

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL
PUBLIC HEARING AND REGULAR MEETING

MARCH 22, 1984

4:00 PM

The second regular monthly meeting was called to order on Thursday, March 22, 1984, at 4:00 pm by Chairman Taricani in the College Township Municipal Building.

Members present: Max E. Hartswick, Fred E. Smith, Herbert W. Stewart,
Dolores A. Taricani - Chairman

Member absent: Gale L. Dargitz

Others present: C. Thomas Lechner - Manager
Beulah L. Houser - Administrative Assistant

PUBLIC HEARING

Request by Radio Semi-Conductor, Inc. for IDA Loan

After swearing-in Radio Semi-Conductor's Representatives Roger Dean and Bruce Breslin, Chairman Taricani asked Township Solicitor Reed McCormick to summarize the firm's request for IDA funding.

The request, said McCormick, was for an IDA loan to build and equip a plant on approximately six acres of land near Fox Hollow Road across from the University Airport. Radio Semi-Conductor, Inc. is requesting a loan of \$2,100,000--of which \$1,600,000 is for land and building, and \$500,000 is for improvements to the interior and for equipment. McCormick added this would not be a public issue bond but rather a private issue, probably with a bank lender. The Benner Township Board of Supervisors and the College Township IDA had both approved the request.

Taricani asked Smith, College Township's Representative to the IDA, to comment and Smith reported that the Authority was strongly in favor of granting the request. He added that with Radio Semi-Conductor's project, which was financed by IDA funds, they employed a significant number of local residents with many of them trained "from scratch" by this Company. McCormick later said the Firm had hired 150 people in a year's time, people in dire need of jobs.

Dagan and Breslin, when asked to comment, said they had no new information related to the request.

In a brief discourse on the Firm's request, Taricani stated that Radio Semi-Conductor was an asset to the Region and that their operation fit the letter and the spirit of the Law, as the IDA Act intended.

With Smith's motion and Stewart's second that Council approve Radio Semi-Conductor's request for IDA funding, the motion carried and the Certificate of Approval was then signed.

The Public Hearing adjourned at 4:10 pm following Hartwick's motion and Smith's second.

Immediately, Taricani called to order the regular Council meeting and made two announcements:

- 1) The Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania had refused to allow the Rudolph Case (a zoning issue) to re-argue its case; they still may appeal to a higher court.
- 2) Although the time of the second Council meeting of the month was established to complete paper work and routine matters (Taricani read from the January 1983 Minutes), Developer Jack Mitchell requested that Council consider his Final Plan for Phases VII, VIII and IX in Spring Creek Estates. Taricani said if Council proceeded through the Agenda and had some remaining time and if Mitchell could present an organized plan quickly, she felt the issue would fall within the intent of the afternoon meeting and Council would attend to the matter.

CORRESPONDENCE

Endorsement of Local Government Week

In a letter dated March 12, 1984, B. Kenneth Greider, Executive Director of the Township Supervisors, requested that Local Government Week be observed April 15-20, 1984. Taricani recognized the request, stating Council supported the matter.

BUSINESS

1. Pike Street Property Returned to Hospital

Noting that the history of this Township's parcel of land was well documented in the papers in Council members' packets, Taricani briefly said the land was given to the Township some years ago with deed restrictions that prevented the Township from selling the land. In 1982, the Township asked the Hospital if they wanted the land returned but at that time the Hospital delayed their reply.

Recently, however, the Hospital notified the Township that they would like the land returned so they may sell it and consider the proceeds as a gift to be placed in their treasury.

Smith then moved that Council approve the transaction of returning the land in question to the Centre Community Hospital and sign the deed. Following Stewart's second the motion carried unanimously.

2. Resolution No. 100 - Allowing PennDOT to Change Location of Private Drive #1 to the Municipal Building

Lechner presented drawings of the proposed change of location of Private Drive #1 from the South side (the College Avenue side) of the Township Municipal Building to the West side (the Borough side). PennDOT, said Lechner, would like a resolution from Council endorsing the change.

Elaborating further on the proposed drive and parking design, Lechner said, vehicles traveling to the Township Building will enter at the traffic light and visitors will park in an area constructed on the West side of the Building. The private drive will traverse the present parking and drive location, terminating in another constructed parking area for employees and for overflow parking. Because East College Avenue will be raised three feet, the private drive will also be raised to keep from giving a "sunken effect" to the Municipal Building.

To Stewart's question concerning ownership of the land where the service road (to the North of the Building) is constructed, Lechner replied that PennDOT owned a portion of the land but that it would be deeded over to the Township for a nominal sum. Stewart also inquired about keeping unwanted traffic off the service road, asking if it would be necessary to stretch a chain across the entrance. Lechner recognized this might be a problem but said the service road would also serve as a right-of-way to another property otherwise landlocked so the road would need to remain open.

Some discussion focused on renovations to the Municipal Building itself. Lechner explained that since the front entrance of the Building will be located on the West side, the existing front doors must be transferred to that entrance and vice-versa. Also noted was that a night depository will be constructed and that a railing for the handicapped must be installed at the new entrance.

Taricani stated that the relocated front entrance should be constructed as attractively as possible and with a sense of importance by adding detail and color but not expense.

Suggesting an early American type standard for the exterior lighting, Smith asked Lechner if he would present some available selections of lighting standards. Smith suggested that lights giving a garrish effect not be used.

To help with the expense, Smith said the College Township IDA is willing to consider assisting the Township on the improvement of the Municipal Building. Needed are an improvements plan and cost estimates which he asked the Manager to provide.

With discussion apparently completed on the proposed changes, Smith moved and Stewart seconded the adoption of Resolution #100, approving the location change of Private Drive #1 to commence at the Western side of the Municipal Building. The motion carried.

3. Code Adoption Procedure

At the last Council meeting Smith had reported on the process of adopting the new BOCA Code. Taricani announced that the Code Committee have placed forms at the Code Office and the College Township Building to solicit citizen input on the revisions. Code texts will be available to the public at wholesale cost to facilitate in gathering public opinion, and at this point Taricani read from the Code Adoption Procedure statement which listed the texts, prices and schedule for adopting the Code.

Smith said that the Code texts had not arrived on time which would delay all the dates on the schedule by some time increment. To inform the public of the input opportunity, Smith stressed that the Code adoption process should be well advertised in the newspaper.

4. Reordering of Planning Commission Members' Terms of Appointments

Lechner explained that the present irregular schedule of appointments of Planning Commission members was due in part to the Commission expanding from a five-member body to a seven member body in the '70's. When appointments came up, he added, there was an attempt to spread out the terms so they wouldn't mature at the same time. The error actually was traced back further, to the inception of the Commission.

The recommended terms of appointment had been submitted per memo dated February 22, 1984 by the Manager to the Planning Commission, who concurred with the plan.

As the concept of adopting the recommendation was discussed, some concern was expressed by Council that they were actually extending appointments before they could consider whether or not they wanted to do so or whether or not the Commission members wanted to serve an extended term (in some cases). Council stressed their concern was with the concept behind the recommendation, not with the people themselves, who Council felt were doing excellent work.

Smith commented that the revised schedule of appointments did regulate terms and he moved that Council correct the Planning Commission members' terms of appointment per memo from Lechner dated February 22, 1984, in the schedule to be recommended. Hartswick then seconded the motion.

Taricani suggested some modification to the memo so that Council adopt the body of the recommendation but make no commitments to terms beyond the end of this year.

To clarify a question earlier in the discussion on the length of Donald Joyce's appointment, Lechner said the appointment had been approved for one year.

At that point a vote was taken on the motion which carried unanimously.

5. Prioritizing Projects for the Twelve-Year Plan

Lechner explained that to qualify for placing these programs on the Twelve-Year Plan, Council must communicate some idea of where their level of concerns are. As a starting point to propose these projects, Lechner said he used the suggestions stated at the December 8, 1983 Council meeting and the Manager then read the corresponding paragraph from those Minutes. He commented that projects such as access to Harris Acres and the traffic signal at the Porter Road and Rt. 26 Intersection would not fall by themselves into CRMPO categories.

In discussing the major projects, Lechner said PennDOT proposed adding a center turning lane on South Atherton Street by decreasing the width of the lanes to 10 feet; no acquisition of additional land would then be necessary. Taricani added that service roads and a center barrier could be constructed to minimize turns.

Hartswick, Smith and Taricani voiced support for prioritizing the projects in the order they were listed for consideration, with Taricani and Smith emphatically stating that the bikeway in conjunction with the By-pass should be placed far down on the list.

In reference to the South Atherton Street Bikeway, Taricani said that although she felt that the Bikeway was a positive addition to the area, the Township has not been properly informed beforehand that they would have to clean it and she stated

she would be reluctant to again support what amounts to an enormous project, especially when the Township must buy equipment to maintain it.

To obtain the funding for the South Atherton Street Bikeway, said Lechner, they required that the Township provide the maintenance. The Manager said the Township had intended to purchase a sweeper anyway; they will, however, buy a different kind to accommodate the major needs.

Taricani stressed Council should know in advance what they were committing themselves to before voting for it--specifically who would maintain it and how long would it be.

Smith agreed, saying they should be cautious of incurring something that would create additional maintenance; he also wanted to know the By-pass Bikeway's course--the beginning and ending points.

Lechner said he had not seen a plan with the Bikeway except in discussing an exchange of land in Slab Cabin Park where PennDOT would like to give more land to the Township to accommodate a bikeway rather than carry the Bikeway along the By-pass, the topography being such that it would be difficult to construct it.

Concerned over extensive repairs, Smith cited the cost-benefit factor as in construction of the interstate highways where the States received 80 percent funding but are now pressed to fund the repairs.

Smith then moved that Council approve the following projects, in sequence relative to their importance, to be submitted to CRMPO for placement on the PennDOT Twelve-Year Plan:

1. East College Avenue Bridge Completion
2. Fifth turning lane on South Atherton Street
3. Fifth turning lane on East College Avenue from the State College Borough line to the Mall and beyond to Shiloh Road. Project would include traffic control at Porter Road.

Included in Smith's motion was a request to PennDOT to provide additional information on the By-pass Bikeway.

After Hartswick's second, the motion carried with unanimous approval.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Lechner announced that:

1. At 1 pm on April 20, 1984, Council members would meet at the Township Municipal Building to begin the Spring Road Inspection.
2. The company submitting the lowest bid on the Traffic Signal Controller for the Branch Road/South Atherton Street Intersection had defaulted and, as a result, PennDOT recommended accepting the second lowest bid which was from Herr Brothers. Lechner emphasized that although Herr Brothers' bid was considerably more than the lowest bid, it was still under the amount considered at the time the 1984 Township Budget was adopted.

Together, College Township and the State College Borough would pay half of the signal's cost (the Township 37 percent, and the State College Borough 63 percent). State and Federal Government would fund the other half.

At 5:17 Council reached the end of discussion of the Agenda and agreed to consider Jack Mitchell's request for approval on Phases VII, VIII and IX of Spring Creek Estates Plan.

Jack Mitchell's Final Plan - Phases VII, VIII and IX in Spring Creek Estates

A major point in the approval of Mitchell's Final Plan was the street paving before the Occupancy Permits were issued.

Lechner said the base pavement is not in place and it was Township policy not to grant Occupancy Permits until the paved base is down.

Asked about the relationship between the paving issue and the plan approval, Lechner replied that posting Surety was based on this and other requirements.

The problem was, Mitchell said, that he wanted the ground where the sewer line had been installed to settle as much as possible, otherwise the paving could cave in.

The issue was complicated by the home buyer pressing to occupy their house as soon as it was completed. Some of the builders, said Lechner, are not informing the buyers that the road has to be finished before an Occupancy Permit will be granted.

Mitchell conceded he could pave the street during the last two weeks in May. (Referring to Phases V and VI.)

Asked for advice, Lechner responded that there was nothing in the plan to prevent Council's acceptance. His recommendation was that Council accept the plan with the posting of Surety--conditions such as no Occupancy Permits issued prior to occupancy and curbing in place as a matter of record.

Taricani said that if he had met all the requirements but could not obtain some of the paving material (amasite), it wouldn't be correct for Council not to approve the plan.

Mitchell then agreed that he would post Surety for trees, curbing and macadam that is not complete, and Lechner added it would be approximately \$13,000.

Stewart then moved that Council approve the plans presented by Jack Mitchell on Spring Creek Estates, Phases VII, VIII and IX, dated March 19, 1984, provided Mitchell posts Surety. Smith seconded the motion and Taricani added that the record should make a reference to the staged holding of the base coats. The vote on the motion was unanimous. JACK (MITCHELL) STATED HE WAS NOT PUTTING THE FINAL WEARING COAT ON UNTIL SETTLEMENT HAD OCCURRED.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5:30 pm the meeting concluded with Hartswick's move and Smith's second for adjournment.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Thomas Lechner
Secretary

MANAGER'S UPDATE

Council Meeting - 3/15/84

1. Notify Highland Development Joint Venture of Council's decision on their request for rezoning of property located along Whitehall Road.

RESPONSE: The developer was notified of Council's decision on
March 19, 1984 by letter.

2. Write letter to State College Borough Water Authority re Council's approval to extend water lines w/fire protection as approved on the Kissinger's Subdivision Plan for those lots.

RESPONSE: A letter was sent to the Water Authority on
March 16, 1984

3. Notify Financial Advisory Committee Members re their appointments and determine meeting date to get organized and meet the charge requirements.

RESPONSE: The Financial Advisory Committee Members were
notified by mail March 23rd and plan to meet
on April 2, 1984 at 7:30 p.m.

4. Discuss with Bob Watkins, C.R.P.C., the issue of standardizing Zoning Ordinances among the Regional Townships and report to Council of his response.

RESPONSE: This item was discussed with Bob Watkins and he'll
consult with the other planners on staff for a
recommendation.

5. Solicit an opinion from the Township Engineer re requiring the streets to be 26 feet (curb-face to curb-face measurements)

RESPONSE: Mr. Sweetland was asked to solicit an opinion
but will not be able to address issues until
April.

MANAGER'S UPDATE

Council Meeting - 3/15/84

1. Notify Highland Development Joint Venture of Council's decision on their request for rezoning of property located along Whitehall Road.

RESPONSE: The developer was notified of Council's decision on
March 19, 1984 by letter.

2. Write letter to State College Borough Water Authority re Council's approval to extend water lines w/fire protection as approved on the Kissinger's Subdivision Plan for those lots.

RESPONSE: A letter was sent to the Water Authority on
March 16, 1984

3. Notify Financial Advisory Committee Members re their appointments and determine meeting date to get organized and meet the charge requirements.

RESPONSE: The Financial Advisory Committee Members were
notified by mail March 23rd and plan to meet
on April 2, 1984 at 7:30 p.m.

4. Discuss with Bob Watkins, C.R.P.C., the issue of standardizing Zoning Ordinances among the Regional Townships and report to Council of his response.

RESPONSE: This item was discussed with Bob Watkins and he'll
consult with the other planners on staff for a
recommendation.

5. Solicit an opinion from the Township Engineer re requiring the streets to be 26 feet (curb-face to curb-face measurements)

RESPONSE: Mr. Sweetland was asked to solicit an opinion
but will not be able to address issues until
April.

6. Manager set a date for road inspection - Friday Afternoon at end of April and Council will confirm the date at the next meeting.

RESPONSE: Road Inspection is set for 1:00 p.m., Friday,
April 20, 1984.

7. Obtain copies of the revised Codes and the forms for suggestions to be available at the College Township Municipal Building.

RESPONSE: These forms are available here and it was announced
at the Council Meeting on March 22, 1984.

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP FINANCIAL REPORT

Cash Position for the 3 months ended 3/31 19 84

		<u>CURRENT</u> <u>MONTH</u>	<u>YEAR TO</u> <u>DATE</u>
BEGINNING:			
Cash	<u>4,504</u>		
Investments	<u>59,371</u>		
Accounts Receivable	<u>165</u>		
LESS Accounts Payable	<u>13,213</u>		
Fund Equity		<u>50,827</u>	
Revenues		<u>48,124</u>	<u>170,839</u>
Total Available for Appropriation		<u>98,951</u>	
LESS Expenditures		<u>46,322</u>	<u>177,027</u>
ENDING:			
Cash	<u>5,633</u>		
Investments	<u>56,562</u>		
Accounts Receivable	<u>165</u>		
LESS Accounts Payable	<u>9,731</u>		
UNAPPROPRIATED FUND EQUITY		<u><u>52,629</u></u>	

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP FINANCIAL REPORT

BUDGET AND ACTUAL APPROPRIATIONS - ALL FUNDS for the 3 month(s) ended 3-31 1984

C.T.	CLASSIFICATION	1983		1984			1984		ACTUAL + to '84 BUDGET
		BUDGET 1983	ACTUAL Y-T-D	BUDGET 1984	ACTUAL MONTH	ACTUAL Y-T-D	BUDGET REMAIN. for '84	PROJECT REMAIN. for '84	
	ASSETS								
100	Beginning Cash	\$ 31,485	\$ 52,394	\$ 58,810	\$ N/A	\$ 58,817	\$ 52,629	\$	\$
	REVENUE								
300	Taxes: Property	152,304	7,657	162,804	9,797	19,541	152,163		
	Local Enabling	312,000	87,942	324,500	24,354	100,647	223,853		
320	Licenses & Permits	190	-0-	5,500	575	2,026	3,474		
330	Fines & Forfeits	41,000	9,879	44,000	3,851	9,212	34,788		
340	Interest & Rents	25,900	5,270	30,300	2,866	7,119	23,181		
350	Intergovern. Revenues	137,659	14,989	151,265	730	15,178	136,087		
360	Charges for Services	28,788	7,135	38,150	5,838	11,780	26,370		
380	Miscellaneous	7,022	264	1,800	163	14,236	(12,436)		
	TOTAL REVENUES	\$704,863	\$133,136	\$758,319	\$ 48,124	\$170,839	\$587,480	\$	\$
	TOTAL AVAILABLE for APPROPRIATION	\$736,348	\$185,530	\$817,129	\$ N/A	\$229,656	\$640,109	\$	\$
	EXPENDITURES								
400	Gen. Gov't.: Administ.	\$109,880	\$ 29,921	\$119,380	\$ 7,200	\$ 22,986	\$ 96,394	\$	\$
	Tax. Coll.	41,355	11,794	44,340	3,236	11,313	33,027		
	Sub-Total 400	151,235	41,715	163,720	10,436	34,299	129,421		
410	Public Safety:								
	Police	178,003	43,360	195,845	17,544	49,447	146,398		
	Fire	26,865	6,609	31,565	-0-	7,355	24,210		
	Planning & Zoning	27,225	6,786	30,155	627	7,373	22,782		
	Sub-Total 410	232,093	56,755	257,565	18,171	64,175	193,390		
420	Health & Welfare:								
	Sanitation	1,000	65	1,000	1	1	999		
430	Highways:								
	General Maintenance	45,000	15,793	61,311	1,068	8,337	52,974		
	Snow Removal	24,770	6,715	26,635	3,173	18,751	7,884		
	Traffic Signals	5,800	503	13,650	643	1,635	12,015		
	Street Lights	8,760	2,151	8,900	699	2,097	6,803		
	Highway Maintenance	50,300	1,076	50,540	5,476	11,233	39,307		
	Construction Proj.	40,790	3,803	25,535	-0-	-0-	25,535		
	Sub-Total 430	175,420	30,041	186,571	11,059	42,053	144,518		
440	Transportation:								
	Transit System	18,168	7,613	12,725	-0-	6,060	6,665		
450	Culture Recreation:								
	Parks & Recreation	41,625	10,156	43,283	-0-	10,696	32,587		
	Libraries	24,889	6,097	28,913	-0-	7,225	21,685		
	Senior Citizens	6,171	766	5,738	-0-	2,004	3,734		
	Sub-Total 450	72,685	17,019	77,934	-0-	19,928	58,006		
470	Debt Service:								
	Principal & Interest	17,262	3,095	16,646	1,011	3,033	13,613		
480	Miscellaneous:								
	Employee Benefits	37,000	3,510	42,158	2,614	7,478	34,680		
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$704,863	\$159,813	\$758,319	\$ 85,345	\$177,027	\$581,292	\$	\$
	REMAINDER for APPROPRIATION	\$ 31,485	\$ 25,717	\$ 58,810	\$ N/A	\$ 52,629	\$ 58,817	\$	\$

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP CASH FLOW REPORT

Based on 1983 monthly flow percentages

	1983											
	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUN.	JUL.	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.
Cash - Beginning Balance	58810	29910	32110	15010	15710	16710	16210	149110	129110	129110	119010	115010
Plus - Receipts	89000	55000	227100	219500	57600	40000	87900	49200	35700	62600	42700	24300
Less - Anticipated Expenditures	85900	53100	32300	72300	49100	47500	92300	62500	40800	77200	45700	81500
Cash - Ending Balance	29910	32610	18010	159210	147710	160210	149110	129710	127610	119010	116010	32810

	CURRENT MONTH		YEAR-TO-DATE	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Cash - Beginning Balance	32610	50827	58810	55817
Plus - Anticipated Receipts	227100	48724	58500	170629
Less - Anticipated Expenditures	37300	21322	179300	170210
Cash - Ending Balance	18010	52427	18010	52427

	CURRENT MONTH		YEAR-TO-DATE	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Cash - Beginning Balance	18010	18017	58810	55817
Plus - Anticipated Receipts	227100	25714	58500	170629
Less - Anticipated Expenditures	37300	9022	179300	170210
Cash - Ending Balance	18010	34619	18010	34619

Exceptions

Ⓐ Includes Contributions from Private Sources - Current Month - 0

Ⓑ Excludes C.A.T.A. Bus Pool Purchase paid in 1983 - 4468

Year-to-Date - 1975