Meeting Minutes
State College Borough Council
October 3, 2006

The State College Borough Council met in a regular meeting on Tuesday, October 3, 2006, in the State College Municipal Building Council Room, 243 South Allen Street, State College, PA. Mr. Welch called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Bill Welch, Mayor
Catherine G. Dauler, President of Council
Thomas E. Daubert
Ronald L. Filippelli
Elizabeth A. Goreham
Donald M. Hahn
Craig R. Humphrey
Jeffrey R. Kern

Also present: Thomas J. Fountaine, II, Borough Manager; Terry J. Williams, Borough Solicitor; Thomas Kurtz, Assistant Borough Manager; Thomas R. King, Chief of Police; Carl R. Hess, Director of Planning; Michael S. Groff, Finance Director; John Marchek, Risk Manager; Tim Grattan, Director of Information Technology; Mark A. Whitfield, Director of Public Works; Alan Sam, Borough Arborist; Cynthia S. Hanscom, Recording Secretary; members of the media; and other interested members of the public.

Mr. Welch began with a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Hour - Hearing of Citizens. There were no comments from the public.

REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Report from the CDBG Citizens' Advisory Committee. Robert Ott, Chairman of the CDBG Citizens' Advisory Committee, was present to report on the activities of the Committee. He began by stating that he planned to discuss the 2007 Consolidated Plan but wanted to address a more pressing problem of the Committee. He noted the Committee agonizes each year with the 15 percent set aside of CDBG funds that can be used for human service agency requests. Every year the requests far exceed the available funds. Committee members have a difficult decision on how to recommend allocating those funds. This year it was especially challenging because the number of members was downsized to make the size of the Committee more consistent with other Borough ABCs. Also, Council shifted their mode of operation and no longer assigns a liaison to the committee. He said he understood how challenging it was to attend every ABC meeting but felt that by eliminating the Council liaison it had created a further burden for the Committee. Mr. Ott asked Council to consider reassigning a Council liaison to the Committee.

Mr. Ott said that this year, like last year, staff's recommendation for human service funding was contrary to the Committee members'. The Committee has discussed setting aside half of the available funds each year for housing/shelter programs and related activities. Last year, staff recommended that all of the CDBG human services funding go to shelter related activities. The Committee recommended against doing that so that there could be a mix of funding. He noted that staff has indicated that some programs with small allocations are challenging and time consuming for staff to monitor. Mr. Ott judged that the Committee's responsibility was to fund a greater number of programs that serve residents. Although staff has indicated that the competitive process for funding human service programs is not necessary to meet CDBG guidelines, the Committee views the process as a way to identify emerging needs.

Mr. Kern noted that one of the reasons that the liaisons were removed from the process was because the views of the liaison did not necessarily represent that of the entire Council. It was also felt that in some cases the views of Council were leading the committee. The object was to have this Council hear from the Committee members and the citizens. He asked how a Council liaison would help the committee deliberate. Mr. Ott indicated, from his perspective, staff recommendations carry a great deal of weight and a Council liaison would offer a balance. The CAC needed some direction from Council.

Mr. Welch noted it may be beneficial to have a joint meeting with the CDBG Citizens' Advisory Committee to determine where we need to go from here.

Mr. Hahn asked if the recommendation for human services funding in the 2007 Consolidated Plan was staff's recommendation or the recommendation from the Committee. Mr. Ott noted that it was the Committee sanctioned recommendation. It continues to fund the Community Help Center and the dental program for the Centre Volunteers in Medicine. Both of those programs were considered non-housing related. He expressed concern that other agencies would feel inhibited in applying for the funds if they hear that staff is recommending that only shelter programs be funded.

Mr. Hahn noted that this Council has a great deal of respect for the members of the CAC. The expertise of both Mr. Ott and the committee members is valued by Council and the concerns of the Committee are important.

Mr. Daubert asked if the recommendations before Council for human service funding would change should they have the ability to start the process over. Mr. Ott said he would ask for funding levels for the same programs but would change the funding amounts. When asked how the funding amounts would change, Mr. Ott explained that one agency received capital funding for renovations in the past; the Committee was told by the agency that they would not be seeking operating funds. However, because agency plans did not develop as predicted, the Committee has been "cramped" because the agency requested operating funds for a housing-related program.

Mr. Welch said it was not unusual that staff makes different recommendations than an ABC. As he understood the funding restriction, only 15 percent of CDBG funds can be used to fund human service agencies. This amounts to $110,321, which is not a great deal of money to split between a great number of good service agencies.

Mr. Fountaine noted the staff recommendation at this point was to approve the Committee's recommendation. Staff has raised questions about the process. Since there has been a $300,000 reduction in funds in the last decade, staff resources have been reduced as well. He indicated that staff is recommending that we may need to discuss how to manage the process.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2007 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Programs' Consolidated Annual Action Plan. Mr. Fountaine said the 2007 Consolidated Annual Action Plan provides details on proposed projects for federal Community Development Block Grant and HOME grant money during fiscal year 2007. The CDBG Citizens' Advisory Committee reviewed the Plan at its meeting of September 12 and recommended it be approved by Council. The Plan will also be available for public review in the Planning Office of the State College Municipal Building and at Schlow Centre Region Library, 221 South Allen Street, through November 6, 2006. Council is expected to approve the plan at their meeting of November 6. The Plan must be submitted to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development by November 15, 2006.

Mr. Welch asked if there were public comments. Connie Martin, Board of Directors with the House of Care at 515 W. Beaver Avenue, home address of 2521 Carnegie Drive in Patton Township, commented that she appreciated the work of CDBG Citizen's Advisory Committee. She asked that agencies be allowed to attend the joint meeting to be scheduled between Council and the Committee.

There were no further comments and Mr. Welch closed the hearing.

Mr. Daubert said he would not be prepared to vote on this issue until a joint meeting with the CDBG Citizens' Advisory Committee has been held. Mr. Hess said it would be difficult to get a joint meeting scheduled before the November 6 meeting. Because of the submission deadline, the Consolidated Plan would need to be approved at the November 6 meeting. He added that should Council chose to do so, the plan could be amended at any time during the year.

Mr. Humphrey said he would like to have a joint meeting but since the distribution of funds was the same as it had been in previous years, it was not necessary to meet prior to approving this plan. Mr. Filippelli agreed that Council should go forward with the submission process. Ms. Dauler agreed and asked staff to work with the Committee to coordinate a meeting with Council in the next few months. Mr. Daubert disagreed and said that it was important to meet with the Committee in the next month.

Ms. Dauler moved to schedule action on the plan for November 6. Mr. Kern seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program. Mr. Fountaine explained the second hearing was on the 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program, which was received by Council at their meeting of September 12. The Capital Improvement Program has been available to the public for review in the Administration office of the State College Municipal Building as well as on the Borough's website. Council discussed the Program at their meetings of September 22 and September 29. Final review is scheduled for October 9 with approval of the plan scheduled for the regular meeting of October 16.

Ron Madrid, 701 W. Beaver, asked Council to reconsider the scheduling of the neighborhood identification signage. Currently, street identification signs in the Borough are not uniform. The plan is to have the historic districts identified on the street signs. The current proposal before Council is to replace the streets signs on a normal replacement schedule rather than one wide sweep. He said there needed to be a more aggressive policy in getting identification and recognition for the historic district areas.

Ms. Goreham asked the cost of replacing all of the street signs. Mr. Madrid noted that it would be $80,000 for the entire Borough. He said he was not advocating resigning the entire Borough within a one-year period. Rather, that one neighborhood could be included in the Capital Improvement Program each year.

Lee Lowry, 206 Sunrise Terrace, said there were four budget items of concern. The project proposed to widen the sidewalks on College Avenue (ST072) was included in the Capital Improvement Program several years ago. Although it was desirable to widen the sidewalks an additional 2-3 feet, it would create problems. The cross section of the street gets steep and the bricks underneath are expensive to replace. The cost for the project would be very expensive and should be reconsidered given the tight budget conditions. The second item was the traffic circles proposed (ST092). In his review of traffic circles built to residential standards, it appears that property will need to be taken by the Borough to build the circles. He cautioned that doing this on arterial streets would force buses and commercial vehicles onto residential streets. He said the third item of concern was the recycling equipment (RF022). The three items proposed to be purchased are to be used to recycle pavement material. Although this may be desirable in certain circumstances, he did not think there would be enough of a local need for the recycled material. Lastly, Mr. Lowry said the landfill reclamation study (RF032) was a "Pandora's box" and cautioned Council not to have great expectations.

Zoning Amendment to Change Building Lot Width Ratio and Lot Coverage Rules. Mr. Fountaine said the third public hearing was on the zoning amendment to regulate building width only when lots are combined into larger holdings exceeding 135 feet in width. Council received the amendment on September 5 and discussed the amendment at the September 11 meeting. From that meeting a serious of questions were raised which have been addressed by staff. Mr. Fountaine reminded Council that any modifications to the proposed amendment would require returning the entire amendment to the planning agencies for a mandatory thirty day review period.

Mr. Hess presented a summary of the ordinance explaining the lot width ratio and lot coverage rules and the need for a uniform treatment of all buildings while preserving a sense of scale and accommodating diversity of building form.

Mr. Welch asked for public comment. There being none, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Daubert moved to authorize the Notice of Intent to Enact this ordinance on October 16. Ms. Dauler seconded the motion, which passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

Zoning Amendment to Define Open Space and Recreational Structures and Areas. Mr. Fountaine said the fourth public hearing was on a zoning amendment to provide a uniform statement of what is meant by open space. The proposed ordinance creates a definition for open space and for recreational structures and areas. Council received the amendment at their September 5 meeting and discussed the amendment at the September 11 work session. Mr. Fountaine reminded Council that any modifications to the proposed amendment would require the entire amendment be returned to the Planning Agencies for a mandatory thirty day review period. Mr. Hess provided a summary of the ordinance.

Mr. Welch asked for public comments on the amendment. There being none, Mr. Welch closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kern moved to authorize the Notice of Intent to Enact this ordinance on October 16. Mr. Humphrey seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

Zoning Amendment to Modify the Mixed Use Overlay District Regulations. Mr. Fountaine said the last public hearing was on a zoning ordinance amendment to modify the mixed use overlay district regulation. Currently, the mixed use overlay allows existing houses to be converted to office uses. The modification would include changes to the existing rules for the allowable number of employees, use of on-street parking to meet parking requirements, and changing the procedures for review of applications from a special exception (which requires review before the Zoning Hearing Board) to the standard land development plan review process. Council received the proposed ordinance on September 5 and discussed the amendment at their September 11 work session. Mr. Fountaine reminded Council that any modifications to the proposed amendment would require returning the entire amendment to the Planning Agencies for a mandatory thirty day review period.

Mr. Hess reviewed the existing ordinance and the purpose of the mixed use overlay district. He then review the changes proposed.

Mr. Welch asked for public comment. Philip Furnas, 614 East Foster Avenue, spoke against the proposal. He noted that additional parking on street will change the residential character of the street and reduce the value of the properties. The ordinance does not limit curbside parking nor provide for the on-street parking rights of the existing residents. Mr. Furnas presented pictures of parking as well as residences that had been altered because of the mixed use overlay. He presented a written statement from a neighbor and asked that it be distributed to Council. He said he was opposed to the proposed amendment and asked that Council dispose of the amendment without approval.

Richard Virgil, 620 E. Foster Avenue, commented that allowing credit for available on-street parking to go to 400 feet from a business would allow for vehicles to be parked along East Foster Avenue, which would not be beneficial to the neighborhood. He asked that Council protect the neighborhoods by leaving the businesses on Beaver Avenue and maintain the residential quality of the neighborhood on Foster Avenue. He noted that Michael Black built a substantial building and that, although he followed the zoning regulations, it did not look like a residential structure – it looked like a business. Mr. Virgil said the intent of the mixed use overlay was to maintain the size and residential character of the neighborhood. He also questioned what would be involved with a tour operation (a proposed permitted use) and whether that would include buses and tourists. Also, a motion picture studio could generate a great deal of traffic if there production is on-site. He recommended Council either revise or reject the proposed ordinance. Mr. Filippelli asked if parking would be problem if parking was restricted to two hours. Mr. Virgil said residents currently accommodate for special events and spillover that occurs. The solution to the businesses problems should not be solved with parking on Foster Avenue.

Mr. Humphrey asked if parking meters could be installed on East Beaver Avenue. Mr. Hess said the cartway was not sufficient in width to accommodate a parking lane.

Dale Trout, 200 High Street, believed the ordinance was going in the right direction. Beaver Avenue is hardly a residential district. He would like to see the 600 block of Beaver Avenue rezoned to residential office to allow uses more appropriate for the level of traffic.

Bob Woodard, General Manager for Nevins Real Estate Manager, 108 West Beaver Avenue, said that he manages property in the mixed use overlay district. He was strongly in favor of the intent and the importance of the buffer between the higher and lower density housing. Office and studio uses provide an excellent buffer but are inhibited by the current regulations. Because of their proximity to the commercial district, the structures in these districts are no longer suitable for owner-occupied, single-family residential homes. If the buildings are not converted to office/business use, they will become rental housing with absentee landlords and the value of the property will deteriorate. He hoped that Council would adopt the ordinance.

Michele Rowland, 230 South Gill Street, noted a mixed use overlay zone was adjacent to her home. He believed the changes in the mixed use overlay would affect the residential character of her neighborhood. She said she would like to see more owner-occupied homes. Even though four families with small children occupied houses in the 200 block of South Gill Street, the area was vulnerable to rental housing conversions. She urged Council to maintain an environment for families.

Barbara Virgil, 620 E. Foster Avenue, said Council should work to maintain the residential character of the neighborhood. Her property was adjacent to the mixed use overlay and she was concerned the changes proposed will encourage the expansion of business into the neighborhoods. She said this ordinance would negatively impact the residential character of the neighborhood by allowing an increase in the number of employees, increase the on-street parking, and force the businesses' clients to use Foster Avenue. The mixed use overlay regulations should provide for essential parking. There are families with young children that live in the neighborhood. She asked Council to preserve the residential area which would encourage other young families to purchase homes in the neighborhood.

Michael Black, 726 North Allen Street, stated that he was a Borough resident, a homeowner, and an alumni of Penn State University. He was a husband to a civil servant and had a child. He said his family was happy to live in the Borough in a mixed residential neighborhood. He said he got involved with this three years ago and has been working with residents and staff to see changes in the mixed use overlay. Some of the concerns expressed by residents are the result of pressure from the swelling of the University. It is a huge corporation in the "belly of the Borough." The increase in enrollment and development that has been occurring has added thousands of users to the area. The area has lost open fields and horse farms to high density housing. There is an explosion of development along Atherton Street and it appears that the Atherton Street/College Avenue corner will be "consumed" by the University. All of this adds pressure to the bordering residential neighborhoods. He said that Council needs to see that the mixed use overlay is a release of pressure on the border between the residential and commercial areas. Businesses can be good neighborhoods for the owner-occupied residents in the high traffic areas. Local business owners will make good neighbors. Council needs to maintain a thriving, progressive Borough and encourage projects such as his.

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

Mr. Hahn noted that many people have commented and he agreed that the mixed use overlay is a transitional area. Council should encourage businesses but did not feel that there was urgency in getting this amendment passed. The areas of the mixed use overlay were sensitive and adjacent to strong owner-occupied neighborhoods. First, he believed the definition of uses should be further defined so that it was clear what kinds of uses would be permitted. Also, although he supported the update of business uses proposed and the flexibility in meeting parking requirements, it should not be done at the expense of the property owners. He added that Council has been supportive of artist studios in the past and encouraged the Planning

Commission to considering relaxing the parking requirements for businesses that are art oriented, which usually require less parking. Mr. Hahn noted that Mr. Black's building was rather large and suggested that size limitations may be in order. Lastly, Mr. Hahn felt the parking requirements for employees of a mixed use overlay business should not be met with the 2-hour spaces; it was not fair that employees should rely on the two-hour spaces.

Council discussed the ordinance as written and believed that it would be appropriate for further discussion be moved to a future work session.

Mr. Daubert moved to direct staff to return the amendment to the Planning Commission for further review, along with comments identifying specific issues to be considered by the Commission. Mr. Humphrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Kern moved to schedule discussion of this item for the October 9 work session. Mr. Humphrey seconded the motion. The vote on the motion was 6-1-0, with Ms. Dauler opposed. The motion passed.

CONSENT ITEMS

Ms. Goreham moved and Mr. Humphrey seconded a motion to ratify the following appointments to the Urban Village Steering Committee.

Representing:	
Borough Council	Ronald Filippelli
	Donald Hahn
Planning Commission	Silvi Lawrence
Penn State University	Gordon Turow
Ferguson Township	Steve Miller Richard Killian (alternate)
Holmes Foster	Rosalie Bloom Brooks
	Eric Boeldt
Commercial	Rick Kalin
	John Simbeck
	David Houtz
Rental Property	Ginny Chuba
	Donna Conway
Off-Campus Student Union (OCSU)	As designated by OCSU
Unity Church	Duane Bullock
Affordable Housing	Ron Quinn
Redevelopment Authority	Eliza Pennypacker

The vote on the motion was 7-0-0; the motion passed.

GENERAL POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Downtown State College Improvement District Renewal Plan. Mr. Fountaine noted that Council received the renewal plan for the Downtown State College Improvement District on August 21 and held a public hearing on September 5. Three people spoke in favor of the renewal. The plan was reviewed by Council at their work session of September 29. Following the 45-day objection period, which will expire on October 20, and if there are less than 40 percent of the property owners objecting, staff will prepare an ordinance to renew the district for approval in November.

Mr. Kern moved to approve the renewal plan for the Downtown State College Improvement District. Mr. Humphrey seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

Amend the Property Maintenance Code to Allow the Ordinance Enforcement Officers to Enforce. Mr. Fountaine said that, currently, the ordinance enforcement officer has powers for only a select number of ordinances. With additional authority, the ordinance enforcement officer can take immediate action rather than refer the infraction to another individual. Ordinances that impact the maintenance of properties were reviewed and it was determined to be appropriate to authorize enforcement by the ordinance enforcement officer. This will result in a more efficient approach to enforcement and compliance.

Mr. Daubert felt this would need to be rewritten as it allows the enforcement officer to enforce all aspects of the property maintenance code and they were not qualified to enforce all the provisions. Mr. Fountaine agreed that there were some things that require special certification.

Mr. Kern moved to approve Ordinance 1850. Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The vote on the motion was 4-3-0, with Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Daubert and Ms. Goreham opposed. The motion passed.

Resolution to Distribute State Aid for Pensions. Mr. Fountaine said that each year, the Borough receives money from the state to assist in meeting pension obligations. In 2006, the

Borough received $ 836,989.59 to be distributed between the police and general government employees' pension funds. In accordance with Act 205, distribution of the funds must take place by resolution.

Mr. Humphrey moved to approve Resolution 917 to distribute state aid to the Borough's police pension fund and the Borough's general government employees' pension fund. Ms. Dauler seconded the motion, which passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

OFFICIAL REPORTS AND CORRESPODENCE

Mayor's Report. Mr. Welch announced the following appointments to the Redevelopment Authority.

Name	**Term**
Eliza Pennypacker	5 years
Rhonda Johannessen	4 years
Duane Bullock	3 years
Vicki Fong	2 years
Steven Herb	1 year

Mr. Welch also suggested that, following the death of Tom Shade, an appropriate memorial would be to honor him by renaming a street. There are two alleys that run near his home, one of which is named Harley Alley. He suggested one of those blocks could be renamed to Shade Alley. Mr. Fountaine said staff would begin working on putting an ordinance together.

Mr. Welch also announced the Community Resources Fair held the previous week was highly successful. The attendees and exhibitors found it productive and useful. He complimented the Borough staff in their coordination efforts for the use of the Municipal Building. He noted that C-NET would be airing a taping of the fair on October 5.

President's Report. Ms. Dauler announced an executive session of Council held on September 29 to discuss personnel matters.

2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program. Council then recessed the regular meeting to discuss the 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program in a work session.

Council began by discussing the projects proposed for parks. Mr. Sam presented an overview of the completed projects for 2006 and those proposed in the 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program.

Mr. Daubert asked the dog park be removed from the Holmes-Foster Park Master Plan. Because the park was a family park with children, he did not think it was appropriate for dogs. Many children are afraid of dogs.

Mr. Humphrey said he thought the plans for Central Parklet included a waterscape. Mr. Sam said the plans for the tot lot at Central Parklet included a water feature. The water and electricity had been installed in previous renovations. To complete the project, however, staff was waiting for grant funds to become available. Mr. Humphrey encouraged staff to complete this project.

Ms. Goreham noted the pedestrian scale lighting proposed for the parklet in 2007 should explore lighting that is beneficial to safety but not bright and harsh. She noted the lighting installed on Garner Street has created some unintentional issues. Central Parklet could have lighting that is subdued yet effective.

Ms. Goreham suggested staff explore pervious blocks for the parking lot restoration for Holmes Foster Park. Since Westerly Parkway is an area that floods, this could be a recharge area. Mr. Sam said that they could look at the area to determine if the flow of water could be absorbed. Mr. Kern noted that the City of Philadelphia is switching to a pervious pavement material for all of its basketball courts and parking lots. City officials believe that it is assisting them in storm water management for large parks and parking areas. Ms. Story said the pervious material being used in Philadelphia is a new technology and in many cases they are being used as test cases. Currently the Lion Country Visitors Center off of Park Avenue has an impervious parking lot but it appears to be failing in that the pavement materials are deteriorating. Mr. Hahn asked if winter maintenance is an issue for pervious paving materials. Ms. Story noted that it may be an issue. Mr. King said pervious paver blocks were used for the St. Andrews parking lot which has not been as successful. It seems to be more successful in areas of low volume where grass can grow up through the blocks. For high volume areas, the soil between the blocks becomes packed down so that water cannot be absorbed.

Next, Council reviewed the proposed projects for Information Technology. Mr. Grattan presented the projects proposed for 2007 and those that had been delayed until 2008, such as the GIS project and the telephone system.

Ms. Goreham asked the meaning if the estimated life was shown as “on-going.” Mr. Grattan replied it was difficult to say how long the system will be in place. It is reasonable to predict that the maintenance fee will be on-going.

Ms. Goreham asked the status of the wireless internet project. Mr. Fountaine explained Council retained Civitium to go to the next phase to develop a request for proposal and solicit private sector vendors to enter into a private/public partnership. Ms. Goreham said she would like to make sure that there are some services available to the citizens. Mr. Fountaine indicated the request for proposal will include that some public access will be free of charge.

Mr. Daubert noted the wide area network (IT075) indicated that $45,000 was the full cost when it is just our share. Mr. Fountaine said he would get that corrected.

Mr. Daubert said he disagreed with the “paperless Council” project to transmit Council material in an electronic format. He did not believe this would allow Council members to make notes on items of concern. Council members should continue to get a paper copy of the agenda materials. Mr. Kern disagreed and stated that he would prefer to get material electronically. There are many companies moving toward a paperless world. He felt there are two sides to this issue. Mr. Hahn said it was easier to access documents through the computer as opposed to paper. However, he agreed that some things should be on paper. He felt there needed to be a balance. Mr. Fountaine said the degree to which the Council will go paperless will be an individual or group choice. He did not believe that they would be able to totally eliminate paper. The level or degree to which Council will use non-paper agendas will be determined during the design phase which will be done in 2010. Ms. Dauler said that it is important for this Council to join the 21st century and learn about technology. She encouraged staff to consider moving this project forward sooner because 2010 was to far in the future. There have been concerns expressed that Council members will sit behind their screens during meetings and ignore the proceedings. She had seen the Harrisburg officials with their laptops in front of them and they were not glued to their screens but rather used the electronic information as a backup. She understood that it was important to the public that Council appear to be listening to their concerns.

Mr. Filippelli asked if the police records management system would use federal or state money. Mr. King noted that staff continues to looking for alternative sources of funding for this project.

Mr. Kern asked the rationale for moving the Geographic Information System (GIS) (IT076) back to 2008. Mr. Grattan explained a server and applications such as CityView would be installed in 2007. Interdepartmental applications that hook into the system directly will be consider in 2008. Mr. Daubert asked if the system would be compatible with the GIS system for Centre Region Council of Governments (COG). Mr. Grattan said that two years ago they were not. However, COG is contributing to the additional license so that ArcView can be used which will allow for an integrated system. Mr. Hess noted there were separate entities from the County down to the municipal level. Integrating the data is complicated and part of a long-term strategy to standardize the structure so that information is updated. Mr. Fountaine said it is beneficial at the regional level that there is a centralized information technology.

Mr. Fountaine said that Council will need to consider the following questions in their final review of the Capital Improvement Program.

- Do proposed projects concur with Council’s goals and objectives?
- Are changes in existing projects and new proposed projects acceptable?
- Does Council concur with staff’s recommendation on Projects “Not Included”
- Are there other projects that Council wants to include in the CIP?

Mr. Hahn asked that Council receive a summary of the issues raised at the public hearing for the October 9 work session.

Ms. Goreham said she would be in favor of reinstating the neighborhood street signs program. It was important to identify the neighborhoods. Mr. Fountaine explained the signs would be replaced systematically over a 10-year period rather than all in one year. The new design would be used which includes the neighborhood name. Mr. Daubert said that 10 years seemed to be a long period of time. Mr. Fountaine explained that funding of the project is an issue. Mr. Filippelli said that there should be a more concerted effort to get the street signs installed in the historic areas.

Mr. Daubert asked about the project to address flooding problems in Highland Alley. Mr. Fountaine said there is no cost effective solution; once actual numbers are available, it will be included in the Program. In the meantime he noted Council had indicated they did not want to see projects listed without numbers. This project would not occur within the next five years. Mr. Daubert said that without the page included it appears that the project will not be done. Mr. Fountaine said he would include language that reflects that it was removed because it would not be completed within the next five years.

Council also discussed the project to widen the sidewalk along College Avenue. Mr. Kern asked if it could be done without repaving the road. Mr. Fountaine said that was unknown at this time. If the project was cost prohibitive, it would be abandoned. Mr. Hahn asked about the engineering costs for the project. Ms. Story indicated that Borough engineering staff would be working on the project. Mr. Filippelli asked if funding could be raised for widening the sidewalks. Mr. Fountaine noted that it was too early in the project to consider funding streams. The engineering staff would complete their review. Mr. Daubert noted that a study was completed about five years ago on widening the sidewalks and it was clear that it was not feasible. He asked the status of that study. Mr. Fountaine said staff was revisiting that work and would be getting information from PennDOT to see if it could be accomplished. He said that it was an important project that should be considered.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 p.m. for an executive session to discuss litigation.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Cynthia S. Hanscom
Assistant Borough Secretary