COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 13, 1983
7:30 P.M.

A G E N D A

CALL TO ORDER

OPEN DISCUSSION (15 Minutes)

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS
- December 9, 1982
- December 23, 1982
- December 29, 1982
- January 3, 1983

UPDATE INFORMATION

FINANCIAL REPORT

CORRESPONDENCE

C-1 Letter from Harris Acres Civic Assoc. re Speed Limit on Rt. 322

C-2 Resignation from Robert D. Shipment from E.A.C.

C-3 Penn Hills PRD Updated Phasing Schedule

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

P-1 Spring Creek Estates, Phase V, Final Plan

BUSINESS

B-1 PennDOT's Proposed Traffic Signal at Rt. 322 and Branch Road Intersection

B-2 Discussion of Act 511 Taxes (Also set Hearing Date)

B-3 Discuss Amendment to Flood Plain Ord.

B-4 Adoption of BOCA Code Ordinances

B-5 Appointment to Fill Vacancy by Resignation of Shipman

B-6 Discuss Council's Position on Robert W. Ishler's Appeal to Court from Zoning Hearing Board Decision

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL

REGULAR MEETING

JANUARY 13, 1983

A regular meeting of the College Township Council was called to order at 7:33 p.m. on Thursday, January 13, 1983 at the College Township Municipal Building.

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

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

OPEN DISCUSSION

None.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Following a motion by Taricani, seconded by Dean, the Minutes of the following meetings were approved as submitted:

- Minutes of the Special Meeting/Public Hearing for the Adoption of the Final 1983 College Township Budget, held December 23, 1982.
- Minutes of the Public Hearing, held December 29, 1982.
- Minutes of the Organizational Meeting, held January 3, 1983.

In a separate motion, Dean moved that the Minutes of the Continuance of the Public Hearing, held December 1, 1982 and the Minutes of the Regular Meeting, held December 9, 1982 be approved. Bailey seconded and the motion was carried.

MANAGER'S UPDATE

Manager Lechner reviewed the items contained in his written Update. Referring to Item 1 of the December 9th Regular Meeting, he stated that per Council's request, a letter had been sent to PennDOT requesting that a new study be conducted on Rt. 322 from University Drive to Boalsburg to determine that area's traffic conditions when the University is in full operation.

Dean noted that a letter from the Harris Acres Civic Association suggesting a joint College/Harris Township request to PennDOT for remedial action on the Rt. 322 problem was listed on the evening's Agenda, and wondered whether their concern was specifically related to College Township's previous request or was purely coincidental.

Taricani replied that it was the former; that Rt. 322 is an area of mutual concern; and that she had forwarded to them a copy of PennDOT's letter refuting the need for any traffic limitations.

Dargitz also acknowledged the shared interest of the two Townships in resolving this matter, and instructed Manager Lechner to contact the Harris Township Manager to determine Harris's interest in sending a joint request to PennDOT reiterating the need for a more appropriate traffic count.

Lechner then resumed his review, and there was no further discussion on the remaining Update items.

FINANCIAL REPORT

The Financial Report indicating the Township's final position for the year ended December 31, 1982 was received as distributed. Taricani moved; Stewart seconded.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. Letter from Harris Acres Civic Association re Speed Limit on Route 322. A letter dated January 4, 1983 had been received by Council from the Harris Acres Civic Association regarding their concern over the traffic conditions on the Rt. 322 corridor into State College. They suggested that the College Township Council members join with the Harris Township Supervisors in requesting the Department of Transportation to post the Rt. 322 corridor from State College through Boalsburg as a residential area with a reduced speed limit (35 MPH); to restrict passing in those areas which present special hazards; to institute turning lanes at these locations; and to mark pedestrian crossings.

Taricani voiced her dissatisfaction with PennDOT'S previously stated position that the Rt. 322 area does not meet the Department's standards for special action. She believes that an area should be handled on the basis of its own needs, and not be judged on arbitrary criteria that do not necessarily apply to this region.

Lechner stated that PennDOT has followed his recommendation that, since State reportable accidents no longer include minor traffic mishaps, the Department contact the State College Police Services for more detailed traffic accident information. He added that PennDOT's interest in the area has increased due to the two recent fatalities, and that some activity on their part seems to be going on.

Per Dargitz's suggestion, Lechner will write a letter to the Harris Acres Civic Association acknowledging their concern and informing them of the Township's plans to contact the Harris Township Manager.

2. Resignation of Robert D. Shipman from E.A.C. The resignation of Robert D. Shipman from the College Township Environmental Advisory Council was accepted by Council with its unanimous thanks for his services. Dean moved; Bailey seconded.

3. Penn Hills PRD Updated Phasing Schedule. On behalf of Calvin Zimmerman, a letter containing an updated phasing schedule for Penn Hills PRD was submitted by Pat Ward of Uni-Tec, Inc.

In response to Dean's question whether this letter satisfied the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance, Zoning Officer Art Beward replied that two stipulations must be met: 1) that an updated development schedule be submitted annually regardless of change and 2) that this update be submitted on the anniversary date of the particular PRD's approval.

Although Ward was unable to immediately recall the date of approval for the Penn Hills PRD, Dargitz suggested that the update be received that night as distributed, and requested that an additional update be submitted on the approval date. POST NOTE: The Anniversary Date is April 13, Final approval was granted April 13, 1978.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

Spring Creek Estates, Phase IV, Final Plan. The Final Plan for Phase IV of Spring Creek Estates was presented to Council by Uni-Tec Engineer, Pat Ward.

According to Manager Lechner, all conditions had been met for approval except for the acquisition of a Surety Bond; it was his recommendation that Council approve the plans with the priviso that the Surety Bond be satisfied.

Dean asked whether the Final Plan had been submitted to the Planning Commission for review. Although he understands the plans have met with the Commission's prior approval, he also sees the need for a final editorial review. Ward replied that such a review is not required in the Ordinance; that previous submissions of final plans to the Commission had resulted in cursory acceptance; and that the Final Plan is identical in all respects to the Preliminary Plan which had been reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Lechner concurred, and stated that it is his policy to review the plans item for item with the Engineer; should minor changes occur, Lechner would authorize them, but any major changes would be referred to the Township Engineer and to the Planning Commission.

Dean said that he was unaware that this procedure was followed, but he is satisfied that it would constitute a sufficient checking review against the Master Plan.

Taricani then moved that Council approve the Final Plan for Phase IV of Spring Creek Estates, dated January 3, 1983, contingent upon receipt of a Surety Bond. Bailey seconded; there was no further discussion; and the motion was carried unanimously.

Formal signing of the Plan will await the acquisition of the Surety Bond.

Council Signatures on Final Plans for Phases V and VI, Spring Creek Estates. Having met the two contingencies [receipt of a Master Plan and approval by the Township Engineer] upon which Council's prior approval had been based, the Final Plans for Phases V and VI, Spring Creek Estates, were formally signed by Council.

BUSINESS

1. PennDOT's Proposed Traffic Signal at Branch Road and Rt. 322 Intersection. Chairman Dargitz reviewed the latest developments in PennDOT's proposed signalization of the Rt. 322 and Branch Road Intersections.

The total cost for this project is estimated at $89,000. Fifty percent (50%) of this cost will be borne by the Department of Transportation; the other half will be divided between the State College Borough and College Township in a 63% to 37% ratio respectively [based upon the relative cost of each signalized intersection].

In a letter to Manager Lechner, dated December 22, 1982, PennDOT requested that the Township inform the Department of its interest in sharing the cost for this installation. Given the fact that the Township wishes to proceed with this installation, Dargitz stated that two options are open: 1) to agree to the proposed installation at the percentages given, or 2) to agree to the proposed installation but negotiate the percentages.

Lechner noted that PennDOT had come to a favorable agreement on the method of attributing the costs for inspection, engineering, and administration. Heretofore, local municipalities were forced to bear the entire costs of these procedures; in this case, per Lechner's urging, PennDOT has agreed to incorporate these expenses (estimated at $20,000) into the construction costs, thus splitting all the costs on a 50-50 basis.

The issue of maintenance and electricity costs was next raised by Dean. Lechner stated that the Borough has recommended that these expenses be apportioned in the same manner (63%/37%) as the signal itself. Because the Township would have to contract for its share of the maintenance, Lechner advised that it would be less costly to the Township if the Borough, which uses its own personnel, were to undertake all maintenance, and then bill the Township for its share.

Lechner then recommended to Council that a favorable motion be made on this project, and advised that Council move ahead expeditiously, as the State funding for this project could be diverted to another program. Once the agreement is signed, the contracts are scheduled to be let out in June 1983; completion is anticipated for the end of the year.

In response to Dean's question as to the effect of this expense on the Township's 1983 Budget, Lechner replied that some contingency funds are available, though not enough to cover the entire cost. While it is possible that some other projects may have to be eliminated, he feels this signal is necessary for the safety of the Township's residents.

Taricani fully agreed, and commended Lechner for his aggressive pursual of this very worthwhile project. She then moved that Council endorse and support the PennDOT proposal as outlined in the Department's letter of December 22, 1982. Stewart seconded and the motion was approved by unanimous consent.

2. Discussion of Act 511 Taxes and Establishment of Hearing Date. Discussion of the proposed Act 511 Taxes was the next Agenda item. Chairman Dargitz emphasized that no decision on these taxes would be made that night; the purpose of the discussion was to determine whether to set a hearing date and advertise the Ordinances for official consideration.

Dargitz then provided some background. As a result of not having raised taxes in recent years, the Township experienced a shortfall of funds for its 1983 Budget. Despite the three (3) Mill increase in Real Estate Taxes for the current year, a number of projects (storm water management, road construction, etc.) had to be eliminated from the Budget in order to balance it as required by State law. Rather than adding even more millage to the Real Estate Tax, and legally we can't increase the Earned Income Tax, the Council decided to examine those alternative revenue raising activities permitted under the various State laws for Townships of the Second Class. These taxes, which have been incorrectly termed "nuisance taxes" by the media, carry an advantage over the Real Estate Taxes in that they broaden the tax base, and do not fall wholly upon the homeowner.

As such, the following Act 511 Ordinances have been drafted for consideration:

1. An Amusement Device Tax Ordinance -- proposed at $50 per machine per year (same rate as Borough)
2. A Franchise Fee on Cable TV -- proposed at 3% of revenues to the Cable Company generated from College Township users. (College Township is the only major municipality in the Region that has not yet imposed such a fee.)
3. A Mercantile License Tax Ordinance -- proposed at .75 mills on retail sales; .50 mills on wholesale sales. (Would apply to wholesale dealers or vendors; retail dealers or vendors; wholesale and retail dealers and vendors; persons conducting restaurants or other places where food, drink or refreshments are sold.)

Prior to opening the discussion to the public, Chairman Dargitz solicited the opinions of the Council Members.

Dean suggested the following: 1) Amusement Device Tax -- some means of control should be developed to keep track of those devices which had already been subject to the tax. 2) Franchise on Cable TV -- additional terms should be included to provide for signals other than electrical signals (i.e., computer data); provision should be made for licensure by agencies other than the Federal Communications Commission (i.e., other legally cognizant regulatory agencies). 3) Mercantile Tax -- examination of that section of the Ordinance which addresses the type of businesses affected; as he now reads the Ordinance, such transient concerns as circuses, concessionaires, non-PSU vendors and the like would also be liable for this tax. (Dargitz noted in response that the sales of many of these concerns would fall below the minimum gross limit subject to the proposed Mercantile Tax; he also suggested that this minimum amount be raised to avoid the very small retailer.) In general, Dean is in favor of the Mercantile Tax as it would spread the burden of payment to taxpayers outside the Township.

Bailey raised the question of a maximum limit on the Mercantile Tax. Dean noted that a maximum tax would be self-defeating -- "the bigger they are, the more you get."

Taricani remarked that while she does not like the proposed taxes, she does feel that a lot of Township money is spent in support of commercial activity, in particular the malls; that many of those persons benefitting from this shopping convenience are non-College Township residents; and that research has shown that the people of College Township are, in effect, supporting the malls. In addition, most municipalities in Pennsylvania that host considerable commercial activity impose a Mercantile Tax; as it now stands, College Township is the exception, not the rule. She is open to any and all suggestions, however, and invited all interested parties to devise a better solution to the Township's budgetary requirements.

Stewart stated that he is not in favor of these taxes. He noted that many of the Township's merchants are already paying taxes in the form of Real Estate Taxes, and that the imposition of a Mercantile Tax could be constituted as "a penalty for being in business, rather than a tax".

Comments were than solicited from the public.

Bob Foust, of Foust Appliances, offered the following: 1) As proposed, the Mercantile Tax is "small and innocent", but such taxes have a tendency to grow as evidenced by the once small 1% Pennsylvania State Sales Tax. 2) As heretofore noted, many merchants are property owners who pay Real Estate Taxes. 3) The book work this tax would entail would be formidable. 4) Council should consider the imposition of a tax on PSU football tickets or other sporting events. 5) He shall

rise to Taricani's challenge and try to devise alternative revenue raising proposals.

Chris Exarchos, owner of Lemont's Victorian Manor Restaurant, also stated his opposition to the proposed Act 511 Taxes, commenting: 1) In those instances wherein the business owner is also the property owner, the Mercantile Tax would raise the spector of double taxation. 2) Taxes have a tendency to balloon. 3) The tax is inherently unfair because it is targeted at only a small group; "why should a person who cooks for a living be taxed when the person who sells insurance is not?" 4) The tax is arbitrary in that it does not take into account the basic economic reality that gross sales do not necessarily reflect profit. 5) Based upon a Regional concept, should College Township unilaterally adopt a Mercantile Tax not imposed elsewhere in the Region, business would tend to be driven out of the area.

In response to Exarchos' last remark, Manager Lechner noted that College Township's Real Estate Tax of Nine Mills is much lower than that imposed by most other area municipalities, and even with a Mercantile Tax, many merchants would be paying a smaller combined tax in College Township than they would pay for a Real Estate Tax alone in any of the other Regional areas.

Charlie Abramson, of Hickey Beer Distributors, queried Council as to how many businesses would be involved (response - 170-200) and as to how much revenue could be expected to be generated from these taxes (response: roughly $40-50,000 per year).

The Manager of Nittany Mall's Barrel of Fun commented on the proposed Amusement Device Tax. His store now contains 51 of the estimated 60 amusement devices now located in College Township; the proposed Amusement Device Tax, therefore, would essentially be a tax against his store. He then asked Council whether replacement machines would also be subject to the tax, and was told by Dargitz that they would not.

Jerry Clinefelter, of Clinefelter's Carpet, added his opposition to the proposed Mercantile Tax, noting that in his case the tax would impose the additional bookkeeping burden of having to separate sales of product vis a vis sales of service. He added that a lot of work would be created for the collection of a very small tax.

Bill Peacock, of the Motorcycle Place, added his negative view of the Mercantile Tax and urged Council to vote against its adoption.

Chris Exarchos and Mrs. Mayes again raised the issue of taxing PSU sporting events; Taricani replied that legal issues are involved since PSU is a Land Grant University, and that it is not in the Township's best interest to discuss this matter publicly at this time.

No further discussion ensued and the advisability of setting a date for a Public Hearing on the adoption of the proposed Act 511 Ordinances was next considered by Council. Bailey then moved and Dean seconded that the three Ordinances be advertised and that a Public Hearing be set for February 7, 1983 at 7:30 p.m. The motion was carried by a 4-1 vote: Bailey, Dean, Dargitz, and Taricani in favor; Stewart opposed.

3. Amendments to the Flood Plain Ordinance. Lechner suggested that the Amendments to the Flood Plain Ordinance be reviewed by the Centre Region Planning Commission one more time before being presented to Council.

Dean concurred, and added that the proposed revisions are legitimate, and offer a more precise method for the determination of Flood Plain land. He also suggested that the Environmental Advisory Council review the proposed Amendments.

4. Adoption of the BOCA Code Ordinances. Dargitz provided the background: Six Ordinances for each one of the following revised codes (1981 BOCA Basic Building Code; 1981 BOCA Basic Mechanical Code; 1981 BOCA Basic Plumbing Code; 1981 BOCA Basic Property Maintenance Code -- previously the Housing Code; 1981 BOCA Basic Fire Protection Code; and the 1981 National Electrical Code) which include a revised permit fee schedule, have been recommended for adoption by each member Township by the COG Code Enforcement Committee (of which Council Member Dean is a member).

Within these Ordinances, provisions have been made for the establishment of a Regional Board of Appeals. Dean outlined the procedure by which the Appeals Board would function, and noted that while the individual municipal aspect would be maintained throughout, the requisite professional talent would be pooled on a regional basis. He added that each of the six Ordinances provide that in all cases, regardless of stringency, the Ordinance of the individual municipality would prevail in cases of conflict. Dean then stated that a Public Hearing must be scheduled for each of the proposed Ordinances.

Chris Exarchos commented that since the BOCA Codes are written for wide, general application, they do not really apply to this area and would cause too many problems "for a small guy like me in Lemont in a Historical building".

Dean replied that although the Code is devised to be nationwide in application, it would not be adopted verbatim. The proposed amendments have attempted to tailor these codes, through additions and exclusions, to suit the prevailing local situation.

Dargitz remarked that he was also disturbed by the universal aspect of the Code, but mentioned that there is really no alternative as a

State College-Area-tailored Code would be prohibitively expensive. He is also disturbed by the "unreasonable increase" proposed for the revised fee structure and would favor differentiation in fees among commercial and industrial, residential, and farm properties.

Taricani reminded Council that COG had decided that the individual municipalities could adopt the fee schedule they deemed best for their own Township. Dean noted that should the income from the altered fee schedules not meet the Township's administrative costs, the Township would have to make up these expenses itself.

Dargitz said that the Mechanical Code as now written could pose problems in that it does not exclude single-family owner-occupied residences. He fears that this Ordinance might permit a Code Enforcement Officer to enter such a home, uninvited, for the stated purposes of inspecting the mechanical systems of the house.

Dean denied this possibility, and read from the proposed Ordinance which states that inspection may be made on a site "for which an application had been filed for a permit" or for which a complaint had been filed. If a Building Permit is not applied for, an inspection will not be made.

Dargitz differed, and stated that he is still not convinced the Ordinance does not apply to single-family residences. Taricani agreed with Dargitz, and noted that it was her belief that the Ordinance does allow for the right to inspect an individual residence.

Dean then remarked that with the exception of the Property Maintenance Code, these regulations have been in effect since 1978. Council is not being asked to establish new procedures, it is being asked to amend them.

A motion was then made by Bailey that Council advertise and establish a Hearing Date for the adoption of the six proposed 1981 BOCA Codes. Taricani seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously. The complete Ordinances will be open to public inspection at the College Township Municipal Building, and the Public Hearing was set for Monday, January 31, 1983, at 7:30 p.m.

5. Appointment to Fill Vacancy on EAC. As noted earlier, due to Robert Shipman's resignation from the Environmental Advisory Council, a vacancy now exists on that Council.

A recommendation had been received from John Olivero, of the College Township Zoning Hearing Board, that Council appoint George Beatty, Associate Curator of the Frost Entomological Museum.

Action on the appointment was postponed to the next regular Council meeting to give the members adequate time to consider the nomination.

6. Discussion of Council's Position on Robert W. Ishler's Appeal to Court of Zoning Hearing Board Decision. An Appeal of the College Township Zoning Hearing Board's negative decision on his request for a subdivision variance has been filed by Robert W. Ishler. Ben Novak, Solicitor for the Zoning Hearing Board, has asked Council for its position on the Hearing Board's decision and on Ishler's Appeal.

Taricani noted her confusion over this request. To her knowledge, Council has never become involved in the Hearing Board's deliberations and appeals. It has always been Council's unwritten policy to support (barring major errors) all Zoning Hearing Board decisions.

Dean concurred, and added that Council has only become involved when it is the Hearing Board itself that has filed an appeal. He is concerned, however, that the Judge could interpret Council's lack of statement as a lack of support for the Zoning Hearing Board. He feels that if the Solicitor believes that a statement of support from Council would be in the Zoning Hearing Board's best interest, then such a statement should be forthcoming.

Chris Exarchos, Chairman of the Zoning Hearing Board, also stated his confusion over the Solicitor's request. He does not see the need for Council taking any position. Exarchos then noted that heresay had it that some members of Council supported a decision in favor of the appellant, to which Dargitz added that he had heard the same rumor from the Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor. If the Council is in support of the Hearing Board's decision (which it is), the Solicitor has requested that Council either join in the appeal or prepare a letter of support.

Taricani remarked that legally, only the collective opinion of the Council as a single body has any status. The Zoning Hearing Board is autonomous. She would not like to establish the precedent wherein every time the Hearing Board rules, Council also has to rule. Additionally, Council should not be expected to respond to heresay. Anyone who has anything to say on this matter should come forward and state his/her information openly.

Dargitz said that no action need be taken on the matter that evening, and instructed Manager Lechner to obtain further specifics on the issue including clarification from the Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor on the necessity for Council taking any position on the Board's decision.

7. Addition of a Second Regularly Scheduled Council Meeting per Month. The necessity of a second regularly scheduled Council Meeting per month was first suggested at the Organizational Meeting on January 3, 1983. As proposed by Dargitz, this meeting would be short, routine, and would deal primarily with items of a clerical nature. He also suggested that Council members receive no compensation for these meetings.

Council was in full agreement that this second meeting per month be conducted (subj... to cancellation) on the fourth Thursday of each month at 4:00 p.m. at the Municipal Building. Dean so moved; Taricani seconded; and the motion was carried.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Dean -- Finance Committee - No meetings have been conducted since his appointment earlier this month.

Bailey -- Transportation Committee - An agreement has been made with Trailways and Greyhound Bus Companies regarding their lease on the bus station; the Committee reaffirmed its previous statements that it will support the Rt. 144 program once the State College Bypass has been completed.

Taricani -- Executive Committee - There seems to be some reluctance on the part of the County Commissioners to endorse Senior Citizens' housing at the Corneal Site; a work session with the Code Committee has been set up; nominations have been entertained for COG positions; Taricani has been nominated to be the first woman chairman.

Stewart -- Public Services Committee - No meetings have been conducted for January as of yet; at the last meeting the Committee was informed of a Police request that the individual Townships enact an Ordinance dealing with the issuance of false alarms.

OTHER BUSINESS

Lechner informed Council of a State College Borough request for a College Township Representative in addition to himself to the Police Services Contract discussions.

Dargitz stated that in the interest of continuity (he was last year's representative), he will attend at least the next contract discussion, and something will be worked out thereafter.

Taricani then advised that a representative must be appointed to the Regional Senior Citizens Advisory Committee in the near future.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 p.m. by unanimous consent. Taricani moved; Bailey seconded.

ET AL

After adjournment, several late-comers questioned Council on various Township matters.

One person questioned Council on the status of the new Sign Ordinance. Taricani explained that new information relating to the revised Ordinance had been received at the Public Hearing; Dargitz remarked that a work session on that Ordinance had been scheduled for the fourth Thursday of the month at 4:00 p.m.

To another's question on the control the Township has over Cable TV services, Dargitz replied that the Township has none. The questioner then commented that despite the fact that the Centre Region was one of the pioneers of Cable TV, most other areas of the nation now have better services at lower rates.

In another vein, this person queried Council as to why the BOCA Codes were selected for adoption over the Uniform Building Code. Dean responded that BOCA has a longer history and is better researched, and also suggested that the questioner contact Jim Quigley for further details.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Thomas Lechner
Secretary

CTL:ss:bh

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP FINANCIAL REPORT

BUDGET AND ACTUAL APPROPRIATIONS

for the 12 months ended Dec. 31 19 82

	19 81		19 82					
	BUDGET 19 81	ACTUAL Y-T-D	BUDGET 19 82	ACTUAL MONTH	ACTUAL Y-T-D	BUDGET REMAINING for 19 82	PROJECTED REMAINDER for 19 82	NET CHANGE in 19 82 BUDGET
BEGINNING CASH	$ 61,766	$ 61,766	$ 52,394	$ N/A	$ 52,394	$	$	$ --
REVENUES								
Real Estate Tax	$ 96,757	$ 96,115	$ 102,108	$ 1,809	$ 101,621	$	$	$ (487)
Local Tax Enabling Act	256,000	263,429	283,000	18,504	289,158			6,158
Licenses, Permits	5,000	3,369	5,000	197	5,076			76
Fines	42,000	39,613	41,000	6,320	44,602			3,602
Interest and Rents	11,767	10,956	30,224	1,737	31,412			1,188
Grants	115,637	108,337	149,397	-0-	138,891			(10,506)
Other Departments and Services	21,000	24,372	21,000	5,038	23,442			2,442
Miscellaneous	12,070	3,379	12,720	16	5,796			(6,924)
Total Revenues	$560,231	$ 549,570	$ 644,449	$ 33,621	$639,998	$	$	$ (4,451)
TOTAL AVAILABLE for APPROPRIATION	$621,997	$ 611,336	$ 696,843	$ N/A	$692,392	$	$	$ (4,451)
EXPENDITURES								
Administration	$ 90,384	$ 100,439	$ 112,442	$ 12,161	$ 123,188	$	$	$ 10,746
Tax Collection	31,006	30,980	33,094	3,677	37,668			4,574
Police Protection	159,152	159,656	177,014	14,884	173,820			(3,194)
Fire Protection	26,718	28,258	27,744	-0-	28,220			476
Regulatory, Planning, Zoning, Code	17,210	17,061	20,000	6	18,733			(1,267)
Health and Sanitation	1,800	1,806	1,500	9	740			(760)
Highway Maintainance	102,867[a]	66,628	115,419[a]	8,629	86,552			(28,867)
Snow Removal	22,000	22,598	23,000	4,262	33,467			10,467
Maintainance Equipment	7,500	7,075	7,500	2,747	10,902			3,402
Road Construction & Rebuilding	-0-	25,873	-0-	-0-	14,552			14,552
Equipment	18,066	-0-	35,053	-0-	4,131			(30,922)
Library	22,335	25,756	22,172	-0-	22,172			-0-
Parks & Recreation	43,414	37,565	44,790	-0-	39,339			(5,451)
Transportation	8,275	10,693	11,000	-0-	11,480			480
Employee Fringe Benefits	27,100	23,644	29,130	3,654	22,169			(6,961)
Miscellaneous	23,798	19,925	8,713	612	7,005			(1,708)
Principal Paid on Indebtedness	4,300	4,300	5,274	90	5,108			(166)
Interest Paid on Indebtedness	860	860	11,803	921	11,559			(244)
Total Expenditures	$606,785	$ 583,117	$ 685,648	$ 51,652	$ 650,805	$	$	$ (34,843)
REMAINDER for APPROPRIATION	$ 15,212	$ 28,219	$ 11,195	$ N/A	$ 41,587	$	$	$ 30,392

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