

STROUDSBURG BOROUGH COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES – FEBRUARY 21, 2023

A regular meeting of the Stroudsburg Borough Council convened at 7:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers of the Stroudsburg Borough Municipal Building with the following members present: Council President Matt Abell, Vice-President of Council Erica McCabe, Council President Pro-Tem Tobias Sabatine, Council member Victoria DeVries, Council member Joanne Kochanski, Council member Melody Trunfio, and Council member James Smith.

Also present were: Mayor Michael Moreno; Borough Manager Larry Kopp; Borough Solicitor Christopher Brown, Esq.; Executive Assistant Mary Pat Quinn; and Street Superintendent Brian Ace.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Public Hearing and Consideration to Adopt An Ordinance of the Borough Council of the Borough of Stroudsburg in the County of Monroe, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to Amend Chapter 2 “Animals”, Part 2 “Keeping of Animals”, Section §2-203 “Violations” of the Stroudsburg Borough Code”.

There were no questions or comments from the public. The public hearing was closed on a motion made by Ms. McCabe, seconded by Mr. Sabatine. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

The aforementioned Ordinance was adopted on a motion made by Ms. McCabe, seconded by Mr. Sabatine. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Public Hearing and Consideration to Adopt An Ordinance of the Borough Council of the Borough of Stroudsburg, in the County of Monroe, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to Amend Chapter 15, Part 4, Section §15-407 of the Stroudsburg Borough Code of Ordinances Entitled, “Unlawful to Park After Time on Meter has Elapsed; Evidence of Violations”.

There were no questions or comments from the public. The public hearing was closed on a motion made by Mr. Sabatine, seconded by Ms. McCabe. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

The aforementioned Ordinance was adopted on a motion made by Mr. Sabatine, seconded by Ms. McCabe. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Public Hearing to review and discuss the results of the Historical Architectural Review Board (HARB) Survey

Mr. Abell reviewed the following results of the HARB Survey:

HARB Survey
Borough of Stroudsburg

Total Number of Respondents: 43 (35 Online, 8 Print/Mail)

1. What is your primary home address?

109/111 N 8th St	610 Wallace Street
140 Mockingbird Hill Road East Stroudsburg	612 Sarah Street
1734 N 6th St	614 Bryant St
2244 Wigwam Park Road Stroudsburg	614 Sarah Street
304 Wallace Stret	620 Scott Street
31 N 7th Street	626 Scott Street
310 Wallace St	6410 White Birch St
413 N. 8th Street	702 Thomas Street
426 Main Street	710 Sarah St
500 Queen Street	726 Scott Street
510 Thomas St	732 Ann Street
547 Main Stret	7444 School View Lane
561 Oak Street	79 Lawai St
600 Sarah St	79 Northpark Drive East
600 Sarah Street	814 Ann Street
607 Ann Street	884 Scott Street

2. Please describe your interest in the Borough Historic District (Select all that apply)?

	# Responses	%
I live in the Historic District	16	21%
I own a property in the Historic District	20	25%
I work in the Historic District	16	21%
I own a business in the Historic District	12	15%
I am a contractor who has done work in the Historic District	4	5%
I am a lawyer, architect, or other professional who has represented clients seeking approvals under the Ordinance	4	5%
Other	6	8%

Other Responses:

I'm a fan!
This is 2nd HARB MTG
Concerned resident
I live in the Borough
Middle Smithfield is putting together an Architectural Review Board, and I was curious to see what this is.

3. How long have you lived, worked, owned a property, and/or owned a business within the Historic District?

	# Responses	%
Less than 1 year	0	0%
1-5 years	5	13%
6-15 years	10	26%
15+ years	23	61%

4. Are you aware that Stroudsburg has a Historic Preservation District?

	# Responses	%
Yes	37	97%
No	1	3%

Comments

Yes, and we did not agree with the formation of this board, and questioned it's benefits that I may add has been more than questionable.

There was no HARB Ordinance or HARB district when we purchased our home at 710 Sarah St. Run by people who live in the 17th century !!!

I wasn't sure we were part of HARB.

I was against it pre-formation.

Takes too long! Process is unnecessarily burdensome.

5. Have you heard of the Historic Architectural Review Board (HARB)?

	# Responses	%
Yes	33	89%
No	4	11%

Comments

Yes, and since it's formation, I feel we have seen more properties in the area start to deteriorate.

Porches are not fixed, Painting is delayed, fences are falling apart.

Rely on only what was done in the past while degrading newer products.

I was against it pre-formation.

I've heard horror stories! Impediment to progress! Too many impractical suggestions.

6. Have you ever applied to HARB for approval of a change to your or a client's property?

	# Responses	%
Yes	22	59%
No	15	41%

7. Were the application instructions clear?

	# Responses	%
Yes	11	50%
No	11	50%

Comments

When is anything having to do with HARB clear?

8. Was the review process explained to you?

	# Responses	%
Yes	14	64%
No	8	36%

Comments

By the Zoning Officer.

9. Did you attend the HARB review in person?

	# Responses	%
Yes	18	82%
No	4	18%

Comments

Treated well the first time, not so well the next two.

10. Was your HARB application?

	# Responses	%
Approved without changes? (If “yes,” skip to Question #15)	9	39%
Approved after changes suggested by the Board?	8	35%
Denied by the Board?	6	26%

Comments

Zoom mtg for new roof. I desired to use architectural shingles to replace 25-year-old architectural shingles but was told I had to use slate or at least slate colored three-tab shingles. Architectural shingles are superior to the three-tab so I could not replace my roof with the same quality I was taking off so according to HARB my roof would look more historical (not as good quality as what I was removing).

Denied, but Kimes said I could come back with different costs & the board said ok. - this was my first time with HARB.

Not suggested, required!

Some changes take multiple meetings for the HARB members to agree or to see samples etc.

No changes were required but a lot of extraneous supplemental information was requested (for a basic fence).

After much difficulty and aggravation.

Not only was our application denied by the Board, after I left the meeting, the audio recording revealed that the Chair of the Board and others on the Board used profanity in our names, ridiculed us and others, and made inappropriate statements about us and other residents of the Borough who have or have not come before them. This behavior was totally uncalled for, unprofessional, appalling, inappropriate, unbelievable, and unacceptable.

All 3 above have taken place.

Changes suggested were easily incorporated.

11. Were you told what revisions needed to be made in order to receive an approval?

	# Responses	%
Yes	11	85%
No	2	15%

Comments

Three-tab slate colored if I wanted approval.

By Kimes not the board.

The Chair merely made snide comments and referred us to the ordinance.

Month after month of waiting !!!!

12. How did HARB's suggested changes affect the overall cost of your project? Please explain.

	# Responses	%
Decreased	2	15%
Stayed about the same	4	31%
Increased a little	1	8%
Increased a lot	6	40%

Comments

We lost our contractor for an entire season. In the interim, costs of materials and labor have increased.

Just kept waiting and waiting while labor and material costs kept rising!!!!

Extra time, extra cost.

13. Were you informed of your option to appeal HARB's decision to Borough Council?

	# Responses	%
Yes	7	70%
No	3	30%

Comments

In summary, yes, the Chair made snide comments how we can gather our "Judge" friends and make our appeal before Council who will crumble. These were totally inappropriate & appalling comments.

Just tired of waiting and starting a new journey.

More wasted time.

14. Did you appeal to Borough Council?

	# Responses	%
Yes	2	17%
No	10	83%

Comments

They rubber stamp.

We are continued until February 2023.

Personal animosity.

15. Were your application and review handled in a timely manner?

	# Responses	%
Yes	15	71%
No	6	29%

Comments

After I heard from a third party that project was approved it was about two months until I received the approval letter. But a month or two is a long time (i.e. not timely) if you hadn't planned for it

Too long in between application and approval for routine matters.

On an audio recording, the Zoning Officer complained about receiving too many applications from the public. The HARB Members then were joking about how they do not want applications but then conceded in a very sarcastic tone that they were there to serve the public.

Stop and review.

Takes forever.

16. How many meetings were necessary to achieve final status of your application?

3
1 over Zoom
Two or three
1
1
1
2
Several times I've applied. Some were multiple, others were just one..
1
1
It was unclear - HARB was not meeting regularly
2
1
Multiple meetings is not the problem! Years are !!!!
Takes forever!

17. Do you feel you were treated fairly and respectfully throughout the review process?

	# Responses	%
Yes	11	52%
No	10	48%

Comments

The Zoom meeting left me with a less than good feeling about the board. There were many people on zoom & some board members responded to other applicants very disrespectfully & with words I have never heard used in a public meeting
Only in the fact I own the property and their requirements were ridiculous. However, it's still a stressful and nit-picky process. If new modern products, like plastic wood can achieve the same look at same or lower costs, why force specific products.
Some communications were needlessly authoritative/demanding, especially for a basic fence installation.
Comments to me, as well as other applicants and their professionals, were rude and demeaning
Not at all. The HARB Members were rude, disrespectful, argumentative, and demeaning. Being cursed at and ridiculed at a public meeting is not being treated fairly and respectfully. In addition, some of the HARB Members stated on the audio recording that they were going to talk to Council members before we even had a chance to present an appeal to try to sway their decision.
Cannot say what I wish to.
At some points yes; at others, no.
A couple of Board Members were arrogant and condescending.

18. Was your project completed?

	# Responses	%
Yes	17	85%
No	3	15%

Comments

Had a small change in the field and one of the HARB members made us reapply. Like a change to a radius, not structural or anything that changed the overall project.
After more than a few changes.

19. In what way(s) did your project outcome change as a result of HARB review?

Comments

None.

A lower quality roof with a lesser year warranty.

Realized that most of the board had no building experience & didn't understand that vinyl siding is better than chipped & cracked siding or how siding is put on a building.

Stayed the same.

None.

None HARB got its way and the Borough rubber stamped it .

Process tends to be longer. I've seen roof repair delays as they argue whether it should be 3 tab or architectural and the color etc.

Client did a little more than minimum.

Minor exterior change.

We did not need to make any changes, as we were as prepared as a responsible homeowner would need to be for a backyard fence installation. However, that did not stop HARB members from trying to micromanage beyond their intended role.

Not completed.

The project did not change which makes me question the efficacy and purpose of HARB for routine matters. It seems that there should be a list of approved materials for routine projects, e.g. shingles for roofing repair or replacement, that then could be approved upon application only.

We lost our contractor for an entire season. The cost of materials and labor has since increased.

Because of HARB, time and money has been lost.

I got much older.

Increased cost a little.

Required to use shingle roof instead of a metal roof.

Better look that it would have been otherwise.

20. Has HARB review affected your ability to repair or maintain your home/structure? Please explain.

	# Responses	%
Yes	13	41%
No	19	59%

Comments

Not timely. Delay in beginning project

You have to bow to the wishes of the board members feelings on a given day. Residents replace their roofs in the historic district on a weekend without review or permits & it is ignored. I have seen it happen & know that it was not approved.

Appearance & common sense go a long way in adding to the beauty of Stroudsburg. By adhering to HARB rules many residents can't financially do what they want.

Increased cost.

The process makes you less likely to undertake things like upgrading windows as they make that specific process difficult.

I just try and fix things appropriately without getting HARB involved. I have felt HARB was excessive and better to ask forgiveness than approval.

Adds extra step; some projects delayed or not attempted due to extra step.

I hope I do not need to make exterior repairs to my 100+ year old home because my experience with HARB is that they (as currently structured) would make it extremely challenging to make important repairs in a timely manner and within reasonable budget. I fully support the mission and purpose of an architectural review board, but I do not believe it is currently being implemented in a way that balances the practical needs of careful and sensitive restoration of historic homes.

The inability to utilize technologically current materials that are consistent with maintaining the historic nature and appearance of a building has prevented routine maintenance and upkeep.

It is unfortunate that you cannot repair your home in a timely manner because of the HARB Ordinance. There are many, many homes in the Borough of Stroudsburg in severe disrepair because the residents/owners/contractors are beholden to the HARB Ordinance and the decisions of the HARB Members. Not every applicant is treated the same way and decisions are not the same for everyone. The process is not fair to all applicants. It is not a feasible process for a homeowner in the Borough.

not anymore.

Restrictions and regulations outside of available budget resources.

Reluctant to develop lot at 8th and Main Streets due to HARB and Property Taxes.

I've put off projects because of HARB.

21. Do you feel having a historic preservation district impacts property values?

	# Responses	%
Yes	25	41%
No	5	59%

Comments

Look at some of the old buildings in the historic district in disrepair & you decide.

If people can't meet HARB rules you end up with a shack. Look behind the borough building to see what I mean.

Positively.

I think it creates an impediment to repairs and upgrades without significantly benefitting the historic value, as very few buildings are original.

For the better.

I do agree with some oversight. However, potential buyers of historic homes also know that these homes need upkeep and restoration that is already difficult - the HARB should not make good restoration more difficult because of egos and desire for power...which is how it comes across currently (or at least in spring/summer of 2021).

In a negative way, property owners cannot afford to restore their properties. There must be an understanding as to the purpose of the District - is it to maintain appearance or restore properties - and this understanding must be applied equally to homeowners and projects.

I know it has to be disclosed when you sell your home. I know I will never purchase another property in a HARB district. Most people do not understand what it ends up costing them in the end.

My last town of residence was settled in 1604 that's historic.

Because the house across the street is falling apart.

Yes, in a good way. It makes a more desirable neighborhood.

Makes it difficult on property owners – no one wants it.

In a negative way.

Negatively, it's all about location, location, location.

22. How could your overall experience regarding the Historic District be improved?

Comments

Less restrictions. More meetings. If you miss a meeting, or it has been postponed, you'll be set back an additional month or more.

Use professionals.

Disband the board & have zoning & codes review for permits. Someone with expertise.

Keep reviews that balance the intention of preservation with still allowing and encouraging growth and upkeep. If its too invasive we won't have much to preserve because owners will stray away from upkeep and renovations that can add value over time and keep the historic district in the kind of shape that attracts investors and showcases the beauty within it. If it's too loose on the other hand we won't have any history to showcase as all. All obvious but important to keep reiterating that balance to keep it in check.

More meetings.

Be visible. No one knows who you are.

Reasonable requirements! The Borough has no se backs for new structures that is ridiculous.

They pick and choose who has to follow the rules

I wish that the architecture and beauty of historic downtown Stroudsburg should be highlighted more, especially for the holidays.

More flexibility and just keeping with the vibe vs recommending specific products etc.

Looking neat and clean is probably better than looking disheveled but historically accurate. Better clearer design guidelines, list of pre-approved products, examples of previously approved projects.

Disband the organization.

HARB should be supporting homeowners and providing resources, not creating barriers. I think the issues currently come down to individual personalities and a misunderstanding of the role of the group.

No Comment

1. Use of today's materials that are consistent with historic appearance - shingles, vinyl siding and trim. 2. Consistency of criteria applied across owners and properties

3. Pre-approved materials for projects - e.g. shingles for roofing; vinyl siding for buildings

The HARB Ordinance should be repealed in its entirety.

Design it with tiers for those who can afford to bring it back to its original glory or those who want it to look original without the expense of original materials.

Better communication.

Make sure all landlords keep up with their property and repairs.

Uniformity and consistency in application of HARB standards and ordinance.

HARB has too much discretion.

Better outreach to those not interested in preservation.

Eliminate HARB.

Dissolve it.

Eliminate! Have guidelines, allow Zoning Officer to approve applications.

The hearing was opened to the public. Michelle Prevoznik discussed her experience as a HARB applicant. She did respond to the survey, and reported that she was unfairly and rudely treated by the HARB members, and the Borough did not do anything about it other than having Solicitor Brown attend the HARB meetings, which she appreciates. She is also a HARB member, and two of the other HARB members have their own reference materials which have not been made available to other HARB members and the public. At a recent meeting, one of the HARB members stated that he met with an applicant at her home to go over aspects of her proposed project. Mrs. Prevoznik stated that that is inappropriate and should not happen, that applicants are supposed to present their proposed projects to the whole Board. She also asked what constitutes a quorum on HARB because the Ordinance states that there will be nine (9) members, and the present Board consists of five (5) people. Mr. Abell answered that a quorum is determined by the members who are present at a meeting, so three (3) members would constitute a quorum. He explained that the Ordinance requires that the members should also consist of a P.A. licensed real estate broker, a P.A. licensed architect, and a Building Inspector. The Borough Council is looking for people to fill those vacancies as well as one more member-at-large.

Mr. Abell agreed that all resources being used by Board members should be made available to other members and the public. He stated that HARB members should not be doing individual site visits with applicants. He advised that in the past during HARB meetings, the Board has recessed so that all HARB members could go with an applicant to a site for further clarification of projects. Mrs. Kochanski expressed concern about the potential liability that the Borough could be exposed to if there was an accident. She agreed that HARB members should be

restricted from meeting applicants individually and that all members should use the same materials.

Mr. Abell asked Mr. Kopp to follow up on the distribution of the Code of Conduct to elected officials and members of the Borough's Boards and Commissions. He thanked Mrs. Prevoznik for her willingness to serve as a member of HARB.

The public hearing was closed on a motion made by Mr. Sabatine, seconded by Ms. DeVries. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Approval of Council Meeting Minutes for the regular meeting on February 7, 2023.

A motion was made by Mr. Sabatine, seconded by Ms. McCabe to approve the minutes of the regular meeting on February 7, 2023 as circulated. Mr. Abell, referring to the review of the Draft CY 2022 Joint Municipal Landfill Report, asked that the minutes be amended to reflect that there could be (not will be) a reduction in the frequency of the landfill monitoring in the second, third, and fifth years. The motion was carried. (5-yes; 0-no; 2-abstentions-Ms. DeVries and Mr. Smith)

Monthly Administrative Reports

The following reports were approved on a motion made by Mr. Sabatine, seconded by Ms. McCabe: Public Works Report, Parking Report, and Right-to-Know Report. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Accept the Unaudited January, 2023 Treasurer's Report

A motion was made by Mr. Sabatine, seconded by Mrs. Kochanski to accept the January, 2023 Bank Account Balances Report and the January, 2023 Budget-to-Actual Report. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Old Business

There was no old business to discuss.

New Business

Kristina Heaney, District Manager of the Monroe County Conservation District, will speak regarding the implementation of Act 167, the Stormwater Management Act.

Mr. Kopp advised that Ms. Heaney was unable to attend the meeting and will reschedule.

Jeff Young, Executive Director of Suburban Ambulance, will speak in regard to ambulance and emergency services in the Borough.

Mr. Young was unable to attend the meeting; however, Don Deremis and Brian Dunlop were present to represent Suburban Ambulance. Mr. Deremis discussed the funding crisis in the

Commonwealth for all EMS companies. They are visiting all of the municipalities in Monroe County to educate the elected officials and the public about the funding needs of Suburban Ambulance. Mr. Abell asked what the shortfall is that is associated with Stroudsburg Borough. Mr. Deremis will look in to that and get back to the Borough.

Mr. Abell asked Council members to pass any questions they have to Mr. Kopp. The matter will be placed on the March 7 agenda. He also suggested forming an Ad Hoc Committee. Mr. Sabatine, Mrs. Kochanski, Ms. McCabe, Mr. Kopp, and the Stroudsburg Borough Emergency Management Coordinator Mehmet Barzev (present at the meeting) will form the Committee.

Consideration to schedule a Public Hearing for consideration of An Ordinance of the Borough Council of the Borough of Stroudsburg in the County of Monroe, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to amend Chapter 15 “Motor Vehicles and Traffic”, Section §15-316 1.A., “Handicapped Parking Zones Established of the Stroudsburg Borough Code”. The proposed Ordinance will remove the handicap parking spaces from 1 Bell Terrace and 2 Bell Terrace.

A motion was made by Ms. McCabe, seconded by Mrs. Kochanski to schedule a public hearing on March 7, 2023 for consideration of the aforementioned Ordinance. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Consideration to schedule a Public Hearing for consideration of An Ordinance of the Borough Council of the Borough of Stroudsburg in the County of Monroe, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to Amend Chapter 15 “Motor Vehicles and Traffic”, Section 15-306 1. “Parking Prohibited at all times in Certain Locations” of the Stroudsburg Borough Code of Ordinances. The proposed Ordinance will add the west side of Stone Street between Scott Street and Thomas Street to the table of prohibited parking locations.

A motion was made by Mrs. Kochanski, seconded by Mr. Sabatine to schedule a public hearing on March 7, 2023 for consideration of the aforementioned Ordinance. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Consideration to schedule a Public Hearing for consideration of An Ordinance of the Borough Council of the Borough of Stroudsburg in the County of Monroe, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to Amend Chapter 22 of the Borough Code Concerning Subdivision and Land Development to Permit Joinder of Adjoining Parcels of Land Without a Formal Land Development Plan.

A motion was made by Mrs. Kochanski, seconded by Ms. McCabe to schedule a public hearing on March 21 for consideration of the aforementioned Ordinance. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Consideration to schedule a Public Hearing for consideration of An Ordinance of the Borough Council of the Borough of Stroudsburg in the County of Monroe, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to Designate Pennsylvania Municipal Services Company as the Collector for Delinquent Garbage Fees and Imposing on Delinquent Ratepayers the Obligation to Pay Reasonable Costs Incurred for the Collection of Delinquent Fees, Penalties and Interest.

A motion was made by Mrs. Kochanski, seconded by Ms. McCabe to schedule a public hearing on March 7 for consideration of the aforementioned Ordinance. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Consideration to Adopt A Resolution of the Borough of Stroudsburg, County of Monroe, Pennsylvania, Authorizing the Transfer of Funds for Budget Purposes for CY 2022.

A motion was made by Mr. Sabatine, seconded by Ms. McCabe to adopt the budget transfer resolution. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Consideration to accept the retirement letter from Mary Pat Quinn effective March 3, 2023.

A motion was made by Ms. McCabe, seconded by Mr. Sabatine to accept a retirement letter from Mary Pat Quinn. Ms. Quinn's last day will be Friday, March 3, 2023. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Consideration to appoint Kenneth J. Pieslak as the Code/Zoning Officer/Project Manager at an annual salary of \$75,000.00 with four (4) weeks of paid vacation.

A motion was made by Ms. DeVries, seconded by Ms. McCabe to appoint Kenneth J. Pieslak as the Code/Zoning Officer/Project Manager at an annual salary of \$75,000.00 with four (4) weeks of paid vacation. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Consideration to approve the 2023 Calendar of the Monroe Farmers Market.

A motion was made by Ms. McCabe, seconded by Mr. Sabatine to approve the 2023 Calendar of the Monroe Farmers Market. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Consideration to discuss approving a letter in support of the Monroe county Commissioners' application for a Keystone Historic Preservation Planning Project Grant to assess the Historic Monroe County Jail and Assessors building's architecture to mitigate risks to the original designs.

A motion was made by Mr. Sabatine, seconded by Ms. McCabe to approve a letter of support from the Borough of Stroudsburg for the application of Monroe County for a Keystone Historic Preservation Planning Project Grant. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Consideration to discuss the Borough's DCED CFA Multimodal Grant and Ann Street Park improvements.

Mr. Kopp advised that Solicitor Chris Brown, Borough Engineer Nate Oiler, Brian Ace and he will meet on February 22, 2022 to discuss the Ann Street Park improvements that are proposed to be done under the Multimodal Sidewalk Replacement Grant.

Consideration to discuss the intersection of Mill Alley and South 9th Street and the possibility of converting the intersection to 4-way stop signs.

Ms. McCabe reported that the intersection of Mill Alley and South 9th Street is dangerous as there are no stop signs at the intersection, and many motorists drive too fast through it. A motion was made by Ms. McCabe, seconded by Mr. Sabatine to refer the matter to the Street Committee. The Street Committee will be asked to make a recommendation to Council before the March 21 Council meeting. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Consideration to approve the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness, as recommended by the Historical Architectural Review Board, to Alice Luongo for the replacement of the current asphalt shingles on the building at 726 Scott Street.

A motion was made by Mrs. Kochanski, seconded by Mr. Sabatine to approve the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness to Alice Luongo for the replacement of the asphalt shingles on the building at 726 Scott Street. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Consideration to approve the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness, as recommended by the Historical Architectural Review Board, to Judith Nielsen for the replacement of the front porch shingles, the lattice under the front porch, the restoration of the three columns on the front porch, and the porch railings on the building at 728-730 Ann Street.

A motion was made by Mrs. Kochanski, seconded by Mr. Sabatine to approve the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness to Judith Nielsen for the replacement of the front porch shingles, the lattice under the front porch, the restoration of the three columns on the front porch and the porch railings on the building at 728-730 Ann Street. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Committee Reports

Codes Committee - Solicitor Brown advised that the Committee will be working on the penalties/fines for violating the graffiti and vandalism statute, an amendment to the Sign Ordinance, and the UCC Board of Appeals. Mr. Kopp is handling the problem properties. The Codes Committee will meet on February 22 at 4:00 P.M. via Zoom.us.

Budget Committee – Nothing to report, no meeting.

Parking Committee – Ms. McCabe advised that the Committee will be meeting on Tuesday, February 28 at 4:30 P.M.

Recycling Committee – Nothing to report, no meeting.

Sewer Committee – Mr. Kopp reported that the draft SOP for billing was forwarded to BCRA. BCRA will be scheduling a meeting in the next couple of weeks to discuss I & I. Ms. McCabe mentioned that some municipalities have decorative manhole covers, such as town logos,

university logos, etc. which may be nice for the Borough to consider. A discussion ensued about the cost. Mr. Kopp will look in to it.

Street Committee – Mayor Moreno advised that the Committee will be meeting on March 1.

Personnel Committee – Mr. Kopp advised that the union agent will be meeting with the Stroudsburg union employees on February 22.

Public Relations/ Media Committee – Mr. Sabatine advised that the Committee is working on the Concerts in the Square. They are also going to provide visitors' centers with the Welcome to Stroudsburg brochure. He suggested getting art to display in the Municipal Building, possibly from local artists as a rotating gallery.

Redevelopment Committee – Mr. Abell advised that the Committee meets on the third Wednesday of each month.

I-80 Expansion Task Force Committee – Ms. McCabe advised that State Representative Tarah Probst met with an engineer from Penn DOT District 4, and she will be sharing information about that discussion with the Borough. Mr. Kopp added that the Borough received a letter from Penn DOT because they will be on Borough-owned property.

Stroud Region Open Space and Recreation Commission – Ms. McCabe advised that the Commission will be meeting on February 28.

Mayor's Report

Mayor Moreno attended the recent Downtown Merchant meeting. Next month is Black History Month. The Latin American Business Forum will hold a welcome reception on Friday, February 24, 2023 from 6:30 to 8:30 P.M. at 18 South 9th Street, Suite 101. Ms. McCabe added that the purpose of the reception is to welcome/ honor Mayor Moreno.

Council Member Reports

Mrs. Kochanski suggested that the Borough look in to a “robo” service that that will provide residents with information similar to what other municipalities are using. Mr. Kopp has been looking in to that. Mr. Abell mentioned that his wife inquired about the need for the Borough to provide translation services. A discussed ensued, and the Borough will look in to it.

Solicitor's Report

Solicitor Brown reported that the Borough's goals were met at the VFG LaBar appeal. The Judge ruled in favor of the Borough but reduced the violation from \$600.00 a day per vacant and abandoned building to \$300.00 a day for a total of \$16,000.00 due to the Borough of Stroudsburg. Solicitor Joseph McDonald and Borough Manager Larry Kopp represented the Borough at the hearing.

Manager's Report

Meetings

Alta RAISE Check-In	February 16 th
Summary Hearing/LaBar Village	February 16 th
County Planning Grant/Old Jail	February 16 th
Gridless/Security Camera Installation	February 16 th
Mike/Main Street Gym	February 17 th
Municipal Leader's Conference	February 22 nd
Final Alta RAISE Check-In	February 23 rd
Grievance Hearing	February 24 th
Denny Peters/Engineering/Creek Walk	February 24 th
COG Meeting/ICS Emergency Management	February 27 th
BCRA Municipal/Utility Coordination Meeting	February 28 th
Safety Committee Meeting	March 2 nd
Meet with Penn Strategies	March 2 nd
Pocono Public Policy Meeting	March 3 rd

Infrastructure/Streets/Capital Projects

Sidewalk Replacement Project/Multimodal Grant. Plan is to use current contractor for remainder of grant. Still finalizing Ann Street Park portion.

Ann Street Sewer Replacement & Paving. Public comment period for Draft Abbreviated Act 537 Plan Update complete. Need signed Memo from Borough Council for submission; missing one signature.

Grants Strategy 2023

LSA Grant. Statewide LSA Grant submitted on March 15th. CFA Board meeting on January 12, 2023 was cancelled. Now the meeting will be held in March.

DCED Multimodal. Grant completed and submitted. Contains "Quick Build" elements of Main Street Project. CFA Board meeting on January 12, 2023 was cancelled. Now the meeting will be held in March.

Monroe County LSA Grant. Submitted on September 28th. For "Quick Build" elements of the plan.

H2O & Small Water and Sewer Grants. Submitted to CFA December 21st.

FEMA Assistance to Firefighters Grant. Awarded \$218,236; 5% minimum match required.

Consolidated Bargaining Agreement (CBA with Teamsters Union)

Contacted by union; they want to start negotiations early, which I support. Scheduling an initial meeting after Union meets with members on February 22nd.

Engineering Creek Walk Project

Terrain Walk with Denny Peters, Project Engineer, rescheduled for Friday, February 24th.

Mobility Study/Alta Planning

Letters of support from local organizations complete except for one organization. Still waiting on letters from Senators Casey and Fetterman; received letter from Rep Cartwright. PennDOT is supporting; tie-in with I-80 Project. Added page on our website in support. Will be submitting Friday, or Monday at latest. Cost increased to over \$15 Million.

Capital Improvements Plan

Working on 10-year Capital Improvements Plan for the Borough listing all major capital projects and purchases through 2031. Dump truck that was ordered in 2022 will not be delivered until 2024; looking at purchasing a utility pick-up instead with the budgeted funds.

Borough Building Repairs

Working on getting quotes for repairs. In the 2023 Budget.

Safety Committee Meeting

Safety Committee will meet on March 2nd.

Verkada Security Cameras

Meeting with installation contractor (Gridless) February 24th and 25th; final installation will be on March 17th & 18th. Change to order to be discussed at March 7th Council Meeting.

Solid Waste Ordinance

Ironing out a small number of minor pick-up issues Tuesdays and Wednesdays. Resident questions/concern have dropped to about zero. Sent out an employee to check on those carts we have identified staying out by curb. Mailing was delivered with calendars for trash & recycling and to remind residents of Ordinance's requirements. Biggest issue is too much trash for cans; probably is a recycling issue. Working on billing with PAMS. First bill to go out March.

Dumpster Ordinance Implementation

On hold until I receive further guidance. 42 properties have asked for appeal or some sort of relief from the Ordinance. 17 Properties have either complied or have met with me and have received go-ahead to proceed. I have received no response from 72 properties.

Sewer Billing

Met with Dave Horton to discuss. Draft billing SOP to BCRA for review; waiting to hear back to schedule meeting. Our Ordinance spells out in detail exactly what is required for 60+ day overdue accounts; they must be sent to a collection agency.

Sewer Rates/EDU Reassessment

Inspection of properties complete. Final review in 2023 and appeal for those whose EDUs are changing. Look at potential EBU system in 2023. Use data to review and update rental property information develop comprehensive database for the Borough with all resident information.

Sewer Collection System/I&I Initiative

BCRA is scheduling a meeting to discuss I&I in late February. Met with Russ and Brian on Friday to put together report; we did a considerable amount of work on this in 2022. Working on ArcGIS mapping of all cleanouts and reinstalled flow meters.

LERTA

Draft LERTA Ordinance to School Board for review.

Code Enforcement

Rental Properties: Follow-up letter sent to those that have not yet registered their properties.

Short-Term Rentals: Compiling list of properties for notification.

Staff Training

Working on a training presentation on Customer Service.

MyGov Software for Codes/Zoning

Going fully “live” with MyGov in 2023 on select permits and licenses. Customers will be required, unless they have a compelling reason, to submit all permit and license online through the Customer Service Portal.

Emergency Operations Plan

I'm working with Mehmet to update our contacts and to look specifically at EMP and Cyber Attacks. Current world situation has me concerned and I want us to be ready. Plan was due to be updated in 2021.

Sewer Fund Delinquent Accounts/Liens

Mary Pat is looking at our list of liens and see what liens need to be renewed and if any need to be taken of the lit. BCRA wants to review billing procedures, as do I. I have talked to three collection agencies with the idea of letting them go after delinquent accounts, which is allowed in our Sewer Ordinance.

Bicycle Racks

Three racks remain to be installed: 745 Main, 401 Main & 33 North 7th Streets. North 7th Street was approved with a slightly changed location. Waiting to hear back from the remaining two property owners. One property owner (1172 Main Street) declined to have the rack on their property. Installation in Spring 2023.

Upcoming Focus

RAISE/Main Street Grants
Sewer EDU Assessment Plan
New Employee Integration

Capital Improvements Plan
Solid Waste Billing
Day to Day Activities

Street Superintendent's Report

Mr. Ace discussed the revised scope of work for the Ann Street Park Project. The estimated cost of the project will be \$130,000.00.

Approval of Bills on Warrants 230221

A motion was made by Mrs. Kochanski, seconded by Mr. Sabatine to approve the payment of bills on Warrants 230221. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)

Public Input for Non-Agenda Items

Kristen Albrecht, a representative of the Delaware Water Gap Defense Fund (DWGDF), was present on Zoom to discuss the disadvantages of the proposed designation of the Delaware Water Gap Recreation Area to a National Park and Preserve. The DWGDF is concerned about how additional visitors will be accommodated, infrastructure improvements, funding and emergency services. She asked the Borough to consider a Resolution to oppose the designation of a National Park and Preserve. Mr. Abell asked her to forward a template to the Borough Manager, and the Council will take the matter under advisement.

There was no need for an executive session.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 P.M. on a motion made by Ms. McCabe, seconded by Mr. Smith. The motion was carried. (7-yes; 0-no; 0-abstentions)