COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL

REGULAR MEETING

HELD OCTOBER 15, 1981

Chairman Taricani called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the College Township Municipal Building.

Members present: Donald E. Bailey, Gale L. Dargitz, J. Carroll Dean, Herbert W. Stewart, and Dolores A. Taricani

Others present: Manager Elwood G. Williams, Sr. Treasurer Robert L. Hayden

OPEN DISCUSSION

1. Robert Ripka, Buchenhorst Road, said he had received a letter indicating he was in violation of the Numbering Ordinance and would have to change his house number. Mr. Ripka commented on the numbering system asking why the numbering system was not uniform throughout the Region and why he had to change his address inasmuch as he has lived at the same residence since 1964.

Chairman Taricani responded indicating she would have Mr. Williams document the numbering system and she would get back to him with this information. Chairman Taricani also expressed her feeling that Mr. Ripka should not have received the letter he did with no knowledge of the matter beforehand and apologized for this letter being sent.

Mr. Dargitz briefly outlined the provisions of the Numbering Ordinance.

Mr. Ripka was concerned that he would have to change his address now and then again in the future because of a possible change in the numbering scheme.

Chairman Taricani assured Mr. Ripka Council would work to resolve his problem in the best way possible and would be back to him.

MINUTES

Minutes of September 10, 1981, Regular Meeting. Corrections as follows:

Page 5, paragraph 2, line 5, change to read: "to with...request. Mr. Dean pointed out the Code for Second Class Townships provides this direction."

Page 6, paragraph 6, change to read: "Mr. Dean advised Mrs. Hubbard to bring to the public hearing all the records she had available to substantiate her statement that upon previous requests for rezoning she had been told 'to return when you have a buyer'."

Mr. Bailey moved the Minutes of September 10, 1981 be approved as corrected. Mr. Dargitz seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

Minutes of September 22, 1981, Special Meeting.

Mr. Dean moved the Minutes of September 22, 1981, be approved as distributed. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

UPDATE

1. Mr. Williams reported he had provided the College Township Planning Commission with a chronology on the status of the Hubbard land.

2. Relative to the site distance problem at driveways on Pike Street, Mr. Williams reported he had contacted PennDOT concerning the question of signs/signals in the right-of-way being hazards. Mr. Khoury, of PennDOT, indicated all signs/signals in the right-of-way are hazards.

3. Mr. Williams reported he had checked with the other municipalities in the area relative to their bidding or not bidding for fuel oil and gasoline -- State College and Ferguson Township have bid; Patton Township is going to bid; Harris Township went to bid but only received one bid from Nittany Gas & Oil which was just the key to the pump at the Oil Center. Mr. Williams indicated College Township would go to bid for gasoline and fuel oil this year. Mr. Williams reported the Federal quota on gasoline has been lifted.

4. Mr. Williams indicated he had, as requested, called all Council Members when the COG Budget was received.

5. Mr. Williams reported he had talked with George Khoury, of PennDOT, on the status of the traffic signal at the intersection of Gerald Street, Struble Road, and East College Avenue. Mr. Khoury said PennDOT was doing the survey now and the design would be completed by the end of this month. It will be going to bid in January 1982 and would be installed by June 1, 1982.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Treasurer Robert L. Hayden reviewed for Council the information in the Treasurer's Report for September 1981. Mr. Hayden reported the final Revenue Sharing grant for this Entitlement Period was received on October 5.

Mr. Dargitz moved the Treasurer's Report for September 1981 be accepted. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. September 28, 1981 letter from Stuart E. Kehler, Parks and Recreation Advisor, Harrisburg Regional Office, Department of Community Affairs, to Mr. Williams relative to the application for a grant for ...ing Creek Park.

2. September 30, 1981 letter from Thomas C. Ickes, District Engineer, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, to Scott Owens, referring to erection of "Deaf Child Area" signs.

3. October 7, 1981 letter from Thomas C. Ickes, District Engineer, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, to Mr. Williams granting permission for College Township to erect "Driveway" signs on Pike Street in Lemont.

OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Taricani indicated the Department of Community Affairs wanted clarification on the overall arrangements for the indebtedness for the post office building. The Township Solicitor had prepared a resolution restating some of the points stated previously to clarify these financial arrangements for the Department of Community Affairs.

Mr. Dean moved Resolution # 74 which is in support of Ordinance # 77 for awarding of general obligation note at the Farmers Community Bank as amended be adopted. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. Rimmey Replot, Preliminary and Final Plan. Chairman Taricani indicated this plan had been considered by the Planning Commission and found to be deficient and in need of a variance. It was her understanding that the applicant is going to seek a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Dean pointed out that if Council took no action the "time clock" continued even though the applicant has applied for a variance.

Mr. Dean moved that Council disapprove without prejudice the replot of the Rimmey property. Mr. Dargitz seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

BUSINESS

1. Rezoning Request from W. E. Esber, Charles Rallis, and Nancy J. Dreibelbis from University District to C-1; and request to revise the Master Plan for the J. Kenneth Walker PRD and R-3 Zoning Request.

Chairman Taricani pointed out that these requests had not yet been reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Dean moved that all the rezoning requests from W. E. Esber, Charles Rallis, Nancy J. Dreibelbis, and that pertaining to the J. Kenneth Walker PRD be referred to the Planning Commission for recommendation. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.

A member of the audience asked that in light of the many rezoning requests received by Council had any thought been given to establishing general policies and guidelines to address these requests.

Chairman Taricani explained that Council cannot establish general guidelines inasmuch as each must be decided individually and cannot be prejudged. Legal guidelines are given in the various laws and ordinances that govern zoning.

The citizen referred to a recent Planning Commission meeting where he felt there was no basis for the decisions made.

Mr. Dean pointed out that the Planning Commission was an advisory group and as long as they stayed within the context of the ordinance and other governing documents they do what their individual best judgment tells them to do. The guidelines they use are the ones established in the Subdivision Regulations, Zoning Ordinance, and Township Code.

Another citizen asked if a petition was presented to Council signed by the majority of the voters in the Township opposing a zoning change would this be a deciding factor. Mr. Dean indicated the petition would be considered along with the other factors in the case. He emphasized again that each rezoning request is considered individually and consequently general guidelines could not be established.

Mr. Dargitz explained the procedure for handling a rezoning request, indicating that land use and items to be considered were all spelled out in the laws/ordinances governing zoning requests.

Council explained the importance of a public hearing in the rezoning requests procedure as an established time to receive sworn testimony on the request.

A citizen suggested that part of the procedure for rezoning requests include review by the Parks & Recreation Committee and the Environmental Advisory Committee.

Chairman Taricani indicated by law this could not be. The input of these committees is provided for by the Planning Commission asking for their opinion when the Planning Commission feels they need the additional assistance.

Referring to a recent Planning Commission meeting, a citizen indicated the Planning Commission stated it was not within their prerogative to ask for these opinions from Parks & Recreation and the Environmental Advisory Council.

Chairman Taricani explained the Planning Commission can ask for any assistance from any advisory group they feel they need. She indicated there appeared to be a misunderstanding which will be looked into.

The motion that all the rezoning requests from W. E. Esber, Charles Rallis, Nancy J. Dreibelbis, and that pertaining to the J. Kenneth Walker PRD be referred to the Planning Commission for recommendation was carried unanimously.

A member of the audience asked what was meant by the "UNIVERSITY DISTRICT". Chairman Taricani indicated it was a district established so that the Township could zone University lands. She encouraged the citizen to contact the Township Office for a copy of the excerpts from the Zoning Ordinance explaining the UNIVERSITY DISTRICT.

2. Landscaping Plan for Lemont Post Office. Mrs. Louise Mayes presented the landscaping plan for Council's consideration.

Mr. Dean asked if the landscaping plan had been reviewed by the Post Office Construction Committee. Several members of the Post Office Construction Committee were present and indicated they had not been requested to review the plan.

Mr. Dean suggested the Post Office Construction Committee should review the plan and see if they had any suggestions to offer.

Council was in agreement that they were satisfied with the landscaping plan and that it should be referred to the Post Office Construction Committee. If the Construction Committee felt the landscaping plan was satisfactory, then the Landscaping Committee could proceed with the plan.

3. Leisure Life Request for an Extension of its Temporary Occupancy Permit. Steve Hurvitz, Attorney for Leisure Life, indicated they were appealing the recent decision of Code Enforcement not to grant further extensions to the Temporary Occupancy Permit obtained earlier in the year for the Leisure Life building. Mr. Hurvitz referred to the section of the BOCA Building Code addressing Boards of Appeal and indicated it is not the function of Council to determine if an appeal has merit and requested that Council establish a Board of Appeals to consider their appeal.

Chairman Taricani indicated Council was aware of their responsibility to appoint a Board of Appeal. They had not yet done so because it was the opinion of the Director of Code Enforcement that the Township probably did not need such a board. When the board

was needed then Council would appoint it. She indicated Council was not opposed to appointing such a Board.

Mr. Hurvitz commented that any action by Code Enforcement to revoke occupancy rights during this interim period would be wrongful and recommended that nothing be done until the Board was established and the appeal could be heard.

Tom Kurtz, of Code Enforcement, explained that this Temporary Occupancy Permit was not something that was being revoked -- it was a Temporary Permit that was expiring. Additionally, Mr. Kurtz explained College Township had been informed of this expiration by copy of the September 21, 1981 letter from David Beitz to Robert Andrews. Mr. Kurtz referred to the section of the Building Code addressing Temporary Occupancy Permits and indicated the determination would have to be whether or not the absence of a sprinkler system endangers life and public welfare. He said Council could appoint a Board of Appeals but questioned whether or not this matter was suitable for appeal. Mr. Kurtz indicated he felt the issue to be considered was that Council could request an extension to the Temporary Occupancy Permit. Mr. Beitz had felt that because the sprinkler system had not been completed as had been outlined in writing within the Temporary Permit period that he could not, in good conscience, extend the temporary occupancy.

Mr. Stewart asked if the sprinkler system was being worked on. Mr. Hurvitz indicated that more time was needed for the system because the insurance carrier for Leisure Life had been contacted and had told Leisure Life they would tell them where to place the sprinklers over the production line. The exact location of the production line has not yet been established. Mr. Hurvitz felt this would be accomplished within the next six months and said that in essence their request would be for another six months of temporary occupancy. Mr. Hurvitz indicated that no production would be done until such time as the requirements for permanent occupancy had been met.

To a question concerning the office space, Mr. Hurvitz indicated sprinklers are not required in the office space. Bob Andrews, Architect for Leisure Life, explained that the construction of the building had the office space separate from the production area by a three-hour fire wall.

Mr. Kurtz commented that Temporary Occupancy Permits had been issued for the office section of the building as well and have since expired. He said it may be possible to install smoke detectors or some sort of temporary supplemental system to protect the office personnel. He indicated he would have to check with the inspectors on this matter.

Harlin Wall, associated with Leisure Life, indicated there were presently three men working in the factory portion of the building. Their efforts are being directed to setting up the tooling and production lines. Mr. Wall indicated if the temporary occupancy was disallowed it would subject them to great economic hardship.

Mr. Dean asked the reason the office section of the building had to have a temporary occupancy permit.

Mr. Kurtz indicated that occupancy permits are usually only given for entire buildings and inasmuch as the office was essentially complete the temporary occupancy permit was given for the office section in anticipation of the completion of the remainder of the building.

Mr. Hurvitz suggested that possibly a fire warning device for office personnel could be worked out until such time as the sprinkler system can be installed.

Chairman Taricani questioned the Township's liability should it allow temporary occupancy and a fire did occur.

Mr. Hurvitz indicated he felt the possibility of a fire was remote because of the type of materials being worked with. He also indicated the Leisure Life was insured, although it would be possible that the Township could be sued if injury occurred as a result of a fire.

Mr. Dean moved:

1. The Township Solicitor be asked for his comments on the Township's liability if the temporary occupancy is extended;
2. The Township Solicitor be asked if a refusal to extend a temporary permit is an appealable situation;
3. Code Enforcement be asked to review the situation and see if some economically acceptable temporary system can be installed; and
4. Code Enforcement be asked if it is possible to interpret the construction of the production line as a part of the original building construction.

Mr. Dargitz seconded the motion.

Mr. Kurtz was concerned about the amount of turn-around time the points in the motion might take. Mr. Hurvitz was concerned also about the approaching lapse time of the temporary occupancy permit.

Chairman Taricani indicated that Council was in the process of investigating the matter and until such time as an answer could be arrived at as a result of the investigation everything would be stayed.

Mr. Kurtz encouraged Council if this was their intent that it be clearly communicated to him otherwise at the expiration of the Temporary Occupancy Permit the building would be closed.

Chairman Taricani indicated Council would properly notify his office of their intentions and emphasized the importance of all parties concerned cooperating in this matter.

The motion as stated by Mr. Dean was carried unanimously.

Chairman Taricani asked Mr. Williams to keep in close touch with Mr. Kurtz and Council on this matter and to contact the Township Solicitor requesting him to investigate this matter promptly.

Mr. Kurtz referred to a proposed sprinkler system plan submitted by Leisure Life. Mr. Hurvitz indicated this plan was submitted as a precaution in case they needed to install a system in order to keep operating but it was not the proper plan.

4. College-Harris Joint Authority, Preliminary Study of Sewer Service to Persia Subdivision and Surrounding Areas. Chairman Taricani indicated Council had received and reviewed the preliminary engineering study for providing sanitary sewer service to the Persia Subdivision and surrounding area. Chairman Taricani summarized the report as indicating that a sewer system was needed in the area for various environmental reasons and the project would be a costly one.

Tom Songer, of Uni-Tec, who had prepared the report also stated that the area has had a history of malfunctioning septic systems. Because the sewer would only be serving properties on one side of the road and because the sewage would have to be pumped back to the area of the Centre Daily Times building, Mr. Songer indicated the project would be costly. He explained that Corning would not be hooking on inasmuch as they have their own on-site sewer system that is operating under a DER Permit and under that permit they are not required to hook onto public sewer if it becomes available. Mr. Songer pointed out that public water is now available along Route 26 as far out as the Centre Daily Times building. All the properties being considered in the preliminary study are now using water from on-site sources.

David Allison, Executive Secretary of College-Harris Joint Authority, indicated the Authority was of the opinion that this project was not economically feasible. He briefly explained the reasons for this opinion and indicated that if Council was of the opinion that the project should be undertaken, the Authority had the money and none would have to be borrowed. Allison indicated nothing firm had been formulated as the assessment the property owners would be paying.

Council discussed polling the residents of the area to determine their interest in the project, the problems incurred with malfunctioning septic systems, the possibility of the wells being polluted.

Mr. Allison indicated that all the residents in the area had been informed that the engineering study was being done, and the Authority received no responses.

Mr. Mitchell of the Lemont Water Company indicated that the Water Company had received several requests for public water from the area. He indicated when public water was provided there would be more water used by the residents consequently aggrevating further the malfunctioning septic systems.

Mr. Allison said the Authority could schedule the matter for discussion again and contact the property owners for their comments.

Chairman Taricani suggested that Council draft a letter to the residents of the area summarizing the engineering study, informing them Council would be discussing the project and inviting them to participate or comment.

Council and Mr. Allison briefly discussed the problems that could occur if at a later date Corning would decide to hook on and also the equitable financial reimbursement for this hook-on.

Briefly discussed was any plans to make the sewer available to the development that has been proposed for the land behind the houses along Route 26.

Chairman Taricani suggested that Mr. Williams proceed to draft a letter to the property owners affected by this sewer project and incorporate in the letter the future plans of the Lemont Water Company for providing service to the area and to proceed to schedule discussions of this sewer project at a future Council Meeting. Council was in agreement on this procedure.

5. Property Owners along Liberty Street and Grant Street in Oak Hall. Chairman Taricani provided a brief history of this situation indicating that in August 1972 the Board of Supervisors of College Township agreed "to take over the alley known as Liberty Street, located in Oak Hall, provided that the landowners deed a 20-foot right-of-way and cul-de-sac to the Township. Also, the Township must be able to provide drainage. The Township will maintain this alley, but no date can be set at this time for blacktop to be placed." A petition had been prepared at the time by the Township Solicitor providing for the right-of-way and the property owners asked to sign it. One property owner did not sign. That property has since changed hands. The Township Solicitor has suggested that the original petition be recopied with the corrections of names, etc., being made and presented to Council for their consideration.

Elmer Jackson, spokesman for the property owners, indicated they were willing to sign over to the Township the land necessary for the proper right-of-way in order for these streets to be paved. Mr. Williams indicated the proper width would be thirty-three feet.

Chairman Taricani indicated to the property owners it would be their responsibility to get the petition updated and to Council. She pointed out the paving project would have to be worked into the Township's road schedule and would not be done immediately. She also asked Mr. Williams to get some estimates of the costs of paving.

Mr. Allison indicated that because the Authority had put in a sewer on these streets and had dug up the streets they would agree to assist with the costs.

Chairman Taricani indicated that the Township would grade and try to stabilize the streets before winter arrived.

6. Fire Protection along Struble Road, First Avenue, and Jalice Circle. Mr. Williams indicated that Ronald R. Maxwell had called asking why there were no fire hydrants in the Struble Road, First Avenue, Jalice Circle area. Mr. Williams asked him to make his request in writing which he did. Mr. Williams talked with Jack Mitchell of the Lemont Water Company who has agreed to install hydrants in this area.

Mr. Mitchell outlined his plan for installing these hydrants.

Council asked Mr. Williams to pursue these plans and write Mr. Maxwell and inform him of the action taken.

7. Conversion of the Retirement Plan -- Explanation and Recommendation by Thomas Lechner, Controller. Chairman Taricani explained that the Township Controller had been asked to review the retirement plan. He gathered information on retirement plans from several insurance carriers and prepared a report analyzing the various plans and his recommendation for conversion.

Mr. Bailey moved that Council approve the Retirement Plan specified as #6 with Robert Huebner and Associates effective November 1, 1981. Mr. Dargitz seconded the motion.

Chairman Taricani explained to the audience that the Retirement Fund Plan covers the seven Township Employees.

Mr. Dean indicated he had done a cost ratio for the various programs and #6 had the highest benefit per dollar cost of any of the programs.

The motion to approve the Retirement Plan specified as # 6 with Robert Huebner and Associates effective November 1, 1981 carried unanimously.

8. Designate Halloween Trick or Treat Night, October 31, 1981, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Mr. Dargitz moved that Council designate Halloween Trick or Treat Night as October 31, 1981, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

9. Deeds of Dedication: (a) Whitehill Street, Cortland Drive, and Cortland Circle in Nittany Orchards Subdivision; (b) Commercial Boulevard in Dale Summit Commercial Park. Mr. Williams informed Council that the Deeds of Dedication had been reviewed by the Township Solicitor and were in order. There were no problems with any of the streets to be dedicated.

Mr. Dean moved Council accept the Deeds of Dedication for Whitehill Street, Cortland Drive, and Cortland Circle in Nittany Orchards Subdivision; and Commercial Boulevard in Dale Summit Commercial Park. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

Chris Exarchos asked about the status of Branch Road being turned over to the Township. Mr. Williams explained the work for this year was completed. Next year the road will be resurfaced and then will be ready to turn over to the Township.

10. Site Distance Problems at Driveways on Pike Street. George Hornbein gave Council an overview of what has happened since the last meeting where this situation was discussed. He indicated that two traffic engineers had come out on two separate occasions to talk about the problem. They concluded that the mirror that had been suggested was not the way to go in this situation and suggested temporary "Driveway" signs which have been installed. Also suggested was the grading of the hill on the Mary Dreese property to allow for a little more visibility but Mrs. Dreese had several legitimate concerns about this being done. Mr. Hornbein suggested the installation of an electronic detection device indicating approaching vehicles. He gave the approximate prices installed of the two devices as: induction loop $500-600; and magnetometer $300-500. He asked the Township to help with the detection device and the two proposed lights to be installed at the sides of the driveways.

Chairman Taricani asked if PennDOT had been asked about their willingness to participate in the cost of these devices. Mr. Hornbein indicated they had not been. Chairman Taricani asked Mr. Williams to contact the proper individual at PennDOT and ask about their willingness to participate in the installation of these devices.

The design of the devices was briefly discussed.

Mr. Dean suggested that the property owners in this area might discuss the signing of a "hold-harmless agreement" with PennDOT holding

PennDOT harmless if an accident should occur because of failure of the device. Mr. Dean asked Mr. Williams to check with PennDOT to see if this would be necessary or if they have written in their governing documents that they are harmless because of light/signal malfunction.

Mr. Dargitz expressed his concern that the Township's involvement in this situation would prompt other requests from the other hazardous driveway situations in the Township.

Chairman Taricani instructed Mr. Williams to pursue this matter with PennDOT. If it can be moved ahead without further consideration by Council to move ahead with it. If not, Council will consider the situation again.

11. Open Salt Bids. The bids for salt were opened and read as follows:

Cargill Salt	$34.18/Ton
International Salt Co.	$28.18/Ton
Morton Salt Co.	$30.14/Ton
Bradco Supply Co.	$29.73/Ton

The proper bonding was attached to all bids.

Mr. Bailey moved Council accept the bid for road salt from International Salt Company for $28.18 per Ton provided everything is in order. Mr. Dargitz seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

12. First Construction Payment Due on Post Office Building. Mr. Dean moved the invoices to Paul Spearly and Sons be paid in the amount of:

General Construction	$ 31,720.76
Plumbing Construction	1,725.75
Electrical Construction	2,538.00

Mr. Dargitz seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

13. Meeting Dates:

(a) Public Hearing to consider proposed use of Revenue Sharing Funds held in conjunction with November 12, 1981 Regular Council Meeting, 7:00 p.m.

(b) Consideration of tentative budget including Revenue Sharing Funds, November 23, 7:30 p.m.

(c) Adoption of Final Budget, December 23, 7:30 p.m.

Council asked Mr. Williams to make the proper legal notices and advertisements.

(d) Public Hearing on Hubbard Rezoning, October 21, 1981, 7:30 p.m.

Council asked Mr. Williams to assure the proper advertisements and legal notices had been made and all adjoining property owners notified.

14. There was a question from the audience concerning the newsletter particularly on the gypsy moth program. Chairman Taricani indicated that the Township did not have much more to report than has been reported in the newspaper. College Township will be included in the spraying area with residents being notified by the County. She indicated that College Township has given some consideration to some sort of arrangement with a private spray contractor for a ground spraying program which would be coordinated by the Township. She offered to make available the information she had collected on the gypsy moth problem for anyone who would like to review it.

As far as the general newsletter that has been discussed, it is on the work program for Council and plans are to have something out by the end of the year.

15. Mr. Dean pointed out that Council has been asked to formulate a consensus position on the reorganization of CATA.

Mr. Dean moved Council endorse the reorganization of CATA as a joint authority the mechanism for which has been described in a memorandum by Jim Miller as far as representation is concerned. The intent being that the reorganization is outside of COG. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.

Mr. Dargitz questioned the advantages of reorganization inasmuch as the present organization is working reasonably well and the Borough of State College is not pushing for a change.

Council briefly discussed the advantages/disadvantages of the reorganization.

The motion was defeated with four opposing votes (Bailey, Dargitz, Stewart and Taricani) and one abstention (Dean).

Council agreed that if the Borough clearly indicated they wanted to get out from under the Authority and strongly supported a joint authority with the other municipalities, Council would take a different opinion on the issue. Council decided to wait and formulate an opinion on this issue at the COG Meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elwood G. Williams, Sr.
Secretary

EGW:lf:bh

Schedule I

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP

TREASURER'S REPORT

GENERAL FUND - RECEIPTS & EXPENDITURES

SEPTEMBER, 1981

	SEPT. 1981	AUG. 1981
Check Book Balance - Beginning of the Month	$ 1,145	$ 267
Receipts During the Month	14,428	33,694
Net Transfers from Savings	653	14,192
	$16,226	$48,153
Expenditures for the Month	$15,896	$47,008
Net Transfers to Savings	-0-	-0-
Check Book Balance - End of the Month	$ 330	$ 1,145

Schedule II

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP

TREASURER'S REPORT

CASH & INVESTMENTS

SEPTEMBER, 1981

	GENERAL	STREET LIGHT	EQUIPMENT	PARKS & REC.	STATE	REVENUE SHARE	SPEC. RD. CONST. FUND
I. CASH:							
Checking Account	$ 333[a]	$ 865	$ 258	$ 469	$ 370	$ 306	$ 363
II. INVESTED:							
A. Daily Interest 5.25%	4,924	4,321	7,654	7,431	11,535	3,382	5,766
B. 90 Day Certificate 5.5% Annual							
C. 6 Month Money Market Cert.	10,000[b]		10,000[b]		10,000[b]		
TOTAL FUNDS SEPTEMBER 1981	$15,257	$ 5,186	$17,912	$ 7,900	$21,905	$ 3,688	$ 6,129
PREVIOUS MONTH	$16,625	$ 5,777	$17,662	$ 7,685	$21,605	$ 3,575	$ 6,042

CASH	$ 2,964
INVESTED	$75,013
TOTAL	$77,977
PREVIOUS MONTH	$78,969

NOTES:

1. General Fund Checking
   a) Includes $100.00 in Payroll Account

2. Maturity dates of certificates of deposits:
   b) December 1, 1981 - Interest Rate 14.74%