

Borough of Carlisle
Council Workshop Meeting Minutes
October 1, 2025
6:00 PM

Present at the meeting: Deputy Mayor Landis, Councilors Perry, Shiles, and Stuby. Also present were Borough Manager Armstrong, Chief Landis, Assistant Borough Manager and Alternate Borough Secretary Juday, HR Director Berrier, and Public Information Coordinator Taylor.

Councilor Roos was absent.

Deputy Mayor Landis called the Council Meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. and lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Borough Council voted 4-0 to allow Mayor Shultz and Councilor Mellen to attend the meeting by Zoom.
(Stuby/Perry)

I. Citizens to be Heard-None

II. Meeting Minutes

1. Borough Council voted 6-0 to approve the September 3, 2025 Workshop Meeting Minutes. (Stuby/Shiles)

III. Public Works

1. Borough Council voted 6-0 to approve a resolution authorizing the submission of an application for a Local Share Account – Category 4 grant from the Commonwealth Financing Authority for an amount not-to-exceed \$200,000 (Two Hundred Thousand Dollars) to be used for the construction of ADA accessible ramps throughout the Borough. (Stuby/Shiles)

IV. Sustainable Community & Economic Planning

1. Borough voted 6-0 to approve a time extension request by Douglas S. Brehm, of Brehm-Lebo Engineering, Inc., on behalf of Hidden Meadows of Carlisle, LLC, the owner of Lots X and 2 within the Hidden Meadows – Phase II Subdivision, for satisfying the conditions of plan approval on the Preliminary and Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan for Hidden Meadows – Phase II as per section 226-21A(3) of the Borough's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The request is for an additional 90 days, and the new deadline shall be January 6, 2026. (Shiles/Landis)
2. Borough Council voted 6-0 to approve a time extension request by Douglas Brehm of Brehm-Lebo Engineering, Inc. ("Applicant"), on behalf of Karen E. & Mark H. Mallin ("Owner"), owner of the property at 808 Walnut Lane ("Property"), for considering and taking action on the 808 Walnut Lane Final Minor Subdivision Plan ("Plan"), as per section 226-21A(2) of the Borough's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The new deadline shall be December 31, 2025. (Shiles/Landis)

V. Council Report

1. Deputy Mayor Landis read a statement on behalf of Borough Council regarding the expected flow of the discussion, asking the gallery to be respectful, then turned the mic over to Chief Landis to update everyone on a recent ICE encounter involving the Borough. The statement is attached to these official minutes. Deputy Mayor Landis's statement is attached to these minutes.

Chief Landis noted that the Carlisle Police Department does not ask individuals about immigration status unless it is required by the circumstances of the engagement. Nor do they seek active assistance from ICE within the boundaries of the Borough for the purpose of immigration enforcement. He then provided details from an April 28th, 2025, incident involving ICE and an undocumented minor in the Borough. Chief Landis noted the details involved, when he was made aware of the situation, the involvement of ICE, and the outcome. Chief Landis's statement is attached to these minutes.

2. Community Trust and Resource Prioritization Public Comments:

Marvin Salsman of 600 Noble Blvd. is in favor of aiding those who need it while also enforcing Federal laws and therefore opposes the proposed legislation.

John Werner of 157 S. Pitt St. supports the ordinance.

Jessie Sherborne of 537 N. Hanover supports the ordinance.

Amanda Smith of 6 Buchanon Dr. supports the ordinance.

Hannah Roman of 613 N. Hanover supports the ordinance and read a message from a neighbor.

Jen McDuffie of 702 N. Pitt St. supports the ordinance.

Carl Malt of 804 Hillside Dr. supports the ordinance.

Jeff Inglehardt of 218 S. West St. addressed Council comments from the last meeting in opposition of the legislation and requested reconsidering of those opinions in support of the ordinance.

Councilor Mellen read a message from Bert Lennon, one of the original drafters of Section VII of the Carlisle Borough Home Rule Charter which explains how citizens can propose ordinances, not agreeing with how this ordinance is being handled. He believes it is an attempt to circumvent the intent of Section VII of the Home Rule Charter, including specific requirements based on voter turnout in the last gubernatorial election. He urged Council to vote no on this proposal. Mr. Lennon's full statement is attached to these minutes.

Mayor Shultz added that there is a referendum process, there is more than one way to pass an ordinance, it is within Council's powers to proceed, and this could be viewed as something that should go to the voters but can also be repealed by the voters.

Mayor Shultz clarified that he did not state that he was going to vote no on this legislation, that there were items on both sides of concern, but that he was undecided.

Deputy Mayor Landis outlined the voting process in the coming weeks should they decide to do so.

Holden Burkholder of 60 W. Pomfret St. supports the ordinance.

Ionna Gudmon of E. North St. supports the ordinance.

VI. New Business-None

VII. Public Comment

Both Councilors Shiles and Perry thanked everyone for coming and encouraged more people to stand up and comment.

Deputy Mayor Landis quoted Maggie Kuhn's famous lines, "Speak your mind even if your voice shakes. Leave safety behind. Put your body on the line. Stand before the people you fear and speak your mind even if your voice shakes. When you least expect it, someone may actually listen to what you have to say. Well aimed slingshots can topple giants". Then she added, do your homework.

VIII. Adjournment-There being no further business or public comment, the meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

Sean M. Shultz, Mayor

Patricia Blair, Borough Secretary

Personal Statement

Over the past nine months I have stated that the Carlisle Police Department does not call Immigration and Customs Enforcement (I.C.E.). I meant what I said. The members of the Carlisle Police Department do not ask individuals about their immigration status unless required to by the circumstances of the engagement, nor do they seek the active assistance of I.C.E, within the boundaries of the Borough for the purposes of immigration enforcement.

However, it is also correct that, on April 28, 2025, members of the Carlisle Police Department did call I.C.E. to seek its assistance with an undocumented individual who was detained for violations of the Pennsylvania Motor Vehicle Code. Because the Borough is unable to release detained juveniles on their own recognizance and must instead release them to a very limited list of individuals or entities who can properly care for a juvenile. This juvenile had no one local that met those requirements and was undocumented.

Upon being contacted, Immigration and Customs Enforcement supplied our officers with the name and contact information of a relative in Hagerstown Maryland. Our officers contacted the Hagerstown Maryland Police Department requesting they contact the juvenile's relative. Hagerstown Police Department could not contact the relatives, and our officers had no other individual or entity to whom the juvenile could be released. . No relative could assume custody and, ultimately, I.C.E. arrived at the Borough to assume custody of the juvenile.

I was unaware of the call to I.C.E. until September 16, 2025, while processing a Right To Know request. Upon learning that Carlisle Police officers had called I.C.E. I made notification of the actions to the Borough Manager and Legal Counsel.

While I would have preferred this interaction to having taken a slightly different path, it must be remembered that our officers are required to make decisions in real time, based on fluid, rapidly evolving circumstances. We plan to use this matter to better inform our response.

To that end, to provide additional oversight , I will be instructing all officers that, going forward, all unanticipated interaction with federal or state law enforcement will require them to check with Department Command Staff first. Moreover, in our post incident debrief, we have determined that, going forward, both Children, Youth and Families as well as Juvenile Probation will be working with agencies to address these issues collectively at a local level, where possible. The Carlisle Police Department will make that interagency cooperation a priority.

Taro D. Landis

Chief of Police

Carlisle Police Department

At the outset, it is important to define for everyone what we can and cannot address. Council will tonight restrict ourselves to only this Statement and to allow public comment on the merits of a Resolution or Ordinance related to undocumented persons and the Borough's interaction with them given the fact that two members of Council are not in attendance this evening and their voices too should be heard.

It is important to note for the record that Council is also aware that there has been at least one recent circumstance involving the police department and an undocumented individual. That matter is presently being investigated as both a personnel matter and an operational matter by the Administration. Other than what Chief Landis plans to share with the community this evening in his prepared remarks, the Borough does not, and cannot, comment on matters that are subject to a criminal investigation, and/or matters that are part of a personnel investigation.

While the Borough will certainly receive all comments that are made this evening, it is important for everyone to understand that the Borough will not be making any further comments regarding criminal investigations and/or matters that may be part of a personnel investigation. To the extent that we are able, we will do our best to provide additional comment at next week's meeting.

"Cate, this is Bert. I am opposed to the welcoming city provision. My concerns come from my experience as a member of the commission that wrote the home rule charter. I helped write section VII, which explains how citizens can propose ordinances, and I do not agree with how this process is being handled.

I have three main reasons for disagreeing with this proposal. I believe it is unnecessary, unwanted, and unlawful.

I think this proposal is unnecessary because we already have enough laws on this topic. The U.S. Constitution, the Pennsylvania Constitution, our home rule charter, and past council resolutions all address these issues. Since these laws are already in place, I do not see any benefit in adding another ordinance. Once passed, the ordinance would become a local law that everyone, including the police, would be required to follow. I also believe the Borough government should reflect the will of its citizens, and I do not see strong support from Carlisle residents for this change.

A major concern is that cities declaring themselves sanctuary cities often face serious budget problems. These cities attract undocumented people, some with good intentions and others who may not. This places additional pressure on city resources and can lead to financial difficulties. When we worked on the home rule charter, we wanted to protect the borough council from outside groups that might not have Carlisle's best interests at heart. I believe this proposal originates from a national organization using Carlisle as a test case, rather than from local needs or feedback. The council's job is to focus on what Carlisle citizens need, not to follow outside agendas. That's why I helped revise the charter—to make sure our laws serve everyone in the borough.

In addition, I believe this motion is illegal because it runs contrary to federal law, specifically the United States Constitution. Article II of the Constitution clearly states that when local or state law conflicts with federal law, federal law is considered supreme. In 1832, certain southern states attempted to ignore federal law, an effort that caused the President of the United States at the time to leverage federal resources to bring them into compliance with the law. The United States Supreme Court agreed with the executive's interpretation of the law in this matter, and the states' actions were deemed unlawful. The current administration has made it clear, under the power endowed to it by current federal law, that states found not to be in compliance with existing federal law will begin to lose federal resources. These resources are crucial to the day-to-day operations of the borough, and considering existing fiscal conditions, we cannot afford to lose any federal funding. Considering some of the challenges we face in providing social services to the homeless and other similar groups, we need to carefully consider any actions that could jeopardize the support needed to combat these challenges.

This proposal would also put local law enforcement in a difficult spot. They have promised to follow federal, state, and borough laws. If this ordinance passes, it could confuse officers and even put their jobs at risk if they are unsure which rules to follow. We should not put our police in this situation.

What frustrates me most is that I view this as an attempt to circumvent the intent of Section 7 of the Home Rule Charter. The charter clearly explains how to bring issues to the council, including specific requirements based on voter turnout in the last gubernatorial election. We establish these rules to ensure that requests truly reflect what borough citizens want. The people behind this proposal have not met those requirements. If Carlisle residents really want this change, they can bring it to the council through the process outlined in Section 7 of the charter.

For all these reasons, I urge you to vote no on this proposal. The council's job is to follow the law and look out for Carlisle's best interests. I do not think a yes vote would do either, and it could put Carlisle in danger."