**CASTLE SHANNON BOROUGH**

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

April 24, 2023

The following elected officials were present: M. Heckmann, J. Maloney; R. Astor; N. Kovach; B. Oates, M. Randazzo; D. Swisher; D. Baumgarten. Tax Collector E. O’Malley was absent. The following appointed officials were present: K. Truver, Police Chief; P. Vietmeier, Codes Official; D. Biondo, Solicitor. Borough Manager K. Stringent was absent.

**Minutes:** The minutes of the April 10, 2023 council meeting were presented. Ms. Randazzo motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Maloney seconded; all in favor; motion carried.

**Public Comment – Agenda Items:** No comments were received; therefore, the public comment section was closed.

**Bid Openings:** Mr. Heckmann presented the results of the bid for the Lower Hamilton Park Infrastructure and Retaining Walls project. Ms. Kovach motioned to award the bid of Contract No. 23-PK4 Group 2 Parks – Lower Hamilton Park Infrastructure and Retaining Walls to Dragun Contracting and Landscape Design, LLC for $1,163,930.00. Mr. Oates seconded; all in favor; motion carried.

**Council Committee Reports**

**Public Relations/Communications** – Mr. Heckmann was happy to introduce the new Main Street website that has been launched. This is a resource to our business community and will provide a resource for news and events. A new retail campaign has started with Main Street Castle Shannon window signs. Council encourages residents to always support our local businesses. Mr. Heckmann commended borough staff for their work on the website.

**Building & Grounds/Public Works** – Mr. Maloney reported on an emergency sanitary sewer situation on Hamilton Road.

The public works crew has been cutting grass and cartways and working on park maintenance.

**Public Safety/Fire:** Mr. Astor reported that the Castle Shannon Volunteer Fire Department responded to sixteen calls in April. Ten calls were in the borough. One response was in Baldwin Township, with five mutual aid calls.

Chief Truver presented Resolution #729 – revising the fees for the application and issuance of a license for a transient retail business including door-to-door solicitors, peddlers, and all other transient retail businesses. Ms. Kovach motioned to adopt Resolution #729. Mr. Swisher seconded; all in favor; motion carried.

Officer Michael Kalas has submitted his resignation. Ms. Randazzo motioned to accept the resignation with regret. Mr. Astor seconded; all in favor; motion carried. Officer Kalas is leaving in good standing and was an exemplary officer.

Chief Truver presented a Memorandum of Understanding between the borough and Keystone Oaks School District. In compliance with the School Code, the renewal for this is every two years. Mr. Maloney motioned to authorize the appropriate officials to execute the MOU for Keystone Oaks School District. Ms. Randazzo seconded; all in favor; motion carried.

Chief Truver reported that Pennsylvania Lawa Enforcement Accreditation Assessors will be visiting the police department this week for a final review.

**Finance:** Mr. Swisher reviewed the check register for April 14th and questioned a lawn mower expenditure. Mr. Swisher also reviewed the check register for April 21st and questioned the invoice for insurance.

Ms. Kovach questioned whether an invoice by Charles Christ for streetscape photos and videos was for the website. Mr. Heckmann answered yes for the construction footage downtown that will be posted on the borough’s You-Tube channel and borough website.

**Community Activities/Planning and Codes** – Mr. Heckmann thanked the volunteers and staff that attended the Saw Mill Run Spring Stream Clean-up on April 22nd. Mr. Astor stated that the event was sparsely attended, but a solid group of people working together accomplished the goal. Mr. Astor added that the creek is continuously improving from this effort.

Mr. Vietmeier stated that Michael Moog, Codes Enforcement Officer, started last week.

**Library –** Ms. Randazzo announced that National Library Week is April 23rd to April 29th and welcomed Heather Myrah, Library Director, and Donna Phillips, President of the Board of Trustees, to tonight’s meeting. Ms. Randazzo thanked Ms. Myrah and Ms. Phillips for their contributions to the library. The theme for National Library Week is “There’s More to the Story”. Ms. Randazzo added that the borough is so blessed to have such a strong library. Strong communities are about strong libraries and literacy.

Ms. Myrah announced that The Annual Tiny Art Exhibition is April 25th from 6:30 pm to 7:30 pm.

The library is hosting a pop-up event at Myrtle Parklet on April 26th from 4:30 pm to 6:00 pm with games, activities, and book give-a-ways.

Friends of the Library Book Sale made $1,800 in sales.

A fundraising event is planned at The Walnut Grill in Bethel Park on April 26th. Presenting the flyer from the website will allow 20% of sales to be donated to the library.

**ALOM –** Ms. Kovach and Mr. Astor attended the ALOM Spring Conference. Ms. Kovach gave an in-depth report on the legislative panel discussion regarding: local use of radar legislation, an emergency response team from Western Pennsylvania, an urban search and rescue bill, reinstatement of civic classes in Pennsylvania history in Pennsylvania schools, recruitment incentives for police and fire fighters, a gift ban for law makers, gun safety, landside legislation, approval of digital advertising, encouragement for local governments to invest in Electronic Vehicle (EV) chargers, and ways to address unfunded mandates.

Ms. Kovach was pleased to announce that Castle Shannon Borough has been once again designated as a banner community by the Allegheny League of Municipalities.

Ms. Kovach attended a session at the ALOM Conference on Animal Welfare and Control Solutions for Municipal Leaders and asked Mr. Vietmeier if the borough’s chicken ordinance contained a manure disposal clause. Mr. Vietmeier will check the ordinance.

**SHACOG** – Mr. Oates attended the Board of Directors meeting in South Fayette. Mark Patrick spoke regarding the creation of a redevelopment authority.

Mr. Heckmann noted that Ms. Stringent is an active participant in CONNECT (communities connected to the City of Pittsburgh), and the members are considering establishing a grant writing authority.

**Manager:** Mr. Heckmann presented a design services proposal by KU Resources for the RACP Funded Streetscape Phase II and discussed the scope of the project. A second proposal was received from Lennon, Smith, Souleret Engineering. Mr. Swisher questioned the bid price from Lennon, Smith, Souleret. Mr. Heckmann noted it was approximately $3,000 less that the proposal from KU Resources, but KU has an active permit with PennDOT which will reduce their cost. Mr. Swisher believes that continuity of the project is not a valid reason to retain KU Resources. Mr. Maloney motioned to table the agenda item until both proposals have been reviewed by council. Mr. Oates seconded; all in favor; motion carried.

Mr. Heckmann presented Resolution #730 for a plan revision for new land development related to Hamilton Park renovations. Ms. Randazzo motioned to adopt Resolution #730. Mr. Oates seconded; all in favor; motion carried.

**Mayor’s Report:** Mayor Baumgarten read a proclamation for National Library Week 2023 whereas libraries have long served as trusted institutions - often the heart of their cities, towns, and schools. The library offers equipment and professional staff support to utilize technology, programs and services; and the library is a resource for people of all ages, interests, and backgrounds. America is celebrating National Library Week including April 25th as National Library Workers’ Day and the immeasurable contributions made by library workers; April 26th as National Outreach Day showing library services are not limited to their physical location; and April 27th as Take Action for Libraries Day encouraging community support for libraries.

Mayor Baumgarten asked Chief Truver to briefly explain accreditation for the police department. Chief Truver stated that there are 160 standards that are national best practices for law enforcement agencies. The Pennsylvania Law Enforcement Accreditation Commission has assessors to review the policy manual, practices, policies and procedures to ensure accreditation standards are being met. The accessors will also talk to the officers and review the vehicles and equipment. Accreditation Manager Lt. David Lane has been working on this for many months. The department has an accreditation project team. Lexipol is the policy manual and is in accreditation services. Mayor Baumgarten added that the accreditation process started many years ago with Former Police Chief Harold Lane, and this is quite an accomplishment and honor for the borough and police department.

**Public Comment:** Paul Salvayon, President of the Castle Shannon Revitalization Corporation – stated that he sent an email to Borough Manager Katie Stringent on an alternative energy grant for EV chargers. Mr. Salvayon continued stating that the grant opportunity would be for $500,000 with a 20% project match for EV chargers for the James Street parking lot, the library, the fire department, the municipal center, the parks, and public works garage. Mr. Salvayon had asked for CSRC to be added to this evening’s agenda for a discussion on this grant opportunity since the grant application is due the end of May. Ms. Stringent replied that she would not be at the April 24th meeting and would defer the request to the May 8th meeting. Mr. Salvayon presented copies to council of the following email received from Mr. Heckmann regarding the borough’s relationship with the CSRC:

Hey Paul,

I hope you are well.  Katie mentioned to me today that you've made a request to meet with her and Council members related to CSRC and Borough matters.  While I won't speak for my Council colleagues who can certainly make time for such meetings if they choose, I'd like to outline my position on our organizational relationship and future meetings that consume Borough staff time.  
  
To my knowledge, you've met with Katie four times in the past few months as well as some meetings with Krista as well.  While some of the topics discussed in these meetings may include some hope at shared opportunities between our organizations, not much meaningful progress has been made.  This, I suspect, is because of a hard truth that must be addressed - the health, credibility and capacity of the CSRC remain problematic.  
  
Myself, staff, and other Council members are concerned by the health of your organization, and despite what has been suggested, our concerns have nothing to do with a "bias" against you or your organization.

The Borough has funded the CSRC and it's initiatives to the tune of well over $500,000 since its inception.  We're in the midst of a more quantitative assessment of this figure, but just consider the years of salary for a Mainstreet Manager from Barry forward, the streetscape match money paid exclusively by the taxpayers, and the hundreds of hours of complimentary police, public works and administrative staff time to enable your many events, fundraisers, bookkeeping, minutes-taking, mailers and more.    
  
The investment the Borough has made in your organization since its inception has been immense, greater than any of our other non-profit partners over a similar time horizon.  Any claim to bias against supporting you simply falls flat.

A fairer statement someone could make is that Council is paying far more attention to the relationship between the CSRC and the Borough as it relates to good governance, organizational capacity, budget allocations, and shared vision and goals for the community.    
  
On this point, I'll mention what seem to be plainly observable truths about the current state of your organization and its relationship with the Borough:

* The CSRC has no website, no mission or vision of substance, and has been judged by the prevailing mainstreet accrediting organization in the state to be problematic on many levels (you can read the many annual reports from the PA Downtown Center to verify this, as I have).  If statewide leaders in this sector do not have faith in the CSRC's operations, that alone would be cause to question continued collaboration.
* The CSRC has neglected to keep records in a way that encourages openness with the public or the Borough as its primary funder.  You do not post minutes publicly nor your bylaws, and to my knowledge you have not published an operating budget or furnished any meaningful reporting on progress, impact or metrics to the Borough in any year since my joining Council (this was also a chronic issue in your PDC reviews).  Non-profit best practices dictate that an organization provide open and frequent reports (qualitative and quantitative) to their funders to keep and grow trust between them.  This simply does not occur with your organization.
* Current and former Board members of the CSRC do not seem to understand the ethical responsibilities they should be mindful of as members of both the CSRC Board and Borough Council.  I'm aware that the CSRC was originally formed with a tax designation that assumes a relationship and shared representation between our organizations.  That said, proper conduct in the interest of public trust is expected in order to maintain that relationship, and there remain a number of instances where respecting the best practices of ethics and governance has been lacking.
* There is an unfortunate history of CSRC leadership creating "us vs them" dynamics with downtown business owners and constituents as it relates to the Borough.  Your insistence at a recent Council meeting that we should be collaborating better feels bereft of recent context where downtown policy matters that should have been collaborative became rhetorical battlegrounds between us.  I have and continue to welcome healthy disagreement between Council and the community, but I don't go out of my way to work with people or organizations who seem to favor unhealthy dialogue.

In the end, a realistic judgment needs to be made as to whether is makes sense to collaborate formally with an organization lacking judgment, formality, controls, respect for public service, financial stability, and a true spirit of collaboration.    
  
If you wish to look at other organizations that the Borough does productively partner with and fund from which your organization can learn from, I would focus on the CSVFD and the Castle Shannon Youth Association.  Both organizations have shown what a healthy, fruitful relationship with the Borough can look like AND are committed to openness and respectful conduct on achieving shared goals.  
\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_   
  
In summary, please be advised that:

* We truly wish the CSRC would find its purpose, secure its own capacity, identify sustainable funding, operate with good governance and find a truly collaborative spirit for us to work with you.  All other non-profit partners we work with and financially support have these things in place, so there should be no mistaking this encouragment as being unfair or uniquely asked of your organization.  We expect it of all of our non-profit partners, as the public's trust demands us to do.
* Katie and Borough staff generally will not be consuming their time with CSRC initiatives or meetings until those aforementioned items are addressed.  While your organization, like any other or any constituent, can ask Council to entertain requests in the future, I will personally be taking the position that until the CSRC conforms to a healthier, more capable set of organizational norms, our collaborative efforts should be minimal.

Again, we look forward to a day where your Board and perhaps your personal leadership of the organization can address these concerns.

Have a good weekend,

Mark

Mr. Salvayon stated that CSRC was created in 2009 by borough council. The current solicitor supplied the bylaws and articles of incorporation. The IRS determination letter lists the CSRC as a Type 1 supporting organization. The CSRC’s sole beneficiary is Castle Shannon Borough. Any grants, funds or activities undertaken are to solely benefit Castle Shannon. As part of that, the IRS determines that there are organizational relationships. The IRS relationship requires CSRC to raise money through grants and donations for Castle Shannon Borough’s benefit. The IRS control tests require that no single members benefit from CSRC; therefore, there are no members on borough council that are self-fulfilling. The IRS relationship tests requires Castle Shannon Borough to operate, supervise and control CSRC. Mr. Heckmann disagreed and stated that the CSRC is an independent supporting organization. Mr. Salvayon disagreed and stated that the IRS letter is the reason that CSRC has been subservient to Castle Shannon from the beginning and why Castle Shannon was controlling all the records, minutes and mailings for many years.

Mr. Salvayon continued stating that the CSRC has to file their taxes differently from most non-profits due to the way the IRS designates the organization. Mr. Salvayon believes Castle Shannon should pay for the accountant and should be providing more services and working better with CSRC. This is the reason why Mr. Salvayon has been meeting with borough officials - to find ways to work together.

Mr. Salvayon discussed a cooperation agreement between the CSRC and borough drafted in 2019 regarding the main street manager position. Mr. Salvayon stated the new main street website would have been another great project that CSRC could have worked on instead of using tax payer money. Doing things unilaterally without CSRC’s help is causing losses of being able to get grant funding through Keystone Communities through CSRC. Mr. Salvayon affirmed that borough representatives and main street manager should be meeting with CSRC to assist them, and the organizations should be working together for grants opportunities.

Mr. Salvayon stated that the other non-profit organizations (CSYA and CSVFD) do not have current meeting minutes posted on their websites. CSRC does not currently have a bona fide website. A website was designed in 2017, and a vendor was paid to redesign the website after that time; however, the project was not completed. The CSRC Facebook page has over 1,000 followers and likes which Mr. Salvayon believes is a more meaningful way to post information on the business district and information about the organization, community, and events.

Regarding events, Mr. Salvayon noted that in prior years the CSRC sponsored a golf outing (with borough staff assistance) that was their main funding source for community events. Mr. Salvayon added that the borough has taken away the partnership for this event.

Mr. Salvayon had commented on Mr. Heckmann’s emailed statement that “The Borough has funded the CSRC and it's initiatives to the tune of well over $500,000 since its inception.” Mr. Heckmann presented itemized information on the conference screen that indicates the borough has expended over $1,298,000 that the tax payers of Castle Shannon have paid for CSRC/revitalization activities, which include the recently completed streetscape grant match and engineering fees. Mr. Salvayon reiterated that Castle Shannon Revitalization Corporation was started by borough council to provide a non-profit source of revenue for events like community day. Mr. Heckmann questioned - what revenue has CSRC brought to the borough. Mr. Salvayon answered the grant funding for Phase I of streetscape. Mr. Heckmann questioned how much CSRC has paid towards the matching funds. Mr. Salvayon replied he did not know the amount of the match requirement. Again, Mr. Heckmann noted the information displayed on the viewing screen that was paid by borough taxpayers.

Mr. Heckmann stated that council decides how finances should be properly allocated based on the quality of the partner, regardless of tax designation or who founded the organization. An organization must operate consistently in a way that conforms to non-profit best practices and shows there is trust in how public dollars are being spent that validate and quantify for council that the impact is warranted. Council is not obligated even if the organization is subservient.

Mr. Salvayon addressed an expense listed of $14,820 spent on the CSRC’s website and asked how much the borough has spent on their flashy new main street website. Bethany Kovach, CSRC Board Member, admits that funds have been spent on their website, but added that all of the borough’s financial contributions have benefitted the community. Ms. Kovach noted that the cost of funding the match for the streetscape was not money given directly to the CSRC. These are things being done for the benefit of the community. Ms. Kovach added that the cost of the main street manager salary in 2022 did not benefit the CSRC.

Mr. Salvayon stated that when CSRC representatives met with the Pennsylvania Downtown Center representatives it was determined that the main street manager was a 60/40 relationship with the borough. Mr. Heckmann stated that the borough paid 100% for this employee position, and the employee’s capacity was to be a 60/40 split. Ms. N. Kovach mentioned that the borough and CSRC needed this employee to get the grant. Mr. Heckmann stated that the borough paid for the grant writer and paid the salaries through reimbursements to the CSRC.

Ms. Kovach stated that when Mr. Warhold identified the downtown area as a blighted area, the previous council agreed to form the CSRC as a non-profit organization. Mr. Heckmann stated that council is not questioning the origin of the organization but questioning forward thinking. Mr. Heckmann agreed that council authorized the listed expenses. Mr. Heckmann pointed out that the organization (CSRC) is being judged upon what the impact and ultimate effectiveness of caretaking of the public’s dollar.

Mr. Salvayon questioned who is judging the CSRC. Mr. Heckmann replied that every time council votes to make an allocation, council members are making a judgement as to what is the efficacy of the relationship – the merit of the relationship. Ms. B. Kovach added that what revitalization has done is effective and benefitted the borough. Mr. Heckmann questioned, what has CSRC done when the borough has paid for it all; what expenditures CSRC has made. Ms. B. Kovach answered she is not saying that she paid for anything; however, the borough benefitted from the expenditures. Mr. Heckmann stated that his argument is that $1.3 million has been invested in the organization and revitalization; and the impacts, some of which has been positive, are because of the investment made by taxpayers. Mr. Salvayon added that the borough enjoyed the benefits of the CSRC non-profit status to accomplish some of the goals, such as businesses donating time and money for Community Day that could be used as a tax write off. Mr. Heckmann noted that this benefit could be enjoyed through any non-profit organization, not necessarily CSRC. Mr. Salvayon debated why would the borough support another organization that is not a 100% beneficiary to the borough. Mr. Heckmann stated that the organization chosen last year for Community Day, the Castle Shannon Youth Association, is an organization that has done far more to demonstrate that they are an effectively run organization.

Mr. Salvayon related that Mr. Heckmann noted that the CSYA has a website that is up to date. Mr. Salvayon stated that the meeting minutes and budget on this website has not been updated since 2019. As a tax payer, I cannot go to this website to find out how much time and money is being invested in the borough fields.

Mr. Heckmann stated that the borough could go through the bylaws to determine how well the CSRC has attended to their rules of operation. Mr. Salvayon responded he does not have the bylaws with him. Mr. Heckmann continued saying the argument is that the borough has expended a great deal of money into the organization, and he stands by every clause in his aforementioned email, which is that some council members do not feel that they are getting a great return on the investment. Council decides which partners it uses to accomplish its goals. Mr. Heckmann reiterated from his email that he would like CSRC to find its vision, how to staff itself effectively, and how to identify dedicated funding streams. The other non-profit organizations have done this.

Mr. Heckmann questioned why the CSRC is so special that these deficiencies should be ignored. Ms. N. Kovach asked that why is the CSRC so not special that they cannot have the same attention given to the other organizations. Mr. Heckmann noted the $1.3 million in expenditures for revitalization over the past decade that has not been provided to other organizations. Mr. Heckmann added that the only beneficiary that may have received more would be the library through tax revenue. Neither the fire department nor CSYA have received that amount of borough funding in the last decade. Mr. Salvayon stated that the funding is directly invested in the borough, the downtown business district, and Community Day for the tax payers’ benefit.

Ms. B. Kovach stated that the borough’s expenditures have benefitted the community, and she believes both groups can benefit from a partnership. Ms. B. Kovach added that the CSRC has new leadership.

Mr. Salvayon stated that he is waiting for an approval on an agreement with the borough on the soldier banners delineating each organization’s responsibilities. Mr. Heckmann replied that the borough continues to leverage staff to cover for a lack of capability on the CSRC’s part to follow through on the soldier banner program. CSRC representatives continue to call borough staff about this program.

Sarah Bride introduced herself as the CSRC representative in charge of the soldier banner program. Ms. Bride stated that her grandfather fought in the Vietnam War and voluntarily served twice in the Marines. Ms. Bride is a federal employee for the Department of Defense and a reservist for the Air Force, and the soldier banner the program is near and dear to her. Ms. Bridge stated the program is a disaster, and she has taken many hours to try to organize the program, i.e., coordinate banners, orders, and replacements. Ms. Bride is asking for the CSRC and the borough to work together to find ways for the CSRC to assist the borough.

Mr. Heckmann said the ask is that CSRC demonstrates that they are a capable partner going forward. Mr. Heckmann referred to the organization’s lack of mission statement, minutes of meetings and bylaws, operating budget and reporting of progress or impact, annual reports, etc. These are chronic deficiency issues identified in the Pennsylvania Downtown Center reviews. Operating with good governance, having controls in place, and standards for ethics for people in the organization are possibly more important than having public minutes.

Mr. Heckmann stated that he has the CSRC archives of minutes that have been shared with the borough and noted that there are swaths of meeting minutes missing. Mr. Salvayon answered that this was before his involvement with the CSRC, and the main street manager was an employee of the borough. Mr. Heckmann noted that Article 8 of the CSRC bylaws state that the corporation shall keep complete books and records and keep minutes of proceedings. Mr. Salvayon related he has a box in his basement with CSRC records that he is willing to provide to the borough.

Mr. Salvayon stated that in order to have a strategic plan, CSRC needs to have all members of the organization and members of the community working together. Mr. Heckmann replied that the CSRC is its own organization and does not need council members for a strategic planning session. Mr. Salvayon stated that the CSRC benefits Castle Shannon Borough, and council is almost 100% involved in everything they do. It was noted that Ms. N. Kovach is a board member for the CSRC and a borough council member. Ms. Randazzo was a member in the founding days of the organization. Mr. Salvayon stated that the current bylaws allow up to 15 members and will be amended to allow other members in the group.

Mr. Heckmann said that CSRC members are asking for a partnership, however some council members would like to see them function on their own. The other two non-profit organizations discussed can do their business independently.

Ms. B. Kovach stated that in the instance of the EV chargers, CSRC can apply for the grant; however, they would need borough approval for use of the charger sites on borough property. Just as the CSYA uses the borough fields, this is a partnership that could be worked on. For street events, the CSRC would need assistance from the police and public works. These events work better when partnering together.

Ms. N. Kovach discussed a prior request from the CSRC to work together to install EV chargers. Borough representatives requested more information. The CSRC provided more information, however the project did not proceed. Mr. Heckmann replied that submitting information for a project is not an automatic approval. Ms. B. Kovach and Mr. Salvayon discussed the possibility of the EV chargers with local business owners who were very excited about the project and are looking for ways to increase their business. There is a new grant opportunity that is much larger than the original proposal. CSRC representatives would like to meet with Ms. Stringent on this project. Ms. B. Kovach stated that the CSRC wants to move forward with opportunities for the borough and that cannot be accomplished without meeting with borough officials. Mr. Heckmann noted that this proposal could be presented to council at their next meeting.

Mr. Heckmann advised that borough administration will continue to share appropriate social media posts from the CSRC and continue to forward calls for the soldier banners to the CSRC.

Annie Shaw, Glen Shannon Drive – asked if the borough has an external audit firm. Mr. Heckmann answered yes – Hosack, Specht, Muetzel &Wood. She also asked if council met in executive session this evening. Mr. Heckmann answered no. She also asked, when was the last time council met in executive session. Mr. Heckmann responded that although he did not know the last time, council would be meeting in executive session after tonight’s meeting on a personnel issue. Ms. Shaw asked if the borough has a capital project plan internally and for how many years. Mr. Heckmann answered that the borough is in the midst of creating a capital inventory that will have at least a five-year outlook and will be a public document when available.

Ms. Shaw stated that although the borough is not violating the Sunshine Act, she believes the borough is skirting it and not acting in the spirit of the Sunshine Act. Ms. Shaw asked for more transparency. As a member of the school board, Ms. Shaw is very proud of the openness of the school district’s meetings, working sessions, and public meetings. All their motions are written out with amounts, and she would like to see the borough agendas reflect this. Council agreed that the agenda could contain wording for motions or discussions.

Mr. Heckmann closed the public comment section.

**Other Business**:

Ms. Randazzo asked Ms. Shaw if there are any plans moving forward with security for the elementary schools. Ms. Shaw stated that Dr. Stropka published a recent statement, and she will forward this to Ms. Randazzo. Ms. Shaw said it would be very difficult to have security installed in the short scheme of things for this year. Ms. Randazzo believes that both organizations could do better with transparency.

Mr. Swisher referenced a resident’s concern at the April 10th meeting regarding water ponding on Poplar Avenue. Mr. Heckmann replied that the borough engineers were asked to assess the area for appropriateness for an addendum to the scope of the road repair.

Mr. Heckmann announced that council will meet in executive session on a personnel matter.

Mr. Swisher motioned to adjourn. Mr. Oates seconded; all in favor; motion carried.

Approved as presented this 8th day of May 2023.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Katie M. Stringent Mark J. Heckmann

Borough Manager Council President