

MINUTES TO THE MEETING OF  
THE BOROUGH OF TRAPPE COUNCIL

February 7, 2006  
7:00 PM

At 6:00 PM an advertised public meeting for a presentation of the Main Street Corridor Plan preceded the 7:00 PM February meeting.

President Strauss called the regularly scheduled meeting of Trappe Borough Council began at 7:05 PM.

Roll Call by the Secretary: Those present were Mayor Connie Peck, President Stu Strauss, Vice President Nevin Scholl, Matt Watson, Paul Greco, Mark Carrig, Ed Kane, and Steve Kurcik. Also in attendance were Treasurer John Klink, Engineer John Sartor, Solicitor Bob Kerns, Planning Commission Chairman Fred Schuetz, Building Inspector Sal Capizzi, and Fire Chief Brian Long.

Minutes of the December 29, 2005 Close Out Meeting: Everyone received a copy of the Minutes for the December 29, 2005 Close Out Meeting. There were no noted amendments or corrections.

N. Scholl motioned to accept the Minutes as presented, second by S. Kurcik, all ayes. Motion carried 7 – 0.

Minutes of the January 3, 2006 Meeting: Everyone received a copy of the Minutes for the January 3, 2006 meeting. There were no noted amendments or corrections. N. Scholl confirmed that previous noted changes were made, the Secretary acknowledged that they were so noted and will be recorded.

N. Scholl motioned to accept the Minutes with the changes as noted, second by E. Kane, all ayes. Motion carried 7 – 0.

Presentation of the Bills – J. Klink

Everyone received a copy of February Accounts Payable. There were additional bills presented as follows:

Kerns, Pearlstine, Onorato, & Fath (Solicitor)	\$4,278.00
E. Sacks Contracting (cleaning inlets)	\$ 80.00
Berkheimer & Associates Commission	\$ 366.21
Selective Insurance (Commercial & W/C)	\$7,347.00

N. Scholl motioned to accept the Financial Reports as presented, second by S. Kurcik, all ayes. Motion carried 7 – 0.

Financial Reports – J. Klink

Everyone received a copy of the Financial Reports. There were no noted amendments or corrections.

N. Scholl motioned to accept the Financial Reports as presented, second by M. Carrig, all ayes. Motion carried 7 – 0.

Perkiomen Valley WaterShed Association – Award made later in the meeting.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH Hall  
February 7, 2006

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Sam Mancuso, College Woods President of Home Owners Association

S. Mancuso was before Council for three issues as follows:

Trash Issue – S. Mancuso was before Council to make comments with regard to trash removal and Christmas trees. President Strauss advised that the issue would be addressed under N. Scholl's report and that Council is aware of the concerns. Also there is an issue with no dumpster lids in Trappe Village allowing trash blowing around – Code Enforcer S. Capizzi will look into the issue and write a letter so stating, President Strauss to follow up.

Meeting Minutes – S. Mancuso expressed his concern with regard to the absence of Council's determination after an executive session not having been recorded in the Minutes. He wanted the minutes to be amended to reference his comments at the general public section of the meeting. Solicitor Kerns advised that once the Minutes were reviewed and accepted as presented they cannot be added to after acceptance. The Solicitor further advised Mr. Mancuso to write a letter indicating his objection to make it part of the record, but further that Council cannot add to the Minutes that are prepared because of a statement presented, Council members cannot do that. Minutes are minutes, they reflect what the minute taker says had occurred that evening and we do not go back to the tapes and re-do the minutes. Minutes are not taken at executive sessions because they are executive sessions, they deal with litigation and advice given to Council, not subject to minutes taken nor will we have minutes taken.

Peden Issue – Mr. Mancuso asked with regard to the process for the Peden issue because of the new Council being seated in January. He is concerned that new council members do have all the documentation in their possession they need to make an informed decision.

President Strauss advised he would make sure that everybody, should the vote come up, that members are comfortable that they have all the information, if not, that means there will not be a vote.

Paul Edwards – spoke with regard to the police study, he was asked to wait until the topic would be opened as an agenda item.

FIRE CHIEF – B. Long (Copy of Report on file in Borough office)

Everyone received a copy of Brian's report. Brian reviewed the report. He advised there are personnel in training right now. The Ordinance to backbill incidents in the Borough will be ready for Council review, more information has been accumulated from other municipalities and will taken under consideration hopefully ready for presentation by next month. Additionally, Brian was in communication with the Upper Providence Fire Marshal to obtain additional funding from Upper Providence for Trap Fire Company due to the amount of calls that take place in their municipality. Upper Providence did not respond favorably the first time and therefore we cannot expect them to respond favorably this time.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

ENGINEER'S REPORT – J. Sartor (Copy of Report on file in office)

Bentley Manor – Work has been done on the street light installation. MJ Electric has been on site. Also Gilmore and Associates has met with Jack Strouse of Strouse Landscaping on January 18 to identify the items still requiring Strouse's attention and Strouse has been asked to provide a cost estimate for tonight's meeting to enable Council to be in a position to understand exactly what the additional landscaping items would cost. No documentation has been received from Strouse; attempts to contact Strouse Landscaping have not been responded to; therefore no information can be presented by G&A and no opinion can be rendered at this time. President Strauss stated he felt that the remaining landscaping items should be costed out; the Engineer agreed. The majority of the work will be done in the spring and there may not be enough escrow funding available to cover the items at Bentley Manor. President Strauss asked J. Sartor to contact some landscapers and give them a copy of the plan and punchlist to obtain additional estimates.

Regarding the street light installation at the site, G&A received a letter from M/D asking the status of the work. The letter was forwarded to the Solicitor and the response should be forthcoming from the Solicitor.

Borough Line, Linfield-Trappe and Proposed Greenwood Realignment – Council requested that G&A review the plans prepared by Upper Providence (UP) Township's engineer and a review letter was submitted on December 4, 2005. At the January 17, 2006 meeting, the Planning Commission made two recommendations. They recommended that Council endorse the realignment of the boundary line between the Borough and UP Township so that the line be revised to coincide with the proposed realigned centerline of Borough Line and the land between the right of way and the current property lines be deeded over to the landowners and joined in common deed.

The second recommendation was that concrete sidewalks be installed along the realigned segments of Borough Line and Linfield – Trappe Road but not at the expense of the current residents or Trappe Borough. N. Scholl stated he believes there are some legal issues involved with this as discussed at executive session prior to the swearing in of some additional council members and he believes it should be revisited again in executive session with regard to the legal issues.

Borough Line Road, West 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue/Lewis Road Intersection Flashing Traffic Beacon – There was some work started on the project in the middle of January on the concrete foundations on the signal poles. The following day the property owner at the southeast corner of that intersection located within Upper Providence Township approached the crews and objected to the work being done on the property.

In conversation with the property owner, Leigh Carter, and G&A's Eric Kaufman and John Sartor met with Ms. Carter after work hours on January 20<sup>th</sup> and discussed the various options and basically explained to Ms. Carter how we achieved the present status of the project. There were discussions with the Borough Solicitor, Dick Watt; it was his recommendation that we halt work on the project until we could clear up Ms. Carter's issue. The development (Musser Property) that was the subdivision of the property behind that house on the southeast corner was reviewed and approved by UP Township

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

several years ago. On the plan, there was an indication shown that the area between the legal right of way and ultimate right of way line would be offered for dedication to the Township. Legal right of way is basically the right of way that exists as defined by the municipality or PennDOT. The ultimate right of way is the portion of property that the municipality or PennDOT has the opportunity to acquire if offered to the municipality to do further road improvements.

During the course of the design of the signal plan, G&A determined that the property in question property lines ended at the ultimate right of way line. A copy of the deed was obtained it showed that the property lines end at the ultimate right of way line. The UP Township manager indicated that UP never accepted dedication of the portion of ground between the legal and ultimate right of way. Ms. Carter has objected to the work, the work has been halted and the Engineer is asking Council how they would like to proceed at this point. Trappe Borough informed the residents living within this Borough's boundary of the pending. There was ample communication between the Borough office and UP Township and G&A's office and UP to inform UP that this project was moving forward and approvals were received. Why her municipality never notified Ms Carter is not evident.

Ms. Carter was before Council to discuss the project and voice her objections and possible alternatives. She referenced a traffic study advising that a traffic signal did not meet PennDOT standard to warrant a traffic light or a 4-way stop. She was concerned about the cost indicating \$50,000 - \$100,000 for installation of the signal. She indicated there were two of the poles for the signal installed on her property, and asked whether there are other low costs alternatives to be considered that are cheaper before approving the construction expenditure. According to Ms. Carter, the UP Engineer indicated there could be a stop sign on that side of the street, signs posted prior to the stop sign, red/white reflector on the base of the stop sign, this alternative could cost \$500 to \$1,000, cheaper than the installation of the signal. Ms. Carter asked why could this not be considered when a beacon is not in her opinion as prudent or as an effective means of decreasing traffic. Additionally, UP does not feel that the activities there warrant a full signal and would consider sharing the cost of this project should it be other than the full signal if it would be the solution for safety of Trappe residents and reduce the accident level and UP would become involved and share the costs.

President Strauss responded by stating that at this time when there is a project so close together with boundaries, some municipalities do not want to share costs. Trappe asked UP if they would like to help us with this matter and we were denied. Another circumstance, Linfield Borough Line Roads, a project initiated by UP asked Trappe whether we would like to share the expense and they initiated the project and we were advised they initiated the project and would have to proceed by themselves. Ideally, municipalities can share the expense, sometimes they cannot.

J. Sartor thanked Ms. Carter for being present to help resolve the matter and noted Trappe has a contractor that has been stopped and this is costing the Borough quite a bit of money as a delay, the sooner it is resolved, the better for all parties. The cost of the

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

project is not between \$50,000 and \$100,000 that it is \$30,746.81 for the flashing beacon. Regarding the less involved options that have not been considered, the conclusion of G&A's study was that a 4-way stop was not warranted and that a flashing beacon was warranted.

G&A's Traffic Engineer, Eric Kaufman, was present at the meeting. Eric is the project manager for the project. Eric responded citing other options that may have been as feasible and why this particular option was selected. The options cited were 1. The intersection did not meet warrants for a multi-way stop, 2. The intersection did not meet warrants for a full traffic signal at this time, 3. The flashing beacon would give the Borough the option of converting to a full signal when signal warrants were met.

President Strauss noted that UP had all the information that Eric had and never questioned it or came back to the Borough – they were not concerned. On May 12, 2003, Eric and J. Sartor authored and signed a letter addressed to George Waterman, UP Manager, provided a copy of the warrant analyses done by G&A, copied the Planning and Zoning Administrator, Lee Milligan as well as the UP Traffic Engineer, Frank Zabowski. May 29, 2003 letter received from Mr. Waterman addressed to G&A indicated the May 12 letter was distributed and reviewed by the Township supervisors and staff and was directed to respond by indicating the Township does not see need for or benefits of a flashing beacon at this intersection and would not willing to contribute funding for its installation.

The question is does Ms. Carter own the ground that the two signal poles are to be located. There was discussion. The Solicitor advised that the Borough is in a situation where we have out poles, our contractor and a piece of property that is really not owned by the applicant at this point. Because it was offered to the Township, they could take that piece and it would become their (UP) property. Mr. Phil Barker, UP Township, advised/reiterated to John Sartor basically what Mr. Kerns said. All information was provided to Mr. Barker for UP Township supervisors and their traffic engineer. It is understood that UP traffic engineer will be reviewing the information and the issue will be brought up at the March meeting.

Mr. Phil Barker, UP Township Supervisor informed Council that the information provided to UP was given their engineer and his preliminary review was that it still does not warrant a traffic signal at that intersection. N. Scholl stated that the same information was provided several years ago; UP did not respond the first time and therefore we cannot expect to receive a response this time. PennDOT approved the flashing signal. There was no further discussion at this time, to be revisited at the March meeting.

Carriage Ridge Estates – A comprehensive punch list is being prepared and a summary of issues was provided in August with regard to what had been done and what had not been done. There are a number of concerns relating to the wearing course. Some areas have been reconstructed and some back areas have been identified where the base course settled and cracked, some repairs made, some not made. The Engineer indicated the

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

developer should go through the report, item by item and look at the number of items that have been completed vs. what remains.

N. Scholl inquired with regard to the basin and its status, Andre DiPrinzio advised it is presently being pumped out and will be aerated, all information will be provided to the Engineer for review.

Community Music School – Construction is proceeding at the School. A situation occurred this past month whereby the contractor installed a retaining wall without contacting G&A's office for inspection. On January 25, G&A faxed to Mrs. French a synopsis of what had occurred reminding her that at the pre-construction meeting on June 28, it was made clear to them what G&A's responsibilities were in the way of inspection of all the site work. Also reminded her that the retaining walls that were shown on the approved land development plans were escrowed items, therefore, when the Community Music School (CMS) sends a request to Council requesting release of the escrow and inquires of G&A if the retaining wall was properly installed, G&A will have to tell council they do not know because the shop drawings were not submitted to G&A nor were they contacted and notified that construction was going on and as such could not inspect the work.

There were four items G&A was looking for to confirm for Council that the walls were in fact properly designed and constructed, a fax to that effect was sent on January 25, on February 2, no response was received by phone or email, on the same day at 5:20 PM, Mrs. French was emailed asking if she received the fax of January 25 and requested that G&A would appreciate a response by the next Council meeting. On Monday, an email response was received saying the fax was received and forwarded to Kelly Builders, the CMS project manager, and was in conversation with G&A's project manager and informed him that their project manager was not aware that the wall required an inspection and that pictures of the wall in all stages were taken and available for review and CMS made every effort to comply with Trappe Borough. This is the only instance that Kelly Builders and CMS has not cooperated, the photos are not sufficient pieces of information and they are not part of what was requested in the January 25 fax. How would Council like G&A to proceed at this point. The wall is 3-5 feet high; the requirements are for anything over 36" inspection. G&A is waiting for Council direction on how to proceed. President Strauss stated there are two choices. One is look at it and assume everything is done properly, and take a portion of the wall down make sure there is a proper base. J. Sartor indicated that the entire wall would have to be removed because there is no way to verify that the foundation was properly installed without removing the entire wall and looking at the foundation. There are two walls and they are several hundred feet in length. Plans are required and G&A was not provided with them. If CMS were asked to submit plans, the plans could be done after the fact and no way for G&A to verify what was installed was in accordance with the plans they provided. They would have to be stamped and signed by a professional engineer. G&A asked for the retaining wall shop drawings including construction details and specifications signed and sealed by a professional engineer registered in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

design calculations supporting the shop drawings, signed and sealed, daily construction and inspection reports from a qualified testing agency including documentation of the installation of the retaining wall. CMS has not been forthcoming in providing the requested information.

The Solicitor indicated the next step is to send a letter asking CMS to take the wall down because we cannot approve something if we do not know how it was constructed. Should an engineer sign off on the plan, and it is not constructed accordingly, it becomes a liability issue and a physical issue if it collapses and anyone becomes hurt. There is also liability on the Borough's part for the Engineer if a request for release of escrow money is made for the wall – Council will look to G&A and ask if the wall was properly installed and whether the funds should be released – G&A will not make such a recommendation.

M. Carrig motioned that the Solicitor write a letter, second by M. Watson, all ayes. Motion carried 7 – 0.

DCED Flood Plain Management Form – At the January meeting Council asked for an estimate of costs to assist to prepare that form and an amount of not to exceed \$300 was given for approval. The question was raised as to whether it is too late to present the application for consideration. No date was given on the form – the Secretary will call DCED for information and then Council can direct the Engineer to make preparation.

N. Scholl motioned the approve submission of the form and move on it, second by M. Carrig, all ayes. Motion carried 7 – 0.

Dr Eric Hans (515 West Main Street) – The applicant has not posted financial security for the engineering review and construction observation.

Heritage Park (171 Royer Drive – January letter from Helene Corbo forwarded to the Solicitor and Engineer, is there anything the Council would like G&A to do in this regard. President Strauss indicated that this is a legal issue and will pursue with the Solicitor.

NPDES Phase II MS4 Stormwater Management Program – There are a number of things that need to be completed before the March 9<sup>th</sup> deadline. One is for a newspaper ad to be placed by the Borough and posters to be placed at various places within the Borough. Reference was made to where the posters were placed last year and an advertisement placed in the Mercury, G&A can do this work. Council felt that Dianne could do this.

A reminder that inspection of all municipally owned storm inlets, basins and Best Management Practices as well as inlet stenciling should be completed by March 9, 2006 as part of the NPDES Stormwater comments. In June G&A filed an annual report to DEP stating what the Borough has done in this previous permit year to comply with the permit requirements. That permit year was from March 10, 2005 to March 9, 2006. Does Council want Public Works to do the inspections, G&A provided the Borough the Operations and Management binder, at a meeting held on May 26 with PW, Administrative personnel, lists of inlet numbers, date of inspections, debris and maintenance required and completed, numbered maps of the Borough. President Strauss will contact PW tomorrow and authorize to do the work. If the inlets are clogged or have

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

debris PW would be contacted to clean and/or remove the debris because G&A is not a contractor or get authorization from Borough to have Sacks do the work. Someone has to remove the material by March 9, 2006

Residential Restrictions for Registered Adult Violent Sexual Offenders Map – A letter proposal was provided for preparation of the digital map to supplement an ordinance restricting residents, locations for registered locations for adult violent sexual offenders. The price to perform the task was an amount of \$350.00. (discussed under Old Business).

Silver Leaf Farms – Communication between the Solicitor and the Gambone attorneys regarding extending the maintenance period.

The solicitor advised there is a significant amount of money in the escrow account to do that maintenance. Nothing received back from the Gambone attorneys. The concern was as to whether there has been further deterioration of concrete and updates their August report.

Developer Escrow

With regard to the issue of enough money remaining in escrow for the developers, John advised that due to the extra volume of work this month he has focused on Bentley Manor and Carriage Ridge and will work the rest of the month doing the remaining escrow accounts. N. Scholl indicated Council was in agreement with G&A's priorities, President Strauss thanked John for everything in excess given to him and his prompt response.

M. Carrig motioned to accept the Engineer's Report, second by S. Kurcik, all ayes. Motion carried.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT – B. Kerns (Copy of report on file in office)

Everyone received a copy of the Solicitor's Report.

CTMA Bylaws Residency of Members – Addressed by M. Carrig. Trappe appointed Ernie Schmitt as a representative to CTMA for Trappe Borough. Mark advised that Ernie is not a resident of Trappe Borough or Collegeville or any of the municipalities that make up the LPVRSAs. There is a question with regard as to how he can be appointed and representing either Trappe or Collegeville or any of the members of the LPVRSAs.

The Solicitor stated that during discussions, he indicated he was looking into that circumstance and will report back to Council next month (March), there should be some developments on that. Further discussion in the executive session this evening.

College Woods/Peden and Dedication – there are two issues that came up concerning College Woods. Dedication first, there is conflicting data relative to the road dedication. The Solicitor indicated that he read John's report and does not disagree. There are also statements in some of the plans that indicate that HOA shall be responsible for the maintenance of various items i.e. open space and including streets. There is an issue relative to the access to the public streets and ownership that will be relative to the ownership and dedication.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

S. Mancuso before Council referencing complaint 2002-24816 – The Solicitor advised that has nothing to do with what is being discussed tonight – they are two separate issues.

As far as Peden is concerned, the Solicitor made a recommendation to send letters asking the HOA to share in the cost for a landscaper/arborist. The HOA declined to participate in paying for one-third the cost of the project. Further discussion in the executive session this evening.

S. Mancuso stated the HOA has not closed the door to participate in the costs, only that they are awaiting estimates from a landscaper/arborist. M. Carrig asked what the next step is to bring this issue to closure; Mark referenced the court decision (complaint) and indicated that the decision is different than that portrayed by Mr. Mancuso. President Strauss stated we needed to contact an arborist and be charged only \$75 and hopefully the HOA and Pedens will agree to share the cost. S. Mancuso to get back to President Strauss with HOA decision.

Silver Leaf Farms – The Solicitor addressed the issue of punch list items in the development including concrete repair and/or replacement and the extension of the maintenance period. No response from the developer to date, but expect to receive a response to the proposal and work issues out; the responsibility is now with the developer to respond.

Professional Services Agreement Resolution – A draft Resolution was presented to Council for their review and consideration that would formalize the escrow provisions for engineering and solicitor fees reviews. This Resolution would be more specific as to the responsibility of the reviews. It is an ongoing continuous escrow that would be replenished at the request of the Borough and in the future would resolve some of the outstanding issues.

M. Carrig motioned to adopt the Professional Services Agreement between the Applicant and the Borough of Trappe, second by E. Kane, all ayes. Motion carried 7 – 0.

Verizon Agreement – The Solicitor met with representatives of Verizon relative to the Cable Franchise Agreement with the Borough and a revised Agreement was presented for the Solicitor's review. The Agreement provides for a 15-year term, 5% of gross revenues, reservation of dedicated access use and free cable service to public buildings in the Borough. A separate pole agreement will be presented in the near future.

M. Watson motioned to accept the advertising of the Agreement as outlined by the Solicitor, second by N. Scholl, all ayes. Motion carried 7 – 0.

Watershed Public Presentation – President Strauss acknowledged Crystal Gilcrest of the Perkiomen Watershed Conservancy who presented the winner of the MS4 Stormwater Survey. Crystal presented a check in the amount of \$100 to Alex Tweedie of 648 Hamilton Court, Trappe Pa, 19426.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

MAYOR'S REPORT – C. Peck (Copy of Report on file in office)

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Finance/Waste/Recycling – N. Scholl

Property/Open Space/Traffic – E. Kane

Public Safety – P. Greco

Paul advised there was report presented by J. Obrecht for the radar speed sign and comments from neighbors who complained of excessive speed were pleased with the result that there has been a slow down of traffic after they see their speed on the speed sign. The sign is effective.

Ordinances/Personnel/Appointments – M. Carrig

Borough Manager's Position – An advertisement was inadvertently run by the Mercury. Mark advised there are to resumes that are of interest and he was in conversation with the other Committee persons and will be in contact with another applicant – both are very strong candidates and have experience in government and pretty much what the Committee is looking for and within the price range. Over the next month, it is hoped that the Committee can present something that is solid for council's consideration. All council members will have the opportunity to interview the strong candidates.

Auditor Appointments – January 3, 2006 two auditor positions became available. One was through the resignation of Sue Leighton and the other due to a move from the Borough. Those vacancies are ready to be filled.

S. Kurcik motioned to accept the resignation of Sue Leighton as auditor, second by M. Watson, all ayes. Motion carried.

N. Scholl motioned to accept the name of Dennis Lee, 744 West Main Street to fulfill the term for two years, second by M. Carrig, all ayes. Motion carried.

N. Scholl motioned to accept the name of Susan Hunyada, 174 Gilbert Place for a one year to fulfill the term of U. Berk Ellis who is no longer a resident of the Borough, second by S. Kurcik, all ayes. Motion carried.

CTMA Bylaws – Mark advised that Collegeville appointed Ernie Schmidt to LPVRSAs as their representative. E. Schmitt is the Trappe representative to CTMA. Mark advised that E. Schmitt is not a resident of Trappe or Collegeville or any municipality that make up LPVRSAs. There is a question as to whether he can be appointed and represent either Collegeville or Trappe or the LPVRSAs since he does not reside in the area.

Public Works/CTMA – M. Watson

At the most recent meeting of CTMA/PW, N. Scholl was appointed as Vice Chairman of the Committee. Nevin elaborated in that both bodies were reorganized and unfortunately with the legal issues with Lower Providence and Regional Sewer Authority the legal bills

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

are mounting; over \$12,000 for depositions on an expedited basis, seems to be moving along, a major issue with the Regional Sewer Authority.

**Planning and Zoning** – S. Kurcik

The Regional Planning Commission has decided to meet at one location for the year 2006 will be in Schwenksville, the public is invited to the Regional Planning Commission meetings held the second Monday of each month at 6:30 PM. Steve volunteered Trappe to host those meeting in 2009 with council concurrence. (when is your term up Steve?) The Borough Planning Commission meets the third Tuesday of every month at Borough Hall, open to the public for attendance.

President Strauss gave an update on Trappe Days – 2006. The Committee is meeting, the days selected for the events are September 16, 2006 and as a rain date September 30, 2006. Trappe Days is paid for by the local business and sponsors, not by the taxpayers. Hopefully it will be bigger and better – entertainment is already being lined up and the headline group for the year is The Duprees.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Police Study** – At the close out meeting on December 29, 2005, Council chose to participate in a regional police study with Collegeville, Perkiomen Township and Trappe. At this time the President entertained a motion to open up discussion whether Trappe would like to participate in the study or not participate in the study.

M. Watson motioned to open up the topic for discussion, second by P. Greco, all ayes. Motion carried 7 – 0.

At this time President Strauss opened up the discussion to the Council, each member having his opinion heard and then the topic will be opened up to the public for their comments. Once the information is received, it is up to Council as to how it will proceed. Some factual information was given. The PSP is presently responsible for public safety and patrolling the streets in Trappe; there is no additional charge for the services provided. Looking at last year's statistics show that the incidents in Trappe are less than one a day. The percent of major crime vs. minor crime, major crime is only a couple percent as were most incidents in our Borough are minor crime. Looking at Trappe's budget as how much the borough pays for all municipal activities that take place for the residents of Trappe is one million dollars. Statistic: Collegeville police department budget alone is 1.3 million. They are in negotiations right now which will increase that number if we get a regional police department; we are looking at either double or increase the police force by two-thirds. If we do proceed with the study we are looking at either doubling or increasing the police force by 2/3. The question on the study, if this study did everything from A – Z, President Strauss would probably go along with the study, but this study does not do that. This study will do is determine 1. If we have a regional police study in Collegeville-Trappe-Perk – how many policemen will be necessary, 2. determine how much equipment, cars, etc necessary to support this

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

department. The most important part of the study is should we have a police department in Trappe one way or another. How do we do that is look at the statistics and make a determination. Should it be determined that there is a need, consideration should be given to other alternatives i.e. rent-a-police officer, for the benefit of the Borough who would the best and most economical go along with, we should look at UP because they have better and bigger facilities and go through the Borough frequently. This study does not look into where are we going to house the department, obtain real estate, and build a separate/different facility and does not give us how much a police department is actually going to cost Borough residents. The reason Perkiomen Township is participating in the study is not because they want a police department but because they want to get information and some costs so when a taxpayer asks why we do not have a department they can state to taxpayers your taxes would increase.

Chief Joe Kirschner who has good credentials and references for the study.

(Steve) Discussion was opened for Council. There were comments with regard to the numbers don't warrant a police force at this time, if those numbers were to change, the opinion could be changed. Most people spoken to in Trappe are in agreement, do not need a police force but are open to alternatives/options. No need to go further with the study.

(Mark) Why? Why was this ever brought up in the first place? Why was it ever brought up to do it with Collegeville when you have Perkiomen and Trappe involved. Why didn't they contact UP or did they? Quotes from Collegeville's budget, major medical, jump in the budget, added 1.2 million budget is that what Trappe to become part of, Collegeville is going to lose 12 properties off the tax rolls this year which will increase their financial burden.

(Paul) The other two municipalities are doing the study, so why wouldn't we do it, it is free, the money is there.

Going around the table ceased at this time and at this point there was an exchange of ideas between Council members with regard to the number of personnel needed, crime statistics, cost per household in property tax,

(Ed) Personally, sees no reason, however because he has spoken to at least 200 people who said in accordance with democracy, only 2 out of 200 said they think we need a police force – so my answer is don't waste time, don't do the study.

(Paul) I just said it 3 times; it is a free police study, free knowledge and that is a terrible thing to waste for knowledge. If you guys are going by what we voted for 17.8 percent of the voters in Trappe, is not a majority, this is not a dictatorship. It is a free study, it's study.

(Mayor Peck) As a resident and business rep in the Borough, we need at least some alternate because those people who are reading incidents that Trappe does not have a problem are not the same people who live in Trappe. She indicated she went door to door and most people said they did not want a police force – there are a lot of people that do want it and Trappe needs to look into it and listen to whatever this man (J. Kirschner)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

has to say. She would like to hear how the survey should be done from him and then make a decision.

(N. Scholl) I've heard a few times tonight that it is a free study, I am anxious to hear if it is being done pro bono. From the information Nevin has it is not and that means the taxpayers of the State of Pennsylvania, not NJ and Trappe are paying for the study, so the fact of the matter is that if it is not free, and cannot see proceeding on a study when I campaigned and virtually every person that he discussed it with said they don't want it. I ran on a platform of no police at this point based on the crime statistics. Nevin is honor bound to follow the wishes of the voters and indicated he intended to do so.

(Matt) Just a couple of things, he said State Police basically don't charge us anything to come out here, 6 months ago didn't the chief from the State Police come in here and say, we are thinking of running a program and if they come out to an alarm, second, third time they are going to charge you for fines, they are going to have to start subsidizing coming out here to these places. If there is going to be a charge, it is going to be coming down the road and you know it is at this time you might not see it but it is – false alarms – discussion for charges of false alarms – minor crimes vs. major crimes, what is the difference – discussion – with Perk taking place with the study, Perk Twp manager, Stu advised the reason behind not taking part in the study and in conversation they didn't think they were interested in a police study, having a police department, but what they want to do is to determine the costs, that way when asked why they don't have a police department, they can say it costs too much taxpayer money.

Matt: so therefore it is a fact finding mission – so information would be provided on a partial basis, but she is trying to get facts and why can't partake in a study that is going to give us facts and educate the people of Trappe in order to make a decision – 200 people in Trappe that don't want a police force per Ed's numbers – are the 200 people in the room because there is no standing room and most people here are for the study. Did those 2 care enough to come up here because the issue is tabled –

There was further exchange of council members – talking – cross talking –

Council discussion closed. Open for public comment.

F. Schuetz – presented a letter directed to Borough officials with names of business owners in favor of the study. Others speaking in favor and citing personal incidents to their property and opinions were Mr. Paul Edwards, Fire Chief Brian Long, Mrs. Cathy Kelemen, Linda Rebstock, Carl MacIlwaine, Fran Ruggiero, Ed McDade.

Chief Joe Kirschner was present to address all aspects of the police study indicating it would cover demographics, geographics, population, chopping centers, prisons, schools, churches, looking at police calls and in the study a proposed budget, would include real estate, and there would be no direct cost to the municipality.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF TRAPPE BOROUGH COUNCIL  
TRAPPE BOROUGH HALL  
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

President Strauss called for a roll call vote for the police study as follows:

S. Kurcik	nay	
M. Carrig	nay	
E. Kane	nay	
P. Greco		aye
S. Strauss	nay	
N. Scholl	nay	
M. Watson		aye.

There were for five nay votes, two aye, motion failed 5 – 2

NEW BUSINESS

Sexual Predator Ordinance – This Ordinance was presented for Council review and is ready to be advertised.

P. Greco motioned to advertise the Sexual Predator Ordinance, second by M. Watson, one nay vote by N. Scholl, the remainder of Council all ayes. Motion carried 6 – 1.

Accompanying map to be done by G&A for a figure not to exceed \$350.00.

P. Greco motioned for G&A to proceed to prepare a map for the above ordinance, second by M. Watson, one nay vote by N. Scholl, the remainder of Council all ayes. Motion carried 6 – 1.

Council adjourned to executive session to discuss the Peden issue at 11:30 PM, the Secretary exited the meeting at that time.

Following the executive session, Council reconvened and voted unanimously to instruct the Solicitor to address a letter to Mr. Peden and the College Woods Homeowners' Association stating that Borough Council will engage the services of an arborist for the purpose of making recommendations for any remediation found necessary to landscaping planted between the Peden property and College Woods property. Council further stated that any recommendations made by this arborist will not be the responsibility of the Borough but will be the responsibility of Mr. Peden and the Homeowners' Association as they may agree.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Katona  
Secretary