

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL
PUBLIC HEARING
NOVEMBER 23, 1982

170

A Public Hearing of the College Township Council was called to order by Donald E. Bailey, Acting Chairman, at 7:36 p.m. in the College Township Municipal Building for presentation of the tentative 1983 Budget for all Township Funds including Revenue Sharing.

Members present: Donald E. Bailey, Gale L. Dargitz,
J. Carroll Dean

Members absent: Herbert W. Stewart, and Dolores A. Taricani

Others present: C. Thomas Lechner, Manager
Robert L. Hayden, Treasurer

The lack of any participants or persons wishing to testify was noted, and the reading of the Outline of Procedure for Public Hearings was omitted.

Council decided to consider Item 4 on the Agenda, Discussion of the Police Budget, in conjunction with Item 1, the overall Budget, due to the inter-relationship between the two.

The 1983 Tentative Budget was then presented to Council by Manager Lechner. The Budget was presented in a new format, the Budget Summary Form, in accordance with current State practice. He stated that all computations were based on 10-Month 1982 Actual Figures, with the final 2-Month Figures being projected.

Manager Lechner then outlined each component of the Budget, which, if adopted, would go into effect on January 1, 1983. He paid particular note to the following:

ASSETS:

1. Temporary Transfers -- Lechner asked Council to consider removing \$20,000 from the Equipment Fund Account for placement in the General Fund to give the Township the needed cash flow to get through the end of the year (1982), thus obviating the necessity of obtaining a bank loan. Conversely, before the end of 1983, these funds will be transferred back into the Equipment Fund allowing for equipment expenditures.
2. Tax Anticipation Loan -- As revenues do not begin to flow in on January 1st, a bank loan will probably have to be obtained in early January to provide cash flow for the first few months of 1983.
3. Accounts Payable (Unpaid Bills) -- This figure reflects a 10% retainer being held on the contractors for repair of the damage to the Municipal Building from leaky plumbing; and Consulting Fees owed to former Township Manager.

4. Taxes from Schedule C -- These include the Real Estate Taxes based on 6 Mills; Earned Income Tax; Real Estate Transfer Tax; and the Occupational Privilege Tax.
5. Fines and Forfeits -- This amount excludes any revenues that might be generated from Traffic Violations.
6. Revenue Sharing Grant -- The Township will receive 10% less than last year. The formula in addition to several factors also base the rate of local taxation; and those Townships that did not increase their taxes will receive less.
7. Additional Revenue -- This item was added for the purposes of balancing the Budget, the amount being based upon projected expenditures -- in effect, a deficit.

EXPENDITURES:

1. General Government -- This figure consists of Administration costs; Tax Collection costs; and costs related to the Municipal Building.
2. Public Safety -- This item includes Police Protection; Fire Protection; and regulatory items, such as Contributions to the Regional Planning Commission. Within the category of Police Protection, costs for Crossing Guards, the Dog Enforcement Officer, and the contract for police services with the State College Borough are all included. Lechner noted that this last item will be reduced by \$14,000 as was decided at his recent meeting with the Borough.
3. Highways, Roads, and Streets -- Consists mainly of two large items; \$72,000 for wages for the Maintenance Crew, and \$75,300 for the Township's Construction and Rebuilding Program (paving and storm water management). This latter figure was reduced from the original \$91,000 which was proposed under the Township's three-year plan.
4. Other (CATA) -- This item reflects a one-time only \$4,468 payment to CATA for College Township's share of the new buses. This item is a result of a 1980 resolution to share the costs when the buses are purchased.
5. Parks and Recreation -- Past Council decisions have been to apply millage towards Parks & Recreation in direct relationship to costs. The current allocation of two Mills did not cover costs for 1982, and definitely will not cover costs for 1983.

172

6. Debt Service -- This figure includes the final payment on the Thompson Street project and the monthly payments on the Lemont Post Office. Also included is a \$400 interest payment on the projected Tax Anticipation Loan (based on a loan of \$30,000).
7. Miscellaneous Expenditures -- Includes employee taxes and benefits; youth services; State College Area Meal Center (AAA). Lechner noted that in 1982, the Township changed its medical insurance to join the State College Borough Group, and, as a result, medical insurance expenses were cut almost in half.

After presenting the Budget, Lechner expressed his opinion that the Township was in a "tough cash flow situation"; ideally, a minimum of 10% of the Township's expenditures should be readily available to ensure proper operation.

Dargitz noted that the deficit of \$86,947 will be reduced by \$14,000 due to the revised Police Budget. After a meeting between Lechner and representatives of the State College Borough and Harris Township (which also contracts for its police services), the Borough agreed to honor the Police Services Contract as written for 1983. This contract calls for the Township's share of the Police Budget to be determined by dividing costs by the total number of all personnel, rather than by the number of sworn officers -- the latter way resulting in a higher cost to the Township. The 1986 Budget, however, will be based on the number of sworn officers, and 1984 and 1985 will be transition years during which time the new formula will be phased in.

Various suggestions were then tendered to further reduce the deficit. The possibility of the IDA contributing toward the Fire Company parking lot costs was mentioned by Bailey.

Dargitz proposed that the paving of Grant Street be eliminated from the 1983 Budget, and Dean proposed eliminating or reducing the scope of such construction projects as the widening of Mary Street, repairs to Hawthorne Drive, and Grant and Liberty Streets. This would reduce the Budget by approximately \$23,000.

Lechner noted that he had already reduced the proposed construction expenditures from \$91,000 to \$75,300 -- solely to balance the budget -- and that he felt strongly that such projects as he had recommended for inclusion in the Budget remain in the Budget.

Dean then proposed that Council adopt a policy of "bare minimum" construction; that all construction be limited to that which is necessary to preserve the structural integrity of existing roads, i.e., that Council tend to needed storm water management, and defer any paving or improvements that are not absolutely essential. Should more money become available through increased taxation, etc., the eliminated projects could be reconsidered.

Dargitz concurred and further recommended that, for budgeting purposes only, the addition of an extra maintenance person be deferred until that time when more revenues become available.

Lechner, noting that such cuts would certainly "hamper the Township's style", recommended that the Real Estate Tax be increased by 3 Mills (generating approximately \$49,000) to accommodate the necessary expenditures and balance the budget. Beyond that, to accommodate those programs that Council has proposed be deleted, Lechner suggested the imposition of so-called "grumble taxes" -- alternate sources of taxation, such as pin-ball machines, etc.

Next, Dargitz moved and Dean seconded that the Manager, with the assistance of the Solicitor, prepare for Council's consideration an ordinance calling for the imposition of a Mercantile Tax on retail sales (without stating an amount); a Franchise Fee (without stating an amount) on Cable Television connections; and a Fee on Amusement Devices. Also, that a resolution be prepared to increase the Real Estate Millage by $\frac{1}{2}$ Mill for the Parks & Recreation Fund, and $1\frac{1}{2}$ Mills for General Fund purposes.

Lechner opposed the suggested 2 Mill increase. In his opinion, 2 Mills would only bring the Township's cash balance back to operational level -- to a par with last year -- and would not enable the Township to get ahead. Three Mills (excluding any alternate taxes) would be more operational and satisfactory, and would enable the Township to accommodate those increases that will inevitably occur in 1983.

Dargitz stated that previous studies have shown that a Mercantile Tax would generate revenue in the area of 2 Mills, and thus, the Council is really talking about an increase to the equivalent of more than 4 Mills. Further, the problem did not occur overnight; the problem has been building over several years; and, in his opinion, the problem cannot be solved overnight. "Perhaps we'll have to do something else next year".

Dean then proposed that Council address those items mentioned in the motion. After the potential extra monies are estimated, Council can then revise the tax increase upward, if necessary, or conversely, should an excess be apparent, Council could then add to the road construction program.

Dargitz mentioned that the Township Budget must be balanced by January First. The proposed Act 511 (Non-Real Estate) Taxes will probably not be enacted by that time, and temporary drastic cuts will have to be made to the Budget until the Act 511 Taxes are put into effect.

Bailey called for the question on Dargitz's motion and all were in favor. Lechner, who cannot vote, once again and for the record stated his opposition to anything less than a 3 Mill increase.

Dean moved that in view of the lack of any testimony, the Public Hearing be declared closed. Dargitz seconded and the motion was carried unanimously. The Public Hearing was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL CONVENED AT 9:13 P.M.

Agenda Item 2. A letter was received from State College Borough Manager Carl Fairbanks informing Council of the Borough's displeasure over PennDOT's proposed plans for signalization of the South Atherton/ Branch Road Intersection. (As noted in previous minutes, PennDOT's recommended signalization falls entirely within the Borough's boundaries, with the total local cost to be paid by the Borough alone.) It is the Borough's contention that the West Branch Road portion of that Intersection also be signalized and that College Township bear one-half of the local construction costs. Additionally, Fairbanks requested that Manager Lechner set up a meeting between themselves and PennDOT to further study the issue.

In discussion, Manager Lechner told Council that he was informed by a PennDOT Official that, should signalization of the West Branch Road portion take place, College Township's share would amount to only 10 to 20% of the total local costs, the exact amount depending upon the signal's placement. Moreover, should construction of the signal proceed as now recommended, PennDOT will be sure to incorporate the capability to add additional signals at a later time if that becomes necessary.

Dean wondered whether the Borough's unhappiness was based on dissatisfaction with the safety elements of the proposed plan or, instead, stemmed from the fact that the Borough would incur all local costs. Since PennDOT's recommendations were based wholly on safety needs, it then becomes the Borough's responsibility to prove their decision erroneous.

Lechner opined that should the State College Borough insist that the West Branch Road portion be signalized, PennDOT's position might very well be that since the money is available now, any anticipated construction should take place as soon as possible. In any case, however, both Lechner and Council were in total agreement that the Township pay only for those costs incurred within the Township's lines.

Manager Lechner then stated that he will set up the meeting between himself, Fairbanks, and PennDOT as soon as possible and will remain current with the situation.

175

Agenda Item 3. Lechner informed Council of a complaint received from a Township resident regarding the existence of a colony of rats near Puddintown Road between Slab Cabin Creek and Spring Creek.

A representative from the DER checked out the situation, and indeed saw rats -- lots of them -- and warned Lechner that they could pose a very serious problem if the situation were not addressed expeditiously.

He stressed that the time to tackle the project is NOW -- when the rats' food supply is dwindling and they are most likely to swallow the bait. An effective eradication program would require a sustained effort of several days duration.

Although the DER is unable to offer financial help, it can give the Township advice and technical assistance.

In discussion, Dean proposed that Manager Lechner (1) clarify the Township's overall responsibility in this matter (a significant part of the affected area lies in privately-owned property) and (2) obtain proposals from both the Borough and a private exterminator, as well as to examine the feasibility of the Township undertaking the project itself following the program set by the DER.

Council was in agreement and instructed Manager Lechner to secure the necessary information and to continue his efforts to rid the region of rats.

Agenda Item 5. A letter was received by Council from Brian Bassett requesting the use of the College Township Building for one night per week for the purpose of holding classes in round dancing. He would need the facility during the hours of 7:15 to 10:45 p.m. for preparation, instruction, and clean-up, and would prefer either Monday or Tuesday or secondarily, Wednesday.

In discussion, it was brought out that the Municipal Building is in use every night but Friday night, and, should the request be granted, use of the facility would be subject to pre-emption by the Council. However, since it was later established that Mr. Bassett's program does not come under the Parks & Recreation Department, Dargitz moved and Dean seconded that his request BE DENIED on the basis that it is a private operation. The motion was carried unanimously.

Agenda Item 6. Manager Lechner gave notice of a Public Hearing to be held on Wednesday, December 29, 1982 at 7:00 P.M. at the College Township Municipal Building. The following four items have been placed on the Agenda:

1. The proposed rezoning of all privately-owned University-Zoned properties extending along the North and South sides of East College Avenue from the Township boundary line to Puddintown Road from University District Zone.
2. Consideration of public comments on the proposed change of Oak Hall's now private Grant and Liberty Streets to public thoroughfares.
3. Consideration of proposed revisions to the present Sign Ordinance Number 40.
4. Consideration of Fringe Benefit Amendments to the Township's Administrative Code, Ordinance Number 53.

ADDITIONAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

A tentative meeting was set for Wednesday, December 1, 1982 at 4:00 p.m. for Council to adopt a proposed budget should the guidelines set at present meeting be insufficient to reduce deficit.

A meeting has been scheduled for Thursday, December 23 at 4:00 p.m. for adoption of the Township's 1983 Budget.

ADJOURNMENT

Dargitz moved and Dean seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 10:10 p.m. The motion was carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
C. Thomas Lechner
Secretary

CTL:ss:bh

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP FINANCIAL REPORT

BUDGET AND ACTUAL APPROPRIATIONS

for the 11 months ended November 30, 1982

	19_81		19_82					
	BUDGET 19_81	ACTUAL Y-T-D	BUDGET 1982	ACTUAL MONTH	ACTUAL Y-T-D	BUDGET REMAINING for 1982	PROJECTED REMAINDER for 19_82	NET CHANGE in 19_82 BUDGET
BEGINNING CASH	\$ 61,766	\$ 61,766	\$ 52,394	\$ N/A	\$ 52,394	\$ 59,618	\$ 59,618	\$ -0-
REVENUES								
Real Estate Tax	\$ 96,757	\$ 95,493	\$ 102,108	\$ 1,498	\$ 99,812	\$ 2,296	\$ 1,750	\$ (546)
Local Tax Enabling Act	256,000	256,050	283,000	32,160	270,654	12,346	13,000	654
Licenses, Permits	5,000	3,273	5,000	478	4,879	121	300	179
Fines	42,000	35,988	41,000	5,453	38,282	2,718	3,200	482
Interest and Rents	11,767	9,262	30,224	3,835	29,675	549	2,000	1,451
Grants	115,637	108,337	149,397	-0-	138,891	10,506	-0-	(10,506)
Other Departments and Services	21,000	18,943	21,000	34	18,404	2,596	4,768	2,172
Miscellaneous	12,070	3,260	12,720	132	5,780	6,940	150	(6,790)
Total Revenues	\$560,231	\$ 530,606	\$644,449	\$ 43,589	\$ 606,377	\$ 38,072	\$ 25,168	\$ (12,904)
TOTAL AVAILABLE for APPROPRIATION	\$621,997	\$ 592,372	\$ 696,843	\$ N/A	\$ 658,771	\$ 97,690	\$ 84,786	\$ (12,904)
EXPENDITURES								
Administration	\$ 90,384	\$ 91,691	\$ 112,442	\$ 5,557	\$ 111,027	\$ 1,415	\$ 7,900	\$ -6,485
Tax Collection	31,006	28,481	33,094	2,579	33,991	(897)	3,700	4,597
Police Protection	159,152	121,763	177,014	14,609	158,936	18,078	14,530	(3,548)
Fire Protection	26,718	28,192	27,744	63	28,220	(476)	-0-	476
Regulatory, Planning, Zoning, Code	17,210	17,059	20,000	-0-	18,727	1,273	-0-	(1,273)
Health and Sanitation	1,800	1,333	1,500	136	731	769	100	(669)
Highway Maintenance	102,867	60,607	115,419 ^a	7,586	77,923	37,496 ^a	8,000	(29,496)
Snow Removal	22,000	16,797	23,000	1,803	29,205	(6,205)	3,500	9,705
Maintenance Equipment	7,500	6,649	7,500	724	8,155	(655)	2,245	2,900
Road Construction & Rebuilding	-0-	-0-	-0-	14,552	14,552	(14,552)	-0-	14,552
Equipment	18,066	-0-	35,053	3,202	4,131	30,922	-0-	(30,922)
Library	22,335	25,756	22,172	-0-	22,172	-0-	-0-	-0-
Parks & Recreation	43,414	37,565	44,790	122	39,339	5,451	-0-	(5,451)
Transportation	8,275	10,693	11,000	-0-	11,480	(480)	-0-	480
Employee Fringe Benefits	27,100	22,977	29,130	5,574	18,515	10,615	2,863	(7,752)
Miscellaneous	23,798	19,159	8,713	-0-	6,393	2,320	500	(1,820)
Principal Paid on Indebtedness	4,300	4,300	5,274	58	5,018	256	90	(166)
Interest Paid on Indebtedness	860	860	11,803	953	10,638	1,165	921	(244)
Total Expenditures	\$ 606,785	\$ 493,882	\$ 685,648	\$ 57,518	\$ 599,153	\$ 86,495	\$ 44,349	\$ (42,146)
REMAINDER for APPROPRIATION	\$ 15,212	\$ 98,490	\$ 11,195	\$ N/A	\$ 59,618	\$ 11,195	\$ 40,437	\$ 29,242

Note: a - Includes Road Construction and Rebuilding for Budget Purposes.

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL
CONTINUANCE OF PUBLIC HEARING OF 11/23/82
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1982

A Special Meeting to continue the Public Hearing held 11/23/82 by the College Township Council was called to order on Wednesday, December 1, 1982 at 4:06 p.m. at the College Township Municipal Building. Items on the agenda were further consideration of the Township rat problem and adoption of the proposed 1983 Budget for all Township funds including Revenue Sharing.

Members Present: Donald E. Bailey, Gale L. Dargitz, J. Carroll Dean, Herbert W. Stewart, Dolores Taricani - Chairman

Others Present: C. Thomas Lechner, Manager
Robert L. Hayden, Treasurer

RATS

At the College Township Public Hearing held on November 23, 1982, Council was informed of a complaint by a Township resident (and later verified by a representative from the DER) regarding the existence of a colony of rats between Slab Cabin and Spring Creeks. Rats have been found to be present on the berm, the shoulder, on private land, and on the banks of the creeks, with the main concentration of rats on both sides of Puddintown Road.

At the November 23 meeting, Manager Lechner was instructed by Council to determine the Township's overall responsibility in this matter and to obtain proposals from the Borough, private exterminators, and the DER on the costs of an eradication program.

In response to these instructions, Manager Lechner contacted the Department of Community Affairs and was told by them that it was a DER problem. In turn, the DER restated its position that, due to funding cutbacks, it could offer only training and consultation services. Only in the case of an extreme emergency—i.e., should the rats present an immediate life-threatening situation—would the DER provide funding for the project in its entirety. It was the DER's recommendation that College Township contract the services of the State College Borough Department of Health which is equipped to handle such problems. (Lechner later noted that the Borough would require a formal request of its services from the College Township Council before the Health Department could proceed.)

At this point, Dean interjected that Lechner was presenting methods of handling the rat population, and was not addressing the prior problem of responsibility.

Dargitz then surmised that the responsibility would lie with whoever owned the affected property—be it a private owner, the State, or the Township itself.

Lechner responded that while he had not yet received a direct answer as to who might be ultimately liable, he had spoken with one of the private owners. This particular person was cognizant of the situation—and had been for many years.

but is unwilling to contribute towards the eradication. In addition Lechner was told by a PennDOT representative that while the Department of Highways "sympathized" with the problem, it does not consider the situation to present an immediate danger to the roads, and thus does not merit the Department's attention.

Two representatives from Trans-Species Unlimited were present and questioned Lechner on whether the rats posed an immediate danger (negative) and whether Lechner felt the rat population would increase and migrate (affirmative).

Dan Stearns, a long-time resident of that area, noted that the rats' presence has been a long-standing one, originally stemming from the University's now defunct hog farms, and exacerbated by the presence of easy fodder by the nearby creeks. Although he is not adverse to spending some Township funds to eradicate some of the rats, he warned Council that total elimination would not be possible.

Dean reiterated that what is needed is a clear-cut interpretation from the Department of Community Affairs on the Township's responsibility. He is not objecting to Township involvement or to the spending of Township funds, but he feels that Council must first establish where the responsibility lies.

Council was in agreement that any further action be held in abeyance until responsibility for exterminating the infestation be resolved, and instructed Manager Lechner to continue his efforts to determine the party or parties responsible.

Lechner agreed, and stated that he will again contact the Department of Community Affairs. He also added that he has received a rough estimate that \$1000 to \$1500 would be needed for the immediate eradication program.

LETTER FROM THE TOWNSHIP SOLICITOR

Chairman Taricani read into the record a letter from Township Solicitor Reed McCormick in support of College Township's refusal to adopt the proposal to join the solidwaste consortium between the Centre County Solid Waste Authority and Clinton County. He agreed with the Council's determination that insufficient evidence had been presented to adequately ascertain the costs or benefits of such a program, and suggested the possibility of alternative waste disposal programs.

ADOPTION OF PROPOSED 1983 TOWNSHIP BUDGET

Manager Lechner presented to Council a proposed 1983 Road and Storm Water Management Project Program. The Program is divided into three stages: Stage 1 assumes a 2 mill real estate tax increase; Stage 2 assumes a 3 mill equivalent increase; and Stage 3 assumes a 3 mill increase as well as those additional revenues to be generated by the proposed new Act 511 taxes (estimated at \$35,000). The projects that could be accomplished under each Stage were outlined; and it was noted that each of the Stages could be performed through one of two options. Option 1 would make use of present personnel through Stage 1, after which one additional road crew person would be hired as of April 1, 1983; Option 2 would

130

entail use of existing personnel only, and would require the Township to contract outside services for those projects which could not be handled by existing personnel or equipment.

Iechner strongly urged Council to adopt, at the least, Option 1, Stage 2, to allow for the extra road crew person as of April 1. The Township has grown since the last addition to the road crew was made in 1976, and with this growth has come an increase in the demand for services. An extra person would assure the Township the flexibility it needs to adequately carry out its programs, and would also be cost effective, as it would enable the Township to handle more projects internally.

To Dargitz' question as to which projects would have to be eliminated should only a 2 mill increase (Stage 1) and new Act 511 taxes (Stage 3) be adopted, Iechner replied that the projects outlined under Stage 1 and Stage 2 are crucial just for the Township to stay on top of the road situation. Should the additional Act 511 taxes prove to generate the \$35,000 or so as anticipated, then Council could always roll back the additional one mill increase next year. Moreover, no monies have been set aside for emergencies and extra items, nor would a 2 mill increase positively affect the Township's hard-pressed cash flow. Over the last five years, Iechner added, virtually the same amount of money has been budgeted by the Township for its road programs, and, when the rate of inflation is factored in, it can be seen that less road work has been projected for each successive year. Also, in actual dollar amounts, project spending has been way down. In 1979, Township road projects amounted to \$51,000; in 1982, spending was reduced to \$15,000.

Several revisions of the proposed budget were next discussed, including the higher than expected Real Estate Tax on the Lemont Post Office. Taricani suggested that, since expenditures were outrunning revenues from the Post Office, an appeal be made on the tax assessment. The Post Office provides a necessary service to the entire Region, not just to the residents of College Township, and there is no reason why the Township should be expected to subsidize it. Council will readdress this issue at a later time.

Dean then returned to the question of a tax increase, and noted for clarification that a 2 mill equivalent increase would meet the revised, proposed budget of \$688,596; to accomplish Stage 1 and Stage 2, a tax increase of 3 mills would be necessary.

Iechner restated the Township's poor cash flow position, emphasizing that a minimum of 10% of the expected revenues in cash is needed to operate effectively. Also, a substantial amount of Revenue Sharing Funds were lost this year as the amount is based on the rate of local taxation, and College Township did not raise its taxes in the determining year.

Taricani noted that the entire Council is cognizant of the Township's budgetary situation, and realizes that many of the problems stem from some unusual and unexpected expenses that were incurred this past year.

Dargitz remarked that although he recognizes the existence of a cash flow problem, he questions the aforementioned relationship between cash flow and budget. In his estimation, they are entirely separate entities, and one does

not hinge upon the other. Restricted cash flow results from a problem in timing, not funding, and can be solved by Tax Anticipation Loans until the expected revenues are received.

Dean then moved and Bailey seconded that Council adopt as its proposed budget for 1983 "The amount shown on the work pages totalling \$688,596 increased by the amount of \$16,650 (the cost of Stage 2) with the intent of increasing the millage rate by 3 mills and pursuing the Act 511 resources and then, next year, if the Township is in the solvent position it expects to be, to consider reducing the millage rate, depending upon what the Act 511 resources turn out to be." He added that this is the only way the Township could enter the year with a balanced budget.

To Dargitz' remark that a balance budget had already been achieved under a 2 mill tax increase, Dean responded that a 3 mill tax hike would be necessary to balance the budget he had proposed in his motion — \$688,596 plus \$16,650 to accommodate Stage 2.

Lechner noted that the Township's street light assessment program is now operating at a deficit of \$1200, and must be increased to a rate of 20¢ per front foot. This increase has been incorporated into the budget.

To Stewart's question on the economic impact a 3 mill increase would have on the typical Township resident, Treasurer Hayden stated that on the average, one mill equals \$5.74, and thus a 3 mill increase would effect an approximate \$17 tax hike.

Taricani brought out that Township residents are receiving a lot of services for the taxes they pay (about \$50-75 per year). Lechner concurred, and noted that the Township spends approximately \$112 per resident for municipal services, comparing very favorably with other Townships.

Dean called for the question on his motion. The motion was adopted via a split vote: Bailey, Dean, Stewart, and Taricani were in favor; Dargitz opposed.

Council next directed its attention to the Act 511 taxes. Possible rates and revenues for each of the proposed Act 511 taxes. (a Mercantile Tax on retail and wholesale sales, a Franchise Fee on Cable Television Customer Revenues, and a fee on Amusement Devices) were briefly discussed, and Manager Lechner was instructed to formulate (with the aid and feedback of the individual Council members) a proposal on these measures for Council's consideration at the December 23 meeting for adoption of the Township Budget. Lechner mentioned that the solicitor is already proceeding to prepare model tax ordinances.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

C. Thomas Lechner
Secretary

not hinge upon the other. Restricted cash flow results from a problem in timing, not funding, and can be solved by Tax Anticipation Loans until the expected revenues are received.

Dean then moved and Bailey seconded that Council adopt as its proposed budget for 1983 "The amount shown on the work pages totalling \$688,596 increased by the amount of \$16,650 (the cost of Stage 2) with the intent of increasing the millage rate by 3 mills and pursuing the Act 511 resources and then, next year, if the Township is in the solvent position it expects to be, to consider reducing the millage rate, depending upon what the Act 511 resources turn out to be." He added that this is the only way the Township could enter the year with a balanced budget.

To Dargitz' remark that a balance budget had already been achieved under a 2 mill tax increase, Dean responded that a 3 mill tax hike would be necessary to balance the budget he had proposed in his motion — \$688,596 plus \$16,650 to accommodate Stage 2.

Lechner noted that the Township's street light assessment program is now operating at a deficit of \$1200, and must be increased to a rate of 20¢ per front foot. This increase has been incorporated into the budget.

To Stewart's question on the economic impact a 3 mill increase would have on the typical Township resident, Treasurer Hayden stated that on the average, one mill equals \$5.74, and thus a 3 mill increase would effect an approximate \$17 tax hike.

Taricani brought out that Township residents are receiving a lot of services for the taxes they pay (about \$50-75 per year). Lechner concurred, and noted that the Township spends approximately \$112 per resident for municipal services, comparing very favorably with other Townships.

Dean called for the question on his motion. The motion was adopted via a split vote: Bailey, Dean, Stewart, and Taricani were in favor; Dargitz opposed.

Council next directed its attention to the Act 511 taxes. Possible rates and revenues for each of the proposed Act 511 taxes. (a Mercantile Tax on retail and wholesale sales, a Franchise Fee on Cable Television Customer Revenues, and a fee on Amusement Devices) were briefly discussed, and Manager Lechner was instructed to formulate (with the aid and feedback of the individual Council members) a proposal on these measures for Council's consideration at the December 23 meeting for adoption of the Township Budget. Lechner mentioned that the solicitor is already proceeding to prepare model tax ordinances.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

C. Thomas Lechner
Secretary