

Meeting Minutes
State College Borough Council
November 7, 2005

The State College Borough Council met in a regular meeting on Monday, November 7, 2005, in the State College Municipal Building Council Room, 243 South Allen Street, State College, PA. Mayor Welch called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Welch began with a moment of silence and pledge of allegiance.

Present: Bill Welch, Mayor
Thomas E. Daubert, President of Council
Catherine G. Dauler
Elizabeth A. Goreham
Craig R. Humphrey
Jeffrey R. Kern
Richard L. McCarl
James H. Meyer

Also present: Thomas J. Fountaine, II, Borough Manager; Terry J. Williams, Borough Solicitor; Carl R. Hess, Community Development/Planning Director; Herman L. Slaybaugh, Zoning Officer/Planner; Thomas R. King, Chief of Police; Michael S. Groff, Finance Director; Mark A. Whitfield, Director of Public Works; Mark S. Henry, Health Officer; Cynthia S. Hanscom, Recording Secretary; members of the media; and other interested members of the public.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Kern moved and Ms. Dauler seconded a motion to approve the following minutes as written:

September 6, 2005, Regular Meeting
September 12, 2005, Special Meeting
September 12, 2005, Work Session
September 19, 2005 Regular Meeting
September 23, 2005, Work Session

The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

PUBLIC HOUR

Pat Vernon, owner of property in the Borough, spoke first about smaller properties in the downtown. Council has been promoting larger development but needed to consider options for smaller properties. He suggested the Borough buy those properties to conserve green space. With the proposal to increase height limits in the downtown, there would be a need to conserve green space.

Secondly, Mr. Vernon recalled that a Borough committee had considered the need to require electronic plan submission. In light of the increasing development activity in the Borough, an ordinance requiring plan proposals for larger buildings (such as 4 or more stories) to include a three-dimensional computer model showing how the building fits into the streetscape and how it restricts sunlight would be beneficial. He argued this technology was available and was standard in most cities today.

James V. Biggers, 1351 Old Boalsburg Road, said he had come before Council two years ago asking for solutions to traffic problems on Old Boalsburg Road. People used it as a shortcut to Whitehall Road without having to use the University Drive extension. Also the speed of traffic on the road was an issue. He said he contacted the Borough and the Chief of Police offered no advice and was "condescending and self-serving." Mr. Biggers noted that the Chief told him that there was not a speeding problem on that street and that his officers were doing a fine job of taking care of the traffic in the Borough. One excuse that was made was that radar could not be used to track the speed of the vehicles. Mr. Biggers said that now he has heard that the Borough was putting in speed bumps, which he believed was a terrible solution and created a liability issue. He stated he "could not believe a group of well-educated people can come up with such a dumb solution." Mr. Welch noted that there were speed humps and not speed bumps. The speed humps are a slow rise for several feet and then a slow decline. Mr. Goreham explained to Mr. Biggers that the Borough had passed a policy to have street traffic issues addressed. Mr. Biggers commented that, if Hamilton Avenue qualified for traffic calming, Westerly Parkway and Easterly Parkway should also qualify. Working with the residents of those streets to mitigate traffic appears to be favoritism. Council only helps those residents in a big, powerful neighborhood group, similar to the traffic mitigation that occurred in College Heights with the diverters. Mr. Welch suggested Mr. Biggers attend a meeting of the Transportation Commission to explain the problems that were occurring. Mr. Biggers said he should have been told to do this two years ago.

Matt Holven, 504 University Drive, asked if there was an ordinance on acceptable dimensions for parking spaces. He believed the spaces for his apartment building were too small. Mr. Slaybaugh

explained there were dimension requirements and he knew of one parking lot in violation; the owners were correcting the problem. Mr. Slaybaugh said he would check the property to determine if the spaces were in compliance. Mr. Holven asked if compliance was determined when the spaces are built. Mr. Slaybaugh replied affirmatively but explained the property owner could realign the spaces later without the municipality's knowledge.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Inter-Municipal Transfer of a Liquor License. Mr. Fontaine said a request for a transfer of a restaurant liquor license from Gregg Township to the State College Borough was submitted by Fuji & Jade Garden, Inc., for a restaurant located at 418 Westerly Parkway.

Mr. Fontaine reviewed the law that permits the transfer of a liquor license from another municipality within the same County. He noted that because of a change in the law in 2003, Council has the ability to attach conditions to the transfer. He explained the application for the transfer of the liquor license was received on September 23, 2005, and was listed as Exhibit A. On October 12, 2005, legal counsel for the applicant sent a letter waiving the 45-day deadline; the letter was listed as Exhibit B. An advertisement was published in the *Centre Daily Times* and the proof of publication was listed as Exhibit C. Lastly, the documentation of posting the property on October 26 was listed as Exhibit D.

Stanley Wolowski said he was the liquor license attorney for Fuji & Jade Garden, Inc. The restaurant was operating as a Japanese/Chinese restaurant in the Westerly Parkway Plaza and would like to serve alcoholic beverages as part of the meal. The applicant had entered into a purchase agreement for a liquor license to be transferred from Gregg Township into the Borough. He noted that the transfer would not adversely affect the welfare, health, peace and morals of the municipality or its inhabitants.

Mr. Wolowski explained the people behind the operation of Fuji & Jade Garden Restaurant are Jing Mei Jiang and Kwei Lan Chau. Jing Mei Jiang was the primary stock holder and president. Kwei Lan Chau did not own stock in the company but was the secretary. Both individuals were responsible people and had never been in trouble with the law. Mr. Jiang currently operated the Hunan Wok and the Fuji & Jade Garden Restaurant in State College, both of which were quiet and orderly restaurants. Ms. Chau had a master's degree in business and previously operated the Peking Garden Restaurant at the Westerly Parkway plaza until 1998. She currently ran the Peking Garden Restaurant in Lewisburg.

Mr. Wolowski presented photos of the exterior of the restaurant and asked that they be listed as applicant's Exhibit 1. The restaurant was 175 square feet with one large dining room seating 150 people. Part of the restaurant was the Fuji restaurant, which served Chinese food. The second part was the Jade Garden restaurant which served Japanese food. The Fuji portion of the restaurant had a sushi bar and a hibachi station. Mr. Wolowski distributed photos of the interior of the restaurant and asked that they be listed as Exhibits 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, and 2E. Separate menus for Fuji and Jade Garden restaurants were distributed as Exhibits 3 and 4, respectively.

Mr. Wolowski indicated the operating hours for the restaurant were Monday through Thursday from 11:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Friday and Saturday from 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., and Sunday from 12:00 noon to 11:00 p.m. Customers typically served were local business people during the day and families in the evenings. Alcoholic beverages would be sold as a complement to the meal. Mixed drinks, wine and beer would be sold. Beer would be sold only by the can or bottle; there would be no beer "to go". The owners were not planning on having a happy hour and the entire restaurant was non-smoking and would continue to be non-smoking. There would be no live entertainment or disc jockeys. There were no poker machines or video games. If the liquor license were acquired, the owners would operate the restaurant in the same manner it was operating. Mr. Jiang would run the daily operations and would be at the restaurant most of the time. In addition, all servers would be trained in the responsible service of alcohol through the Responsible Alcohol Management Program (RAMP).

Mr. King reviewed information on the number of liquor licenses in the Borough. Currently, the Liquor Control Board had a standard ratio of 1 license for every 3000 people. Given that the population of the Borough is approximately 38,000, there are 1.6 licenses per 3000 in population, which is 64% more licenses than the Liquor Control Board quota. He noted there were 44 retail establishments in the Borough selling alcoholic beverages: 27 bars/restaurants, 8 hotel bars, 5 bottle shops, 1 distributor, 2 private clubs, and 1 liquor store. Mr. King presented statistical information on the youthful population, the high-risk drinking behavior, and the high number of alcohol-related crimes reported in the Borough. He compared the number of police calls to a bar/restaurant versus a non-bar, which showed the number of police calls to bars was 18 times greater than calls to all other Borough properties. He concluded that, generally, retail liquor licenses associated with dining establishments or restaurants do not adversely affect the welfare, health, peace and morals of the Borough or its residents. Conditions should include measures to prevent an adverse effect. His concern was whether or not the management capacity existed to ensure compliance with the Borough and the Liquor Control Board laws.

Mr. Henry presented a history of health of inspections at both the Hunan Wok and the Fuji & Jade Restaurant. He noted that the Hunan Wok has had 8 routine inspections where numerous food

handling and sanitary violations were found and corrected. Since 2001, four citizen complaints have been made which were followed by inspections where numerous violations were found. Recently, on October 28, 2005, during a re-inspection following a complaint against the Hunan Wok, the Hunan Wok was ordered closed for business and to refrain from cooking food for public consumption. On October 30, 2005, in response to a citizen complaint, State College Police found food was being prepared from Hunan Wok for public consumption at the Fuji & Jade Garden restaurant. He noted that only one routine inspection has been done at the Fuji & Jade Garden restaurant since it opened in September. Several food handling and sanitary violations were found at the inspection and were later corrected. Mr. Fontaine noted a memo was prepared by the Health Officer and was included as the Borough's Exhibit 1.

Ms. Goreham asked if Ms. Chau's restaurant in Lewisburg had a liquor license. Mr. Chau indicated it did not.

Mr. McCarl asked if conditions placed on the liquor license would remain if the owner goes out of business. Mr. Fontaine indicated the conditions were attached to the license. A condition placed on the license could be to require that any transfer to another business go through the Council review process. Mr. McCarl noted this condition was placed on the liquor license transfer for the Rotelli Restaurant in Calder Way. He asked that status of that request. Mr. Fontaine indicated it was approved by the Council and provided to the Liquor Control Board. No further notification has been received.

Mr. Humphrey asked the relationship between the public health violations and the responsible service of liquor. Mr. King said the Liquor Control Board has rules and regulations associated with the license. It is imperative that those rules are followed closely. If agreed to by the Liquor Control Board, the conditions set by the Borough would be enforced by the Liquor Control Board. Mr. King noted that Council would need to judge if there is a connection between the current violations and the ability to handle the rules and regulations required to operate a liquor license.

Mr. Kern asked if the license could be contingent on the successful operation of the restaurant. Mr. Williams said the license could not be contingent on the Borough's enforcement of the Eating and Drinking Establishment license. The Liquor Control Board controlled the license. It was the role of Council to approve or disapprove the transfer. The Liquor Control Board would enforce the conditions. The Liquor Control Board would determine what conditions were reasonable.

Mr. Kern asked if alcohol could be sold if the restaurant was closed because of food handling violations. Mr. Williams said the applicant could not remain open if no food were being sold. Mr. Wolowski said the liquor license was based on a restaurant selling food. If no food were sold, the applicant could not use the liquor license. The applicant would be cited by the Liquor Control Board for violating the liquor code if alcohol were sold without a valid restaurant.

Mr. Welch asked about the size of the bar. Mr. Wolowski indicated the bar would be only 10 seats and offered as a way for a diner to get something quickly before a meal. He noted the applicant was agreeable to the limitation of 10 seats at the bar.

Mr. McCarl asked if the Liquor Control Board could determine that the Borough currently has too many licenses. Mr. King indicated that the Liquor Control Board felt the decision on the number of licenses that could be transferred into a municipality should be determined by the municipal authority.

Ms. Dauler asked about the expansion of the liquor license into other store fronts in the Westerly Parkway Plaza. Mr. Fontaine noted this has been a previous concern. A condition could be attached to the transfer that restricts the expansion beyond the area of the original application.

Mr. Welch noted that previous owners of this location had conducted after hours parties. Mr. King explained that was being done by different owners but Council could condition the license to limit after hour parties.

Mr. Meyer said that draft beer was not an issue but believed that serving pitchers of hard alcohol was a concern. Mr. Fontaine noted a condition could be added that restricted drink size to 22 ounces.

Mr. McCarl questioned the distance to a school and wondered if this was an issue. Mr. King noted that Highway Pizza, a restaurant selling alcohol, was in the same plaza. Although that license had been with the establishment for 25 years, the proximity to the school should still be a concern. Mr. Williams noted the Liquor Control Board regulated mandatory distances to schools; concerns on the proximity to the high school would be addressed in the hearing before the Liquor Control Board.

There being no further comments, Mr. Welch closed the hearing. He announced Council would vote on whether to approve or deny the liquor license transfer request at their November 21 meeting and, if approving the request, whether to identify any specific conditions for the liquor license transfer approval.

Commercial Incentive District. Mr. Fontaine noted that Council has reviewed the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for many months and has indicated their authorization to

schedule a public hearing and enactment. The Planning Commission reviewed the proposal in October and made recommendations on both the Commercial Incentive District and the Signature Development Projects. Council would receive public comment on the proposal and could enact the ordinance following the hearing.

Mr. Hess presented an overview of the proposed Commercial Incentive District ordinance. He explained the ordinance was an effort by Council to create incentives for property owners in the downtown in exchange for additional floor area ratio, height, or a reduction in parking requirements.

Delores Taricani, managing partner of Medical Arts Building and TownCenter One, noted that this process had been long and the downtown businesses have paid an emotional and financial price for doing this. She sincerely felt that a new look for the commercial space in the downtown was the most viable way for the Borough to have a good future. The height does not dictate design. The Beaver Avenue garage is a tall commercial structure that is an aesthetic improvement for the Beaver Avenue corridor. She commended Council for working through their differences.

Michael Freeman, 723 West Nittany Avenue, encouraged Council to vote in favor of the zoning changes that will bring a new look for the Borough. He visited 60 to 70 property owners to discuss this proposal and many were very excited. The proposal would combat sprawl and provide opportunities for improvements in the downtown.

Ken Gray, West Park Avenue, noted that he was not a business owner, he did not own rental property, and was not a lawyer or a realtor. He did not want to speak for or against the ordinance because he did not fully understand the implications of the changes. In his view, Council had not done an adequate job in informing people about the commercial incentive and the signature developments. He did not believe that Council should rely on citizens to take the initiative to find out about the proposals before Council. This was a difficult issue and more effort should have been made to contact the neighborhood associations so that Council could make an informed decision about citizens' concerns.

Pat Vernon, property owner in borough, suggested looking at the broader picture. The Commercial Incentive district was one partial approach to what was going on in the Borough. This took care of the larger properties but did nothing for the property owners with smaller tracts of land. The newspaper suggested Georgetown-style townhouses for the downtown, but he believed that kind of development would be best suited for the adjoining areas of the downtown. Foster Avenue is only one block from Beaver and would be an excellent place to develop market rate housing on a smaller scale.

Arthur Anderson, 650 Glenn Road and Planning Commission chair, noted the Planning Commission spent a great deal of time discussing this ordinance and believed that it was important that a smaller area be considered. It would allow staff and the Commission to look at the incentive zoning within a controlled area to determine the response of developers. He believed Council should go slowly with this. The Planning Commission recommended not to include the entire area but rather a smaller portion on the west side of the commercial district.

Mr. Daubert moved to enact Ordinance 1821, the Commercial Incentive District ordinance. Mr. Kern seconded the motion.

Ms. Goreham moved to amend the motion to reduce the area proposed. When asked if this was an appropriate amendment, Mr. Williams noted that reducing the size of the district would require the ordinance to be sent back to the Planning Commission and another public hearing would need to be held. He informed the Mayor that it was the chair's decision on whether or not the amendment to the motion is inappropriate. Mr. Welch believed the amendment was inappropriate and indicated a second motion could be made if the initial motion would fail. He then asked for a vote on the motion. The vote passed with a 6-1-0 vote, with Ms. Goreham opposed.

Ms. Gorham indicated that this was the first of two zoning changes. Although Council agreed on the objective of the ordinance (to attract business to the downtown), she did not want to see the district extended to Garner Street where she believed it could result in disastrous consequences. Council may see an extension of the Beaver Canyon with high residential structures with little parking provided.

Zoning Amendment to a Conditional Use for Signature Development Projects. Mr. Fontaine said the third public hearing before Council was for a proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to establish conditional use criteria for signature development projects. Council would receive public comment on the proposal and may enact the ordinance following the hearing.

Mr. Hess presented an overview of the ordinance. He explained that 30,000 square feet is the minimum lot size and delineated possible sites in the downtown that could be consolidated. The conditional use would allow for a 8.0 floor area ratio, which means the building could be 8 times larger than the size of the site. A building could be 12 stories not to exceed 145 feet. The uses and setbacks would be the same as that required in the Commercial Incentive District.

Mr. Vernon suggested a requirement be added for green space. He also commented on the limit to 12 stories. He believed that more floors could be built within the 145 feet and should not be limited.

Mr. Anderson commented the Commercial Incentive district permitted 95 foot buildings but did not limit the number of stories. If a typical residential floor were 9.5 feet, there could be 10 stories built. He felt the 145 feet was extreme and used the University's power plant exhaust stacks as an example of 145 feet. Buildings built to this height could be seen from the Mount Nittany Expressway (Route 322). It was exceptionally troublesome when considering that the 45 foot height limit should be maintained in the core downtown area.

Mr. Gray commented that the majority of citizens were not aware of the 145 foot height limit and would probably be opposed. Although the Borough may have had discussions with downtown business association and developers, there was no effort to inform the taxpayers. Mr. Welch noted that this has been on Council's agenda for several months. The Council meetings are aired on television and the issues are discussed openly in the public. Mr. Kern noted that a series of hearings were held earlier in the year; meetings were advertised and public comment was encouraged. Mr. Gray noted that most citizens would feel this was inadequate. It was Council's responsibility to ensure that citizens were informed.

Mr. Freeman noted that he had spoken with Ron Madrid, member of the Planning Commission and a neighbor in the Holmes-Foster Neighborhood Association. Mr. Madrid supported these zoning changes to encourage a vibrant downtown.

There being no further comments, Mr. Welch closed the public hearing

Mr. Kern moved to enact Ordinance 1822 to allow for a conditional use for signature buildings. Mr. Humphrey seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 6-1-0 vote, with Ms. Goreham opposed.

Ms. Goreham noted this was the second zoning change which should affect only key intersections and the former municipal site but the district was expanded to the east. It was a fact that larger buildings would increase traffic and increase the number of vehicles that would use the adjoining neighborhood streets. She believed that one building could have disastrous consequences.

Zoning Amendment: R3B Zoning District. Mr. Fontaine said the last public hearing was an amendment to the R3B zoning district to permit light standards to be increased from 20 to 25 feet. On September 19, Council instructed Planning staff to draft a zoning ordinance amendment that would increase the maximum height of exterior lights in the R3B zoning district from 20 to 25 feet. The amendment arose from a request by the YMCA to illuminate an in-line roller hockey area using luminaries mounted at 25 feet. This, in the YMCA's judgment, provided the best and most economical way to light its facility. A variance had been sought, but was denied on the basis there was no hardship. Thereafter, the YMCA sought legislative relief from Council. The Planning Commission reviewed the proposed ordinance at its September 29 meeting and acknowledged that the YMCA was a sympathetic petitioner that did a lot of good things for the community. Nevertheless, the Commission believed the focus of the problem was really a nonresidential use in a residential zone and recommended against raising luminaire height because of potential adverse effects for R3B residents and residents in adjacent zoning districts.

Mr. Anderson said it was important to acknowledge that the proposal for the YMCA encroaches into the side setback areas. Raising the height of the light poles may not be the best and economical solution to the problem. The lighting needs could be met by staying within the ordinance. He agreed the YMCA was a good community resource but did not believe Council had considered the impact of 25-foot lights. The higher the light fixture, the more visible would be the lights from adjacent properties. The Planning Commission recommended Council not enact this ordinance.

Dennis Ditmer, State College YMCA director, said the YMCA was in favor of the 25-foot light standards. The Whitehill Lighting consultant working with the YMCA had advised that, although the 20-foot-high lights would work, they would not be ideal. The 25-foot lights were used for sports lighting and would keep the light within the property lines by using a more direct downward beam. The lights at 20 feet would have to be at a slight angle to properly light the rink. In addition, the cost of the 25-foot lights was half of the cost of the fixtures at 20 feet. The 25-foot lights would be less glaring and more economical.

There being no further comments, Mr. Welch closed the hearing.

Mr. Kern moved and Mr. Meyer seconded a motion to approve Ordinance 1823 to increase the permitted height of light fixtures to 25 feet. The motion passed with at 6-0-1 vote, with Mr. McCarl abstaining because he was on the Board of Directors for the State College YMCA.

CONSENT ITEMS

Planning Commission Resignation. Mr. Fontaine indicated that Richard J. Schuhmann, in an e-mail sent to Elizabeth Goreham, was requesting that his resignation from the Planning Commission become effective immediately.

Mr. Kern moved to accept Mr. Schuhmann's resignation, with regret. Ms. Goreham seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Design Review Board Resignation. Mr. Fontaine informed Council that John R. Hiester, member of the Design Review Board, had submitted a letter of resignation effective December 15, 2005.

Mr. Kern moved to accept Mr. Hiester's resignation, with regret. Ms. Goreham seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

Special Activities: Great Strides Walk-a-thon. Mr. Fontaine explained an application was received requesting permission to use Borough sidewalks for the Great Strides Walk-a-thon for the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation. The event would be held on Saturday, April 29, 2006.

Mr. Kern moved to approve the use of Borough sidewalks for this event. Ms. Goreham seconded the motion, which passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

OLD BUSINESS

Noise Waiver Request from Penn State for the HUB Lawn Terrace. Mr. Fontaine said Penn State was seeking a waiver to the Borough of State College's Noise Ordinance to conduct six performances or events after dark on weekends (in addition to the AfterFest activity) on the performance area adjacent to the HUB-Robeson Center. These six activities would use amplified sound and be approved, sponsored, and managed by the Office of Unions and Student Activities. Amplified performances during weekend daylight hours and community sponsored events would not count against this total. Council has discussed this request at several meetings over the past four months.

Most recently, at the November 4 work session, Council reviewed a revised policy to waive the noise ordinance for these events. At that meeting, Council made two modifications. The first change would require that sound level monitoring be conducted at the corner of Locust Lane and Foster Avenue. In addition, the police would monitor noise levels at several locations during the events, to include areas adjacent to Addison Court. The second change was a minor modification to the section on police enforcement for events that exceed the limits as established.

Mr. McCarl noted that following a phone call he had received, he looked at the Locust and Foster location in relation to the HUB lawn. Although he believed the problem had been addressed with monitoring at different locations, he would be in favor of moving the monitoring location back to Beaver and Locust. Mr. Daubert noted the monitoring location was moved because the traffic at Beaver and Locust could reach the 70 decibel level.

Ms. Dauler asked about the other locations where monitoring would be conducted. Mr. Fontaine said, other than Addison Court, the locations would be selected to address complaints. Initially, monitoring would occur at Foster and Locust as well as Addison Court and various other locations.

Ms. Goreham stated that although there would be six events throughout the year, Council should be aware that these events would bring people into the downtown.

Mr. Meyer moved to approve the noise ordinance waiver request for six activities subject to the conditions listed in the waiver policy. Mr. Kern seconded the motion. Council voted in favor of the motion with a 7-0-0 vote.

2005 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)/HOME Consolidated Plan. Mr. Fontaine said the 2005 Consolidated Action Plan included allocations of CDBG funds for three specific planning activities that were now being covered using local funds due to the decrease in 2005 CDBG funding. The CDBG Citizens Advisory Committee and staff are recommending Council reprogram these funds to the general administration line item. A public hearing was held on October 3, 2005, at which time no public comments were made.

Mr. Kern moved to approve the amendment to the 2005 CDBG Consolidated Plan. Ms. Dauler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2006 CDBG/HOME Consolidated Annual Action Plan. Mr. Fontaine noted that the 2006 Consolidated Annual Action Plan provided details on projects proposed to be funded by federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Home Investments Partnerships Program (HOME) grant money in 2006.

The CDBG Citizens' Advisory Committee reviewed the Plan at its meeting September 12 and recommended it be approved by Council. The Plan must be submitted to HUD by November 15. A public hearing was held on the Action Plan on October 3, 2005. No public comments were made.

Ms. Goreham asked if the 2006 funding amounts were available. Mr. Humphrey indicated they were not. Mr. Hess explained the Senate and House of Representatives had approved differing amounts. There was a conference committee established to review the different funding levels.

Mr. Kern moved to approve the 2006 CDBG/HOME Consolidated Action Plan. Ms. Dauler seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

OFFICIAL REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Mayor's Report

Mr. Welch urged the public to vote the following day in the election.

President's Report

Mr. Daubert also urged the public to vote. He announced the work session scheduled for Monday, November 14, 2005, had been cancelled. Council would meet in a work session on Wednesday, November 16 at 12:00 noon to receive the 2006 Operating Budget.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia S. Hanscom
Assistant Borough Secretary