

East Stroudsburg Borough, January 30, 2014

A special meeting of the East Stroudsburg Borough Council was held at the Municipal Building on Thursday, January 30, 2014 at the beginning of the regular Committee meeting. The following members were in attendance: Peter Begley, Roger DeLarco, William Reese, and Sonia Wolbert. Also attending were: Manager James S. Phillips; Solicitor John C. Prevoznik; and Codes Official Marvin Walton.

Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance – President Delarco

Mr. DeLarco called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. and led the pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes of January 21,2014 Regular Council Meeting

Mr. Phillips noted corrections to the minutes that were distributed that Mr. Begley had caught, that Mr. Begley did not make the “no” votes under either the discussion on filling the Council vacancy, or for advertising for the special meeting. Mr. Begley made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Wolbert, to approve the minutes of the regular Council meeting held January 21, 2014 as corrected; the motion carried unanimously.

Public Comments – Agenda Items

None.

Council Vacancy for the 6th Ward

Mr. Prevoznik said a vacancy exists on Borough Council for the 6th Ward, and two persons – Donald Repsher and Richard Smith had submitted letters of interest. Mr. Smith is present tonight. Richard Smith said he resides at 546 N. Courtland St. and worked 21 years at Patterson Kelly Co., 22 years as a postal mail carrier, and served 21 years in the military with the local National Guard Unit. Mr. DeLarco reviewed the meeting schedule for Council – normally three meetings per month, with occasional special meetings. Mr. Smith said he was ready to do the job. Mr. Begley commented that the Council position is not really a job, but public service. Mr. Reese asked Mr. Smith if he knew what Committees of Council he might be interested in serving on if appointed? Mr. Smith said he wasn't sure.

Mr. DeLarco asked if Council wished to take action to fill the vacancy tonight? Mrs. Wolbert made a motion to appoint Don Repsher to the Council position; seconded by Mr. Reese. After discussion on the motion, Mrs. Wolbert and Mr. Reese withdrew the motion. Mr. Prevoznik said Council must act to fill the vacancy within thirty (30) days, so Council could wait to take action at the Feb. 4th meeting. Mr. Reese then made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Wolbert to table action on the Council vacancy; the motion carried unanimously.

Discussion on Residential Permit Parking Provisions

Mr. Prevoznik said he mis-spoke at the last meeting on January 21st, concerning the issue whether a contractor could utilize one of the two parking permits that can be issued for each residence. Mr. Prevoznik said the existing Ordinance language requires that a person must be a legal resident of the dwelling to obtain a residential parking permit.

Mr. Prevoznik said Council had adopted the changes to the permit parking because the number of rental units on certain streets is now exceeding the number of owner-occupied units – with resulting increase in the number of cars. Council must decide if there is a need to regulate parking in these areas – if there is a need, then is permit parking the answer? What is the least-disruptive way of regulating parking in these areas? If Council wants to permit drop-in visitors, then one option is to allow 1 hr. “free” parking for visitors – but this will require more enforcement. Stroudsburg uses this method in the “Hill District”. Mr. Prevoznik also noted that the Permit Parking

system is not designed to be a revenue-raiser – it costs more to send a police officer or PEO to a Magistrate hearing than the Borough could possibly receive from a fine.

Mr. DeLarco said he is concerned that a one hour limit might encourage ESU students to park on streets near campus to attend one class.

Mr. Begley said he thinks at least three (3) passes should be issued per residence; he does not see that many cars actually parked on some of these streets, and he does not want residents to be inconvenienced. Mr. Begley said parking is not static, people work different hours, some cars are in the shop, so he does not see the need for the current restrictions. Mr. DeLarco opened the meeting to public comments.

Anthony Romano of 98 East Brown St. said he has three vehicles and drivers in his family, with no off-street parking available. Mr. Romano said the Visitor Pass provision is “ludicrous” – what if family members come to visit?

Lisa Musetti said she is the property manager for 255 Brodhead Avenue, and the tenant there has two sons who visit her daily – but they cannot stop each time for visitor passes. Ms. Musetti said the visitor pass provision should have been left as it was before.

Logan Baum of 29 Stemple Street asked what was the problem with the way the permit system was operated before? His family has three vehicles but only off-street parking for one. His wife, Danielle Memoli, said this current visitor pass system is an inconvenience for residents.

Craig Todd of 31 Stemple Street questioned why the change was made to allow more than two unrelated people per residence, because it will only create more parking violators. Mr. Todd said the previous permit regulations at least provided some flexibility for residents, and probably resulted in less enforcement problems for the Borough.

Richard Finney of 383 Brodhead Avenue said the Borough should require a rental unit residence with four people to provide off-street parking for four vehicles. Mr. Finney also suggested that if someone has a driveway on their property, then they shouldn't need as many parking permits for use on the street. Mr. Finney questioned the visitor pass procedure, saying he has six children and what if they all come to visit?

Mr. DeLarco said some residents were abusing the visitor passes by permitting them to be used for “regular” vehicles, not visitors’. Mr. Reese said one suggestion raised is to put the address of the residence on the visitor pass to help in monitoring who is using the visitor passes and when.

Lennie Kaye of Braeside Avenue said he supports the current permit parking system.

Mr. Romano again asked where he can park his 3rd vehicle? He cannot afford to continue to pay parking tickets. Mr. Romano suggested that Council suspend enforcement of this ordinance until some changes are made. Mr. Romano also said this matter was important enough, that a letter should have been sent out to residents concerning the changes in the permit parking regulations.

Mayor Martinelli said Council needs to take another look at this ordinance. Mr. Reese agreed, and said it appears that many people want to go back to the old system.

Danielle Memoli asked how long will it take for Council to come up with changes to the ordinance? Mr. Phillips said any changes will need to be done by ordinance, and an ordinance must be advertised at least seven days prior to the meeting at which it is to be acted upon.

Mr. DeLarco said Council is working to try and address the residents’ concerns, and appreciates the input that has been received tonight.

Public Comments – New Business

Lennie Kaye asked about the posting of a weight limit on the “Iron Bridge” on Ridgeway Street? Mr. Phillips said the ownership of the bridge is not real clear; apparently the railroad is responsible for the bridge structure itself and PennDOT is responsible for the road cartway; there is an old PUC ruling from the 1970’s concerning the responsibility for maintenance that was needed then, but it is not clear if that previous PUC ruling still applies now or whether it pertains at all to possible replacement of the bridge.

Mr Kaye also asked about the proposed widening of Interstate 80 as reported in the newspaper? Mr. Phillips said the Borough has not received any notifications concerning this proposed project – yet.

Correspondence

Mr. Phillips reported receipt of the following items of correspondence:

- i. Utility Service Partners, Inc. – 2013 year royalty payment to the Borough for the service line warranty program - \$2,302.74 received.
- ii. Public Utility Commission (PUC) – Order directing that Bridge where SR 2024 crosses the Railroad (Ridgeway St.) be posted with a 13 ton weight limit.

Executive Session for Discussion of Litigation Matters

None.

DPW Director Position

Mr. DeLarco made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Wolbert, to authorize advertising for the DPW Director position, based on the revised job description previously approved by Council. The motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

With no further business, Council members recessed the special meeting and continued with the Work Session/Committee meeting.

James S. Phillips, Secretary