizzola stated he does not feel that way. He supports them and the Borough's neighboring forces.

Mr. McTigue echoed Mr. Pizzola and is proud of the CIT. Mr. McTigue asked if Council was going to appeal for additional officers to be trained. Mrs. Seader responded no, the county wants 20% of the force trained and the Borough more than meets that.

Ms. Gasparovic asked if Mayor Byrne or Sgt. Kenney would like to address the civil unrest that is going on now or speak to the CIT? Sgt. Kenney responded that CIT does not deal as much with the civil issues and speaks more to the mental health side. It opens up avenues and resources to use that were not available years ago. Mental health is a big issue and affects many people. The Borough police department does not have that many issues.

Ms. Barnes stated that Council appreciates what they do. Sgt. Kenney responded that he would take that back to the force.

## **8. COMMITTEE REPORTS -**

- **Mr. Niwinski:** - No report
- **Ms. Gasparovic:** - Ms. Gasparovic thanked Steve Schoell for doing work for free and for removing a tree and cement that had fallen. Ms. Gasparovic stated that she received thanks and complaints on different items from residents: she thanked Mr. Pizzola for contacting BCWSA to fix a leak at Prospect and Hulmeville Avenues. She thanked Ms. Ferraro for fixing problems with trash collection recently. She received complaints that there is still an ongoing issue with trucks speeding up Hill Avenue to reach Maple Avenue.

Ms. Gasparovic followed up on Mr. Ferraro's suggestion from last month's meeting about educating residents about waivers, variances and special exceptions. She would like to prepare a document as a guide to put on the website. She stated that she might reach out to Mr. Ferraro for assistance.

Ms. Gasparovic mentioned that there is a Shade Tree Commission vacancy which needs to be filled. It will be advertised on the website and is looking to fill the vacancy next month. Ms. Seader would like to see that when there is a vacancy that it is advertised and have people who are interested attend meetings.

Ms. Gasparovic stated that the Borough just received its insurance renewal proposal for the package policy and Workers' Compensation Policy (WC). Both rates have gone up due to increase in police hours. The total increase is about \$1,600. Ms. Gasparovic addressed Council as to if they were intending to keep the increased police hours. She prepared documents with police payroll estimated projections. She stated that she estimated an increase in payroll from \$64,000 to \$78,000. The estimate can be changed but a good faith estimate must be submitted to the insurance company. Ms. Seader stated she would like to keep the increased police hours. Mr. McTigue asked how the number squared up with the budget, is it on track. Ms. Gasparovic responded that the Borough has been over budget fairly consistently. Mr. Pizzola stated that based on the \$78,000 it is higher than the budget. Mr. Niwinski stated if the rating is based off of police hours and the hours are raised, it will never go back to the lower hours rate as the insurance company will want to keep the higher premium. Mr. Niwinski asked if the hours are auditable. Ms. Gasparovic stated only the WC where the hours can be adjusted for an additional or return premium. Mr. Pizzola recommends \$70,000-\$72,000. Mr. Pizzola recommends and questions if there is a need to keep increased police hours. Ms. Seader stated that it is only an increase of 2 hours/day. There was discussion about police hours and rates. Ms. Barnes stated

that the Police Committee should meet and discuss the hours. The premium is due July 15<sup>th</sup>, so it can be discussed and finalized next month. Ms. Gasparovic stated she would need estimates for quotes to be obtained after the Police Committee meeting. Mayor Byrne stated that complaints about the Police Department have stopped due to the increased hours. Ms. Gasparovic stated that she would get estimates based on the Police Committee's recommendation.

- **Mr. McTigue:** - Mr. McTigue stated that bulk trash is this Saturday, June 20<sup>th</sup>. There will be 4 trucks and residents should have their trash out by 6:00 am. The service issues were attributed to the loss of a permanent driver and a new permanent driver should be assigned in the next week or so.

Ms. Seader asked if the COVID-19 disaster declaration Resolution needed to be updated. Mr. McTigue responded that Emergency Management told him as long as the Governor's declaration is in place it is not necessary. However, Mr. McTigue recommended that it be renewed. Ms. Barnes made a motion to adopt Resolution 2020-10 Ratifying the COVID-19 Disaster Emergency Declaration Pursuant to Section 7501(b) of The Pennsylvania Emergency Services Code, 35 Pa.C.S.A. 7101 *et seq.*,. Mr. Niwinski seconded. There were no objections. The motion carried.

- **Ms. Seader:** - Ms. Seader thanked the poll workers on election day who faced a lot of challenges.

The Borough's Secretary/Treasurer's bond came through.

The Newsletter went out and is on the website.

Ms. Seader stated that there is a Langhorne Manor Facebook page and that it is not an official LMB page. It is not monitored by the Borough and is run by residents.

Ms. Seader stated that the State is still in the yellow phase but does not anticipate being there much longer. This does not change things significantly. As Borough Hall is not large enough for appropriate social distancing for Council or residents, Council will continue to have meetings through Zoom through the green phase.

Ms. Seader had asked Mr. Ferraro who is the Comcast/Verizon liaison, to look into all of the different accounts the Borough has with them. Ms. Seader provided a list of the accounts from Mr. Ferraro to Council and stated that the accounts cannot be combined. Council should keep the Police accounts separate in case of grants. Mr. Ferraro stated that if Council was to make changes it would probably force them into a new contract which would lock Council into rates that would not be able to be changed. Ms. Gasparovic asked what the television is for? Ms. Seader stated that the current civil unrest is a perfect example of why it is needed and she believed they used it for surveillance. Ms. Gasparovic asked Mr. Ferraro if Council renegotiates how much money the Borough gets from Comcast and Verizon, when it comes up, is the Borough already maxed out or is there anything else the Borough can get in that respect? Ms. Seader responded that she and Mr. Profy have been working with a consultant who has been negotiating the contract. When the County negotiates their contract, the Borough gets the

benefits of it and it is still in the process. The renewal has been delayed due to what is happening right now.

Ms. Seader stated that Stephen Perloff recommended last month that Council adopt a Postal Service Resolution. Ms. Seader read part of the Resolution. Ms. Seader stated that she spoke with Mr. Profy who recommended taking out the paragraph that urges the President to remove the burden on the Postal Service to prefund its pension costs. Mr. Profy spoke to the argumentative nature and interjected the Borough into a legislative issue. Mr. Perloff stated that analysts say that if you take away the requirement that alone would make the Post Office solvent, that is why he put it in the and recommends that it is kept in the resolution. Mr. Perloff also spoke to the costs of the Borough to mail items through the post office compared to FEDEX. Mr. Perloff mentioned also that mail-in ballots will be used in the future. Ms. Gasparovic stated that it is important that Council is able to urge Congress and officials above them on important issues. Ms. Seader asked Council for a motion to adopt the Resolution 2020-11 In Support of The United States Postal Service as written leaving this paragraph out. Ms. Judge made the motion and Ms. Gasparovic seconded. There were no objections. The motion carried.

- **Mr. Pizzola:** - Mr. Pizzola stated that streets are being prepared for paving, it should start tomorrow and weather dependent, conclude Friday or Monday. Then the seeding and soil will be completed and the last thing will be the ADA ramps.

Mr. Pizzola reported that Morrissey did crack sealing on the access lanes and gave us a warranty discount for a cost.

Mr. Pizzola stated that he has been working with Jason Snyder who is the engineer who designed the roadway repairs on what Mr. Pizzola calls the No Trucks project. The Borough must have an ordinance and comply with PennDOT regulations to enforce no trucks except for local deliveries on all Borough roads.

PennDOT has asked all municipalities to look at hot pour mastic for upgraded repair for cracks and potholes. Mr. Pizzola would like PennDOT to use the Borough as an exhibition site in order to have work done on the access lanes. Mr. Pizzola spoke about the issues on the access lanes and this should greatly reduce the need for personnel to fill potholes.

Mr. Snyder stated that he is out at the paving sites every day if anyone needs to talk to him. He has an ongoing punch list.

Mr. Snyder prepared draft road study documents for Mr. Profy to review and draft an Ordinance as to the No Truck project if Council would like. He proposed “No Trucks Except Local Deliveries” signs on all core streets based on structural integrity. The Borough has no authority over the state streets. Trucks must have an actual delivery on a Borough street. Posting for weight would require the police department purchase scales and is not recommended.

Mr. Snyder stated that he contacted the Commonwealth to see if there is support for the Borough to be an exhibition site for the hot pour mastic. It would not be free, but if Council is interested and would like to continue, he thinks he could have answers in the next week or two.

Ms. Gasparovic asked if our Ordinance is based on weights so would it be smarter to just have a No Trucks Ordinance. Mr. Snyder stated he had not seen our Ordinance. Mr. Pizzola stated that the Ordinance is out of date as it has a weight limit of only 4,000 lbs. Mr. Profy stated that he would like the material and data from Mr. Snyder so he could create a more comprehensive Ordinance.

Ms. Gasparovic asked about getting more seed for those who did not have grass grow and could they put down more if there is extra? Mr. Pizzola said there is no guarantee that it will grow and there is not much they can do. Mr. Snyder will ask the superintendent if they can add more, but the contracts hold residents responsible. He will add it to the punch list and see what the response is.

Ms. Seader apologized, but had one more item after the discussion of the Fence Ordinance. Chuck Goodnow came to Council for a waiver for a 4-foot gate on his property in the middle of the hedges. The fence was approved but the gate was not. Ms. Seader asked for a motion that Council grant the waiver for Mr. Goodnow. Mr. Pizzola made the motion, Mr. Niwinski seconded. There were no objections. The motion carried.

Mr. Pizzola stated that when the road project contract was negotiated it took out the Borough parking lot and a small section on Gillam Avenue that is in Middletown due to cost. This reduced the contract by about \$28,000. The Borough now has a \$200,000 grant from the RDA plus savings on flipping the Gillam Avenue paving to the other side of Hulmeville Avenue to the overpass. Mr. Pizzola is asking for Council to approve paving the Borough Hall parking lot while General Asphalt is still in the Borough and the contract has not been closed out. The Borough has the funds and explained that he looked at how the General Fund revenues are coming in now as compared to last year. Tax revenues are basically the same, liquid fuels will probably be reduced due to COVID and the remaining balance on the contract that has to be paid is \$662,000. If the parking lot is added, the total comes to approximately \$680,000. As of May 31<sup>st</sup>, there is \$380,000 of capital reserve, \$305,000 in the Road Improvement fund, the \$200,000 RDA grant which hasn't been collected yet, the liquid fuels fund is \$85,000 plus a \$30,000 journal entry in the General fund that is owed to the Highway Aid Fund. This all totals \$1,000,000 which can only be used for roads. If the Borough pays out \$680,000 it leaves them with approximately \$320,000 in the paving fund without anything from Liquid Fuels. The payment is \$6,600 and with the funds the Borough has today they can pay for 45 more months which is why Mr. Pizzola is asking for this to be done. Mr. Pizzola corrected a statement he made about the Borough signing an escalator clause that if the price of oil goes down by 10% the Borough shares in the savings, if the price of oil goes up the Borough has to pay. Mr. Pizzola stated that the Borough did not however, sign the escalator clause due to the concern that oil prices would rise in the future.

Ms. Seader asked if Mr. Pizzola asked if the Borough can use Liquid Fuels for radar signs. Mr. Pizzola has not got an answer. She asked for clarification that the parking lot was in the original bid, but removed due to cost.

Mr. Snyder said he will issue change order. Mr. Ferraro stated that the issue with the savings and the additional fuel costs came up twice. The second time it came up was when the time-table was being extended in December and Mr. Pizzola said it was not a good idea for Council to enter into that kind of an agreement with them. Mr. Ferraro stated he thought the contract would have been reviewed at that point. This is the third time talking about a change order and a third opportunity while extending their time-table and give them additional work, to negotiate the \$7,000 back into the contract. Mr. Snyder stated they could do that.

Ms. Gasparovic asked about the condition of parking lot. Mr. Pizzola stated it is over 30 years old and needs to be done. Mr. Snyder stated he would like to fabric and re-pave the parking lot to extend its life. Ms. Barnes stated she was concerned about issues with dumping over the years and the Borough needs to be careful about any dumping. Mr. Pizzola stated there have been no issues since the signs were put up several years ago. **Correction 7/7/20-Ms. Gasparovic stated she would like the suggestion that was made and rescinded by Mr. Snyder to extend the paving to the Borough Hall Parking lot as he had extra paving materials. This suggestion was rescinded due to Mr. McTigue's following statement.** Mr. McTigue stated there is a part of the area behind the parking lot that is Native grounds and they should be aware of them. Mr. Pizzola made a motion to repave the Borough parking lot. Ms. Judge seconded. There were no objections. The motion carried.

- **Ms. Judge:** - Ms. Judge stated that \$500,000 from the sewer account was wired to investment account.

Ms. Judge stated that the hardware was installed in the Borough office and data transferred.

Ms. Judge stated that the texting service was launched this week. Several texts went out and 85 people have signed up.

Ms. Gasparovic thanked Ms. Seader and Ms. Judge. This will save money. The postcard that went out stated that people would have the option to get hard copies of the newsletter and a small number of people have made that request.

Ms. Seader stated that the Borough is getting more electronic which is a good thing.

- **Ms. Barnes:** - Ms. Barnes stated she is happy to hear that the truck ordinance is being looked into.

Ms. Barnes stated that the Friday after council meeting, she took lunch, dinner and dessert over to the workers at Langhorne Gardens as was approved at last month's meeting.

Ms. Barnes stated that the Planning Commission will be meeting shortly for the Grupp subdivision in July and they are hoping to meet in person.

Ms. Seader reminded Council to get Ms. Ferraro their reports.

**9. MAYOR'S REPORT** – Mayor Byrne stated that the electronic speeding signs record speed, number of cars, average speed and is accessible to be downloaded to the police car. They are battery and solar powered. The cost for two units is \$5,824 and four units cost \$11,378. Hulmeville Borough is seeing a drop in speeding with the use of their devices. Ms. Seader reminded Council that the Borough did not receive an RDA grant for them but should review it. Mr. McTigue asked if it was in the budget and stated that the RDA grant process is coming up and is due September 30<sup>th</sup>. Mr. McTigue questioned if it is in budget and stated that the grant process is coming up. Mayor Byrne suggested looking into the \$15,000 plowing budget as there was no snow this year and asked about the Liquid Fuels. It has not been confirmed that the Borough could use Liquid Fuels. Ms. Gasparovic asked if there was a sense that there would be RDA funds available. Ms. Seader stated that they never know. Mr. McTigue stated that due to people looking for RDA relief in this time, the bottom line may be decreased for municipalities and the Borough should be careful of that. Mr. Pizzola stated that he would bring numbers to Council at the next meeting.

**10. SOLICITOR'S REPORT** – no formal report. Mr. Profy responded to Ms. Gasparovic's question at last month's meeting on the responsibility to properly post weight limits on the roads and bridges in order to assess fines. There is an advance informational sign that needs to be posted in the event that the bridge does not have an intersection immediately preceding it in order to avoid the fine. This will be addressed when the Ordinance is prepared as far as putting weight limits on the roads that are subject to the jurisdiction of Langhorne Manor Borough. Ms. Gasparovic asked if this was a moot point due to the Council stating no trucks in general. Mr. Profy said that it would be addressed when he obtains the information from Mr. Snyder.

**11. CORRESPONDENCE** – None

**12. APPROVAL OF BILLS FOR PAYMENT** – Ms. Seader stated that all Council members received a copy of the bills list for payment for May and asked for questions and concerns. Mrs. Gasparovic questioned some items which were addressed. Ms. Gasparovic asked if the Borough charges for removal of trees from the street, is the homeowner charged? Mr. Pizzola stated that the Borough has never charged the homeowner for the removal of an emergency tree. Ms. Gasparovic stated that it is in the Ordinance and Council has been giving homeowners the wrong information and a change in the Ordinance should be looked into. Ms. Gasparovic wanted someone made aware of what looks like a minimum sewer charge for Langhorne Gardens. Ms. Seader asked for a motion to accept the bills list as presented. Ms. Gasparovic made the motion. Ms. Barnes seconded. There were no objections. The motion carried.

**13. APPROVAL OF TREASURER'S REPORT** –

**Highway Aid Fund for March:** Ms. Seader asked for a motion to accept the Highway Aid Fund from March as presented. Ms. Judge made the motion. Ms. Barnes seconded. There were no objections. The motion carried.

**General Fund for May:** Ms. Gasparovic asked about items which were addressed. Ms. Seader asked for a motion to accept the General Fund for May as presented. The motion was made by Mr. Niwinski and was seconded by Mr. Pizzola. There were no objections. The motion carried.

**Sewer Fund for May:** Ms. Seader asked for a motion to accept the Sewer Fund for May as presented. The motion was made by Mr. Niwinski and was seconded by Ms. Judge. There were no objections. The motion carried.

**Highway Aid Fund for May:** Ms. Seader asked for a motion to accept the Highway Aid Fund for May as presented. The motion was made by Mr. Niwinski and seconded by Mr. Pizzola. There were no objections. The motion carried.

**14. COMMENTS FROM RESIDENTS AND VISITORS:**

Ms. Gasparovic asked if there was any information on a candlelight vigil. Ms. Seader stated that it was being put off due to inability of being able to contact people. They will be asking for Council support in order to hold it on Borough grounds.

**15. ADJOURNMENT** – Ms. Seader entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion was made by Mr. McTigue and seconded by Ms. Barnes to adjourn the meeting. No objections were presented. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 11:12 P.M.

The next meeting will be July 7, at 8:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara T. Ferraro  
Secretary/Treasurer  
Langhorne Manor Borough