

The monthly workshop meeting of the Borough Council of the Borough of Sinking Spring was called to order on Wednesday, February 27, 2008 at 7:00 p.m., at the Sinking Spring Borough Hall by President Stewart Wenrich. After the Pledge to the Flag, a Moment of Silence for the men and women serving in our armed services was observed. Mrs. Regina Shade called the roll reflecting the following Council Members present:

Stewart Wenrich
Bruce Light
Barbara Kutz
Lawrence Schmidt
George Butkus
James Zerr
Elizabeth Sloan

Other officials present were: Mayor Clarence Noecker; Charles Haas, Borough Solicitor, Michael Hart, Public Works Director, James Oxenreider, Chief of Police, Peter Eisenbrown, Ludgate Engineering, and Regina Shade, Borough Secretary/Treasurer, who recorded the minutes of the proceedings.

VISITORS:

Mr. Robert Ludgate, Sr. appeared in front of Council in regards to the Revitalization Project that is happening in the Borough. Mr. Jim Pachui, Chairman of the Project, Mr. Sam Loth, and Mr. Ludgate had a meeting the day prior with representatives of the Department of Community and Economic Development to discuss the project. They are looking favorably on the Revitalization of Sinking Spring however we have a long way to go. One (1) of the items that came out of the meeting was that we have an out of date comprehensive plan. Our first step is to get an updated plan before we proceed any further. In addition, they would like to see us put together a joint comprehensive plan. It was brought up that we have a working relationship with some of the surrounding municipalities as we are working on the Rt. 422 Corridor Project. Mr. Zerr serves on the committee. The State liked that idea. They continued that this plan would be fifty (50%) percent paid for by the State. In general, Mr. Ludgate believes that the County will help fund part of the plan as well. By sharing amongst several municipalities the cost that was not covered by the State or the County will be divided up among the other municipalities cutting down our out of pocket cost substantially. So to get funding from the State or otherwise we will need to have an up to date comp plan. We do currently have a joint comp plan with Spring Township, West Lawn, and Wyomissing which was created in 2000. This current plan focuses on Spring Township; we need a plan that focuses in on the Borough. It really does not say too much about Sinking Spring with the exception that Sinking Spring should develop its downtown but it doesn't say how. We need to have a specific plan. He explained what is in the plan. At the meeting there were representatives from the Governor's office so we have met with the appropriate people and we have been encouraged to move forward. Since the meeting was positive the revitalization committee is requesting permission for Mr. Zerr to ask the Rt. 422 Corridor Project Board if they could explore the possibility of a joint comprehensive plan getting funding from the State. If we move forward the next applications must be in by July 1st. The State funding would be up to \$50,000.00. The County encourages this as well, so we can ask them for a contribution as well. Ms. Sloan questioned if there was a range of money that the County usually chips in. Mr. Ludgate was not real definite

VISITORS (cont'd):

on an amount. He can certainly find out but at this point we are looking just for permission to see if there is interest and then we will come back and learn what the cost to the Borough would be. Ms. Sloan wanted to know what the cost would be up front. She does not have a problem pursuing it but she would like to know the cost. Mr. Ludgate stated that once we know the scope of the project and who will be involved then we will know the cost. Mr. Ludgate feels the County would come up with half the local share; he believes they have done that for other municipalities. He continued then the remaining cost would be paid by the contributing municipalities. He feels it should be a light burden. Mr. Butkus questioned exactly what is covered in the comprehensive plan. Mr. Ludgate said in broad terms the comp plan takes a look at where you are, what goals you have, and what strategies you might have to reach those goals. One (1) of the major goals of everyone in the corridor would be the flow of traffic on Penn Avenue which would include the bottleneck in Sinking Spring. That was a big issue that was discussed at the meeting with the State. This would open up economic development right here in the Borough but in addition, it would help the businesses and industries to the west that ship through here and those that commute to the City of Reading. Mr. Butkus questioned if it will address infrastructure. It would. He proceeded to talk about SWOT Analysis. This stands for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats. Mr. Ludgate stated the comp plan can be open ended on how far it goes but in general it identifies where you are, what your goals are, and how to get there. Ms. Sloan questioned if this corridor project isn't PENNDOT'S problem. Mr. Ludgate explained that there is a ten (10) year program and how it works. He said more often than not, you receive nothing. Another issue that is of concern is getting right of way. This would be for the moving of traffic and for pedestrian traffic. The intersections are not at right angles which makes it very difficult to cross the street. We have a real problem. A discussion ensued. Mr. Ludgate stated they have met with the Chairman of the Berks Economic Council. He explained about the project in Hamburg. Ms. Sloan wanted to know in the past years how often we have applied for PENNDOT money? Mr. Ludgate did not know however the task force did ask for money for their project and it was received. Mr. Zerr and Mr. Ludgate met with PENNDOT over a year ago and they were all in favor of this project moving ahead. The concept is a long way from being on the board. There are no specific lines drawn but the thoughts of right angle crossings are the concept. Once again, all he is looking for is permission for Mr. Zerr to explore the possibility of a joint comprehensive plan with the members of the Rt. 422 Corridor Project. Mr. Schmidt asked what happens if the other municipalities don't want to go along with this. Mr. Ludgate said it will mean it will be more difficult to get the State funds. The first monies go to those municipalities that form joint plans. Mr. Schmidt stated that these other areas might have a plan already. Mr. Ludgate agreed however, we are looking for a joint plan of the corridor members. It not the whole area just the corridor. Mr. Francis Butkus wanted to know not in dollars but the percentage the Borough would need to come up with if this was all to happen. Mr. Ludgate said it is a difficult question to answer as we don't know exactly how much the County will give. Mr. Ludgate stated assuming the County would give 25%, the State would give 50%, the other 25% would come from the three (3) Boroughs, and three (3) Townships involved with the Corridor project. Mr. Butkus questioned how long it takes to prepare a joint comprehensive plan and the other was in broad range terms what would the cost be for the study. Mr. Ludgate stated the quickest it could be done would be about six (6) months and should stretch no more than one (1) year. The cost should be \$100,000.00 but if the State matches it could be done for less. Mr. Ludgate explained what goes into the plan. Mrs. Shade stated that we will need to do a new comprehensive plan she believes within the next year and half as she was under the impression that

VISITORS (cont'd):

must be done every ten (10) years anyway. Mr. Ludgate stated that was a good point. This is exactly how this came about at the DCED. The DCED wanted to see our most recent comp plan however the plan we currently have was created in 2000. The DCED said we needed to update our plan and then bring that plan to them. Ms. Sloan questioned if we move ahead and authorize Mr. Zerr to move ahead are we looking for these other municipalities to buy into this. Mr. Ludgate stated that if they say yes, we would have a joint contract. He continued to explain how the process would develop. Mr. Zerr said he is just taking this as a consideration to the corridor as a possibility. This would allow us to step two (2). It is just permission to make a connection. No commitment to anything. Mr. Wenrich stated we aren't asking for funding. Ms. Sloan questioned Mr. Zerr on his feelings if these other municipalities will be interested in this type of thing. Mr. Zerr feels there will be. A brief discussion ensued about the Corridor project. Mr. Schmidt made the motion to allow Mr. Zerr to go the Corridor project group and inquire if they would be interested in doing a joint comprehensive plan; seconded by Mr. Light. AYES – 6, NAYS – 0, ABSTAIN – 1 (Mr. Zerr); motion carried. Mr. Ludgate volunteered to meet with any Councilperson or group of Councilpeople who would like more information about the Revitalization project and everything that goes into it.

BUSINESS:

The first item on the agenda was the handbook. Mr. Butkus had a few questions. Mr. Butkus questioned the addendums he thought were passed over the past two (2) years. One (1) pertained to employees going to fires and the second had to do with salaried employees. The fire issue addendum we have however we do not have a signed form. Mrs. Shade was not directly involved with this and was not sure which one was the actual addendum. Mr. Butkus felt we passed it along with Mr. Zerr however Mr. Zerr stated he was not sure where it stood after that either. Mr. Light thought he and Mr. Hart sat down and drew something up. Mr. Hart stated he didn't but he has three (3) different copies of the addendum however none of them were signed. He had the same question of the salaried people as well. He continued, as he read through the manual he had questions about vehicle equipment use. He said he thought this didn't really need supervisory permission as much as Council's permission. He continued what happens to the insurance. Mrs. Shade stated that the handbook was based off another municipalities' book. After we made our additions and subtractions, the book was sent to Mr. Fitzpatrick for his review. Mr. Fitzpatrick sent it to the legal department in his firm that handles personnel matters and they reviewed and corrected the entire work making it compatible with the current laws. Mrs. Shade continued that some of these questions might be better addressed by Mr. Fitzpatrick and since he was not at the meeting we could defer till a later time. A discussion ensued as to whether or not we want to allow Borough employee's to use Borough equipment at all as it opens the Borough up to all types of liability. Mr. Wenrich requested Mr. Butkus write down his concerns and forward it to Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mrs. Shade. Mrs. Kutz found some typos. She had a question on the absenteeism portion. She feels it should read an employee needs a note for three (3) consecutive days. Mrs. Shade stated there was some concern that an employee could take off every other day and would not need a note. She continued that we are looking at every possibility. It was decided three (3) consecutive days or five (5) occurrences. Another question pertained to conferences. It says the Borough will pay for food. She feels there should be a cap on what they can spend for food. She thought a dollar limit should

BUSINESS (con'd):

be established. Ms. Sloan stated it is usually like \$25 a day. She also does not want alcohol included. Mr. Wenrich stated if it is an all day conference or an overnight conference he feels it should be \$35.00. A discussion continued on this topic. Mr. Wenrich stated again to put that in an e-mail. Mr. Butkus stated it says no where that employees can attend these seminars with Council approval. Mrs. Shade stated that at times things come up. We try to let everyone know. Mr. Butkus said he feels we don't need to send every street worker to every seminar. Mrs. Shade stated what about leaving it up to the discretion of the supervisors. Mr. Butkus said with no disrespect to the supervisors Council is responsible for the money and how they spend it. Ms. Sloan stated well you can send them to these classes and then they move on. Mr. Wenrich stated you can't control that. Mr. Wenrich kindly asked that these points be placed into e-mail format again. The next item was a mistake; it should have read a minimum of five (5) years of service instead of maximum. She questioned shouldn't the pay periods be mentioned in the book. Mrs. Shade stated currently our week runs Sunday to Saturday but Mr. Hart would like to change them. Mrs. Kutz would like to see in stated in there. Mrs. Shade stated this handbook is not in stone. Mr. Hart stated along with Mrs. Shade that this will be changing as different situations rise to the top. This was just a starting point. Mr. Hart would like to see the week start on a Monday and end on a Sunday. Mr. Butkus made a motion to start the week on a Monday and end on a Sunday and keep the pay cycle at every two (2) weeks; seconded by Mr. Light. AYES – 7, NAYS – 0; motion carried. Vacation time and seniority was next. Mrs. Kutz thought we discussed about having employees hand in their vacation time at the beginning of each year. It is not based on seniority. Mrs. Shade explained if two (2) people come to you on the same day and wants the same day off, the person with seniority will get the day. However if someone puts in for the time first and then someone with more seniority wants that day off, that is too bad, the person who made the request first gets it. However, once again, we do need to address the situation if two (2) people want the same day and request at the same time, the one (1) with seniority will prevail. Ms. Sloan feels that is fair. The next item was vacation time. A discussion ensued on this topic and when an employee is allowed to start taking their vacation. Mrs. Shade explained that an employee receives four (4) personal days a year and depending on when they start they are prorated. On the first anniversary of their date of hire they are able to take their vacation. Mrs. Kutz stated it also states that no vacation can be taken in their first six (6) months of employment, this should say within their first year. Mrs. Shade stated that is true however what has been done in the past is we do advance them if needed however if they chose to leave we will withhold the money from their last pay. A discussion ensued. Mr. Wenrich stated to get Mrs. Shade any changes they would like to see and she will forward it to Mr. Fitzpatrick. Mr. Wenrich stated this is a work in progress and has been two (2) years in the making.

The next item was the new sewer software package. Mrs. Shade explained that after waiting for 21/2 years for Weidenhammer to get the new software package, they have chosen not to move forward with this program. We received our \$600 check back for the license. She continued that we are moving ahead and looking at some other different packages. We have talked to one (1) company based out of North Carolina and we have had a meeting with a local company as well that many of our surrounding municipalities use. In addition, this company also carries software that would be of benefit to our Public Works Director. It is very user friendly and Window's based. Ms. Sloan questioned that Weidenhammer had our money for two (2) years. Mrs. Shade stated that was for the license that was all. Ms. Sloan questioned if we would be entitled to interest on that money. Both Mr. Wenrich and Mr. Butkus stated not really. We had software to use and you are

BUSINESS (con'd):

not actually buying the software. You are buying the legal permission to use the software. Mrs. Shade stated she did not know the particulars however they are not selling that anymore. Mr. Wenrich asked Mr. Butkus to get together with Mrs. Shade to review this information.

The next item was the Ordinance information needed for the purchase of the new fire vehicle. Mr. Haas stated that Mr. Fitzpatrick sent out an e-mail to everyone as well explaining his opinion on how to move ahead with this. Proposals came in from Commerce Bank, M&T, National Penn, Leesport, and Susquehanna. National Penn and Susquehanna offered the best loan terms. The terms were on a ten (10) or eleven (11) year basis are very similar. Susquehanna offered a 3.99% fixed for a ten (10) year term. National Penn offered a 4.03% for an eleven (11) year term. National Penn had a bit of a different payment plan. They had interest payments to be made every six (6) months and annual principal payments. Susquehanna had interest payments every three (3) months and monthly principal payments. National Penn also offered an option of a 3.91% fixed term for seven (7) years with the same repayment schedule. Mr. Fitzpatrick made the recommendation for the seven (7) year term at the lower interest rate if the Borough feels they can make those payments. Ms. Sloan questioned what Susquehanna's rate were on the seven (7) year loan. Mr. Haas stated that did not offer that. Ms. Sloan wanted to know if we could explore going back to Susquehanna as she feels that do a lot of business with them. Mr. Haas stated no. Ms. Sloan questioned if it wouldn't be worth a phone call. Mr. Haas stated if we wanted to restart the process all over we could to that. Mrs. Shade explained that we would need to start all over again. Mr. Zerr said we would have to go out for another RFP. Mrs. Shade stated Mr. Fitzpatrick was looking for Council to vote on this as it needs to go into an Ordinance that will need to be advertised and sit open. We are looking to take delivery of the fire equipment the beginning of April, so we will need the money shortly. Mr. Haas stated that Susquehanna only bid on one (1) of the options. Ms. Sloan stated that they bid lower on the ten (10) year loan. She continued so maybe they could be lower on the seven (7) year and that would mean less money out of our pockets. Mr. Haas passed out Susquehanna's proposal. Mrs. Shade stated that we could open it up again however we would need to open it up to everyone. Mr. Haas stated that Mrs. Shade was correct; we would need to start the process up all over again. Mrs. Shade stated she is concerned if we don't take one (1) of these proposals and we open it up again, we won't have the money to take possession of the truck. Mrs. Kutz asked Mrs. Shade which of the proposals did she like. Mrs. Shade preferred the seven (7) year loan with National Penn. She explained that she likes the semiannual payments; it is easier for payments as well as budgeting. In addition, since the tax money starts only coming in March, it will be easier to make the payments after we start getting the money in. The fire company will like to pay their loan off in four (4) years on less, Mr. Zerr said. Ms. Sloan said going forward from this time on she would like us to go back to the original bidder and ask them if they can do better. Mr. Wenrich stated you can't do that. You must follow the specs. You can't change it. Someone questioned how the RFP went out. Mrs. Shade stated it went out for \$250,000, \$300,000 and \$400,000.00. Mr. Schmidt questioned how much is the loan? Mr. Wenrich stated not to exceed \$400,000.00. The truck is \$182,500.00 however there is an issue with the exhaust system. He explained what the problem is and that we needed to change the exhaust on the truck. KME e-mailed the committee that FORD has told KME that if they alter the exhaust system they will not honor the warranty. So, we will not be able to change where the exhaust system is at so that means there will be no additional money needed. That means we will be getting

BUSINESS (con'd):

a credit of some type. They also believe they have a way around the exhaust problem as well. Mr. Weaver stated that he heard the Feds were going to drop the interest rates the following day and that maybe we should consider that before we do anything. Mrs. Shade stated that we put out an RFP on this. That is a request for proposal, that means what each bank can give us. We can do it again however the problem is we are running out of time. We need to create an Ordinance; the Ordinance must be advertised and lay open for a period of time before we can adopt it. We are to take possession of the truck the beginning of April, so we don't have the time to do another RFP, adopt an Ordinance, and then take possession of the truck if we don't decide tonight on which bank to use. Mr. Weaver questioned that we can't just go back to that bank. Mr. Haas stated no, we need to go back to every bank. Ms. Sloan stated maybe we could lean a bit on the banks. Mr. Butkus stated no, this is like a contract. Ms. Brenda Messina questioned why would we take out a loan if we have the pole building and the truck already in the budget? She questioned how much money are we going to be spending on interest for money that is already in the budget? Mr. Hart questioned if this was a loan or a line of credit. Mr. Butkus stated it sounds like a loan. (It was hard to hear as everyone was talking). Mrs. Shade stated when we started this she brought just the \$182,500.00 to the table however at the last Council meeting it was decided to look into doing the Codification which is about \$100,000.00. Mr. Haas said that is the way he understood it as well. Mr. Haas said that there is no where does it say that you must take all the money. Mr. Butkus stated you must pick an amount. Ms. Messina questioned was there something about why we were going to borrow this money wasn't there some type of stipulation. Mrs. Shade stated that if you borrow over \$125,000 you must go to the DCED for their approval. Mrs. Shade stated you will be paying a few thousand dollars to go to the DCED now and if you borrow more later on, you will need to go back to the DCED again. Mr. Wenrich stated if we go for the \$200,000.00 could we throw it back to Mr. Fitzpatrick to see if this would change anything. We need to ask for \$250,000.00 as that is what we bid. Ms. Messina questioned why not take the \$250,000 and then use that for the rest of the things that are needed like the air conditioning. Mrs. Shade stated that the air conditioning was not in the budget. It is roughly \$20,000 for a dual system. Mr. Light made a motion to borrow \$250,000.00 from National Penn Bank for a period of seven (7) years for a rate of 3.91% pending Mr. Fitzpatrick finding out that we can do this; seconded by Mr. Schmidt. Mr. Haas does not feel this will be a problem. Mrs. Kutz questioned if there is anything that we would like to do that was not budgeted. Mrs. Shade stated we were talking about the Codification; however that would be about \$100,000.00 more or less. This will require bringing in an outside company to do this. The last time this was done was in the 1980's or early 1990's. We tried to do it in house but it is way beyond us. Mr. Wenrich asked for a roll call vote. AYES – 6, NAY – 1 (Mr. Butkus); motion carried.

The next item was the new fee schedule. Mr. Hart stated this is something we have been battling for a while. Some of the fees we are currently charging do not cover our cost to do the inspection. Jackie from Ludgate and Mr. Hart are putting something together and will propose it to Council when completed. A discussion ensued about some of the items and why we need to pull permits for some things. Mr. Hart stated it is for safety reasons. Our plumbing permits are handled by Kraft Code Services. Currently Kraft Code Services does our plumbing, mechanical, and electrical. We need to keep it that way until Mr. Hart gets certified. In addition, Mr. Hart would like to ask Kraft to do our accessibility reviews and inspections as well. Currently, it must go up to L&I in Harrisburg; however they are trying to get out of doing local inspections. This is part of our

BUSINESS (con'd):

fee structure problem. Their fees are slightly higher so that needs to get corrected as well. A discussion ensued about pulling permits for things and who should pull the permits and why are permits needed. Mr. Butkus questioned if you have a licensed plumber install the equipment why would an inspection be needed; they should know what they are doing. Mr. Hart said yes, they are licensed plumbers but they take short cuts. There are builders out there and since he has been doing this, these contractors do take short cuts. Mr. Eisenbrown added just because you hire a licensed plumber that doesn't mean the licensed plumber will be coming. He could be sending a journeyman. The licensed plumber might not ever step a foot on that property. A discussion ensued as to what would happen in an emergency. Mr. Peter Eisenbrown explained that if an emergency happens over the weekend, a licensed plumber would know the first thing he needed to do on Monday morning was call the Borough for the permit. The normal contractor will know that they need to get permits. In this day and age, a contractor worth his pay will know when and if a permit is needed. They can no longer plead ignorance. The homeowner should be aware of what permits are needed as well. Ms. Sloan thought that maybe we could put this information in our newsletter. It was also thought that it could be added to the website. Mr. Hart said currently we are putting applications on the website for various permits and a brief description of when a permit is needed. Another discussion ensued and Mr. Eisenbrown said that pulling a permit is for safety reasons, to make sure gases aren't entering the dwelling or that decks are secure, those types of things. It is not to make money.

The next issue was to appoint the Building Code Official. Currently Ludgate does this for us however Mr. Hart did pass the test. Mr. Butkus made a motion to appoint Mr. Hart as the Building Code Official and having Ludgate Engineering as the backup; seconded by Mr. Light. AYES – 7, NAYS – 0; motion carried.

The next item was the sewer committee applicants. Mrs. Shade stated she received one (1) letter from Mr. Les Weaver along with a verbal request from Ms. Brenda Messina. This is for the study questioning if we should turn the Authority into a working Authority. Mr. Butkus made a motion to hire the two (2) applicants and to run the ad again this coming weekend; seconded by Ms. Sloan. AYES – 7, NAYS – 0; motion carried.

Mr. Light questioned a report that was placed in his box from ARRO. There was a \$6,300.00 problem. According to Mr. Butkus we will not be paying this at all. The company that did the televising was bought out by another company after the project was bid. They submitted the bill to which ARRO said there were errors and to resubmit a corrected bill; however no bill was resubmitted. We are going to deduct this from what we are to pay them.

The next issue was the appointment of the part time police officer. Mr. Zerr said that the Safety Committee requested the hiring of a part time police officer. Mr. Zerr made a motion to hire a part time officer, Nicholas Calabria, at the rate of \$16.28 per hour; seconded by Mr. Schmidt. AYES – 7, NAYS – 0; motion carried.

BUSINESS (con'd):

Mr. Zerr stated at the Safety Committee meeting it was discussed about replacing one (1) of our vehicles. This is the year that we do that. It was between two (2) vehicles; one (1) being a four (4) wheel drive and the other a cruiser. The committee decided on a 2008 Dodge Charger Police Cruiser. The proposal is together. They are looking for Council's approval to move ahead. The only thing this proposal does not include is the radio but we do that here. They would like to award the contract to Warnock. Mr. Schmidt questioned if this includes the stripping. Mr. Zerr said it will be included. Chief Oxenreider said last time it went up to Richland. Mr. Zerr stated this is actually under budget. Ms. Sloan questioned when the 2008 will go down in price. Mr. Zerr stated it is under the State contract. This means it is irrelevant. The price is as low as we can get it. Mr. Zerr made a motion to authorize the purchase of the Dodge Charger (2008) from Warnock at a cost of \$30,516.00; seconded by Mr. Schmidt. Mr. Wenrich called for a roll call vote. AYES – 7, NAYS – 0; motion carried. Mr. Wenrich questioned if the cameras for the cars were in yet. Chief Oxenreider stated no, he was holding off till we ordered the car as there is a special camera for the Dodge Charger.

The ALCO sensors were not in the PA Bulletin. A County Detective is checking into this; but it should be in the next PA Bulletin. MADD will pay for the ALCO sensors.

Mr. Zerr assured Council that our fire department along with the County has the foam that will be able to fight ethanol fires.

We currently have a resolution about charging for services and equipment to clean up after an accident. This resolution is being challenged. That is nonbinding. They have taken the FEMA schedule along with the fee schedule from another fire department. They would like to put both of these together and come up with a schedule for us to use. They would like to create an Ordinance. This will be turned over to Mr. Fitzpatrick to create the new one. It covers all costs including signs, employees, etc.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. Francis Butkus invited Council to attend any of their meetings. They are opened to the public. He continued to explain about the expansion and the cost. He stated we have waited and our \$4,500,000.00 project will now cost us \$5,500,000.00. He continued that what the Authority has started is going to be needed to be done, one (1) way or another. He wants Council to untie their hands. He reminded Council that there is an election coming up. Mr. Wenrich stated we just got the independent study back last month for everyone to look at. It is not that Council is turning "a deaf ear" or a "blind eye" but they are doing their due diligence. Mr. George Butkus was hoping that Council would consider moving ahead with the design phase and either put in or take out the clarifier as necessary. He would like to allow them to move ahead with the process as they will need to get submitted to the State for their approval as well. He wants it to keep moving. The Chapter 94 Report will state whether we need to put in the clarifier or not. Mr. Wenrich stated bring it to the next general meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORT:

Ms. Sloan made a motion to place a plaque at the Borough Hall with the names of all fallen Sinking Spring Borough soldier's on it; seconded by Mr. Butkus. Mr. Hart questioned if we want it here or at Memorial Park. Ms. Sloan wanted it here. AYES – 7, NAYS – 0; motion carried. Mr. Schmidt questioned how much this would cost. Ms. Sloan stated a couple of hundred dollars. Mr. Schmidt questioned Ms. Sloan stating she was questioning all the money we spend on things and now she wants this for a couple hundred dollars. Mr. Butkus stated that she was just going to get the costs and not buy the plaque. Mrs. Kutz stated that is something the VFW does. Mr. Zerr stated that is what the Ladies' Auxiliary does.

Mrs. Kutz said she called the Christmas light company that is doing the banners for the entrances of the Borough. The price did not agree with what we were quoted. Mrs. Kutz stated when she called the gentleman he had spoken to Mr. Light. Mrs. Kutz then stated that since the order was placed she was just requesting they send a confirmation of what was ordered. The confirmation was received and it did not agree with what they thought it should be. Mrs. Kutz spoke to Mrs. Karli, President of the Park and Rec Committee, and she was unaware of what happened. The difference came to \$1,126.00 which was the cost of the LED lights. We have till the end of February to get the order in. Mr. Light stated the gentleman called him. He requested new catalogs and he told the gentleman to call Mrs. Kutz. A discussion ensued. Mr. Schmidt made a motion for the increase to the LED lights at a cost of \$1,126.00 for the banners; seconded by Mr. Light. Mr. Wenrich called for a roll call vote. AYES – 5, NAYS – 2 (Mr. Butkus, Ms.Sloan); motion carried.

Mr. Zerr stated they were going up to the KME plant on Saturday. They will probably be doing the pre-paint inspection.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Regina M. Shade
Borough Secretary/Treasurer