

**EAST GOSHEN TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING  
1580 PAOLI PIKE  
February 17, 2014—7:00 pm  
Final Approved Minutes**

**Present:** Chairman Marty Shane, Vice-Chairman Senya D. Isayeff, and Supervisors Carmen Battavio, Chuck Proctor, and Janet Emanuel, CFO Jon Altshul, Township Manager Rick Smith, and ABC member Erich Meyer (Conservancy Board).

**Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance**

Marty called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Moment of Silence**

Carmen called for a moment of silence to honor the troops, all those in uniform, their families, and especially those who have given their lives.

**Recording of Meeting**

No one indicated that they would be recording the meeting.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment

**Chairman's Report**

*Kevin Pierce, Esq., Assistant District Attorney*, was present to answer questions relating to the dog law and the disposition of the criminal charges resulting from the recent dog attack on Brookmont Drive.

Kevin reported that the victims did not want to re-live the experience through a trial, so Judge Tartaglio was left to make a final ruling on the case. Mr. Pierce explained that the prosecutors asked for one result, Judge Tartaglio ruled in a different way, and Mr. Pierce respects the ruling of the Judge. He noted the victims were also comfortable with the Judge's ruling.

*Resident Lisa O'Neill, 10 Brookmont Drive*, asked if the victim had been killed, what would have happened. Mr. Peirce responded that the case would probably have been tried under a different statute. Ms. O'Neill referenced a more recent case involving the dogs, and Mr. Pierce explained that in that case the charges were declined because the D.A.'s Office did not think the case could be proven beyond a reasonable doubt. Ms. O'Neill said that the residents left the last meeting thinking the neighborhood's safety would be paramount, and that does not seem to be the case.

*Resident Eva Snyder, 22 Brookmont Drive* asked Mr. Pierce if pictures of the dogs would be shared with the public. Mr. Pierce said that no, they would not. Ms. Snyder asked if a resident was on the dog owner's property, what would happen. Mr. Pierce responded that

it would be considered trespassing. Ms. Snyder asked when the owners were supposed to be compliant and Mr. Pierce replied that he didn't know the exact date but it was to be soon. Ms. Snyder reported the two warning signs that were supposed to be put up are there now, but they were not put up right away. Mr. Pierce urged the audience to report any violations immediately to the State Dog Warden.

Ms. Snyder asked what if the dogs get out again. Mr. Pierce replied that the next steps outlined in the Dog Law would be followed. Ms. Snyder said that the law was not protecting them. Mr. Pierce noted that neither he, nor the Board, can change state laws. Ms. Snyder asked if any three of the four dogs were deemed dangerous and Mr. Pierce affirmed this. Ms. Snyder asked if any of the dogs have removed from the property, or have been euthanized, and Mr. Pierce replied that to his knowledge the dogs are still on the property.

Marty explained that the Dog Law can only be changed by state legislators. He said that in this case the Judge's decision was within the scope of the Dog Law. He reiterated the importance of reporting violations.

*Joe Mobile, a representative from State Representative Dan Truitt's Office*, asked for clarification about whether under the Dog Law, if a resident is attacked, and the dog is killed to prevent further injury, there is liability for the person who kills the dogs. Mr. Pierce replied that it sounded like Mr. Mobile's understanding was correct. Mr. Mobile asked if this was true even on private property. Mr. Pierce replied that there could be different interpretations in this situation. Senya responded that the wording in statute was straightforward, and he was surprised that Mr. Mobile would ask this question when the wording was so straight-forward.

*Justin Harding, 1 Brookmont Drive*, said that he lives across from the home where the dogs live. He asked if the Dog Warden was a public servant and Mr. Pierce replied yes.

*Resident Frank Snyder, 22 Brookmont Drive*, noted that it was important to balance protection with the law. He said the neighborhood is bonding together to try to find a way to feel safe. He asked how to protect the children of the neighborhood. He suggested thinking creatively within the law, passing ordinances, such as only allowing one dangerous dog per household.

Marty noted that we can regulate the number of dogs, but not the kind of dog in a household. He said that East Goshen currently allows four dogs. This, however, is a zoning issue, and the case at hand is not a zoning issue. He added that enforcement and regulation is up to the Police and the State Dog Warden. Marty agreed that neighborhoods are not the place for dangerous dogs, and urged residents to write their legislators.

Mr. Snyder asked who is responsible for following through on any violations. Rick answered that it is ultimately the PA Department of Agriculture. He also suggested googling "PA" & "dangerous dogs" to access the information available on the

Department's web site. Rick explained that the SPCA is responsible for routine dog law enforcement, but that once a dog bites someone residents should call 911 or the State Dog Warden.

Ms. O'Neill asked if any of the dogs came from the SPCA. She asked if the SPCA has the responsibility to take a dog back if it bites someone. Marty noted that the SPCA classifies dogs as level 1, 2, or 3, where level 3 are the most difficult dogs. Ms. O'Neill asked if a level 3 dog can be adopted. Ms. O'Neill added that some municipalities, such as Media and Glenolden, regulate dangerous dogs. Rick stated he would research the matter,

Don Tyson, 12 Line Rd, noted that if the defendants shot two kids, and then there would be two charges. He asked why, then, if there were four dogs, and more bites, there were not more charges. Mr. Pierce responded that this is how the law is written. Mr. Tyson was confused about who to call to report violations. The Police told him to call the D.A. and the D.A. told him to call the Police. He asked why the police cannot answer questions.

Chief Bernot responded that the Police can't discuss active investigations. She did work with the D.A. on the second reported incident, which was fully investigated and was not found to have enough evidence to prosecute. She encouraged residents to call the Police in case of an offense, and, if possible, even take a picture of the violation.

Mr. Tyson asked why the Police couldn't talk about the case. He asked Chief Bernot if he could see the police report. Chief Bernot said that he could not see the Police Report because it is an active investigation. Mr. Tyson asked if there was a transcript of the hearing. Mr. Peirce could not remember whether a court reporter had been present or not.

Mr. Tyson asked if he could have pictures of the dogs so his kids would be able to recognize them. Mr. Pierce replied that the D.A.'s office does not give out pictures. Mr. Tyson asked what the law considers a proper enclosure and Mr. Pierce deferred to the State Dog Warden. Mr. Tyson wanted to know the role of the SPCA. Rick replied that the SPCA provides animal control, but that dangerous dogs are out of its jurisdiction.

Marty wanted to make it clear that residents should call the Police or the State Dog Warden if they observe a violation. Mr. Tyson asked if the Board would invite the State Dog Warden to a Board Meeting, and Marty said yes.

*Willistown Resident, Diane Weltman, 5 Line Road*, was frustrated that there was nothing the Township could do to remedy the situation, and she expressed a desire to start here, rather than with state legislators. She said the Board represents the people, and there are things they want changed. Ms. Weltman asked if, at a Township level, the Board would move forward with trying to make changes to the Dog Law.

Marty replied that we can work with our state legislators, and he added that the Board in general has a good working relationship with the people who can make changes. He added that we can be more effective if multiple Townships are involved.

Carmen suggested that the Brookmont community write a letter, or letters, to send to legislators. He added that the more people who participate, the greater the chance for change.

Rick suggested that residents contact him directly with specific suggested changes to the Dog Law and that he would compile a list and send it to the legislators.

#### Comp Plan Update

Janet reported that the next meeting is February 23<sup>rd</sup>.

#### Police Commission

Chuck announced that WEGO is hosting a promotion ceremony on February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015, at 5:00 pm. Chuck noted that the Police Department has started 12-hour shifts, and that this model would be reviewed on a regular basis to be sure it is working as desired.

#### Malvern Fire Company

Rick noted that the Malvern Fire Company had one cover assignment in East Goshen last month. He also reported that a sprinkler pipe burst in Bellingham last night, forcing some residents to be relocated.

#### January 2015 Financial Report

Jon reported that the general fund had revenues of \$700,560 compared to expenses of \$901,236, for a year-to-date deficit of \$200,676. Compared to the YTD budget, revenues were \$222,103 over budget and expenses were \$90,577 under budget, for a positive budget variance of \$312,680. Jon also noted that the auditors would be on-site next week.

#### Consider Request to Reduce Speed Limit on East Strasburg Road

Marty announced that we are in receipt of a letter asking us to submit a request to PennDOT to reduce the speed limit on the section of Strasburg Road between North Chester Road and Dutton Mill Road. The current speed limit is 40 mph and the requested speed limit is 35 mph.

*Residents Bob and Roseanne DeLucca, 1630 East Strasburg Road*, informed the Board that since they have lived there, traffic has increased. They observe large trucks driving at unsafe speeds. Also, they report that visibility from their driveway is poor. Mr. DeLucca said that the speed indicator set up by the Township helped reduce the speed of cars.

Marty noted that the Board can request that PennDOT do a speed study at this location to determine whether a lower speed limit is warranted, but that the odds are low that a speed study will produce this finding.

Mr. DeLucca said that if the police patrolled the road, it would help. He has observed that where the Police are seen regularly, people often slow down. Marty asked Chuck to relay this matter to Chief Bernot. Marty asked if Mr. and Mrs. DeLucca would still like to request the reduction in speed limit from PennDOT and they both replied yes. Senya

observed that changing the speed limit won't change speeding behavior, but that regulation of the speed limit does.

Mrs. DeLucca explained that years ago PennDOT cut down a hill near their driveway, but it was not cut down enough, making visibility difficult. She asked if PennDOT could put a weight limit on trucks using this road. Mrs. DeLucca also related that her son had been broad-sided coming out of the driveway. Janet noted that PennDOT was going to cut the hill down more, but it ran into rock.

Carmen noted that if the DeLuccas see trucks speeding, they should try to get some identifying information from the truck, such as the truck number, license plate, or company, and report the driver to the company. He added that most truck companies have aggressive safe driving policies.

Senya asked if the DeLuccas saw the speed data that the Township gathered from its own speed study, and Carmen gave the DeLuccas a copy of the report. Marty noted that if PennDOT does a study, the data may yield different results. Mrs. DeLucca asked again about putting a weight limit on the road, and Rick replied that PennDOT will only do so if there is some structure, such as a bridge, that is weight-restricted.

It was the consensus of the Board to send a letter to PennDOT asking for a reduction in the speed limit.

### **Consider Grothman Variance Request for 1331 East Strasburg Road**

*Debbie Shulski, Esquire, Riley Riper Hollin & Colagreco*, representing Jason and Elizabeth Grothman, explained that Mr. Grothman made two attempts to invite the neighbors of 1331 East Strasburg Road to meet with him about subdividing the property, and building two homes. No one responded. The Grothmans are in receipt of one letter from a neighbor concerning the property. Ms. Shulski added that Jason has added an agreement to retain the existing mature tree line.

Senya asked if the neighbors who wrote the letter had seen the building plans. Mr. Grothman replied that no, they had not seen the plans. Senya said that the letter does not help his case, because the neighbors who wrote it couldn't possibly understand what they were supporting if they had not seen the plan.

Ms. Shulski emphasized that Mr. Grothman made a good faith effort to get input from the neighbors. Senya understood it to sound like Mr. Grothman was offering to keep trees in order to get a variance for a subdivision. Janet noted that one gentleman attended a Planning Commission meeting and was opposed to the subdivision.

Ms. Shulski asked if the width of the lot was a concern, because she says that a hardship results from the unique shape of the property. She added that the minimum lot size is geared toward providing on site water and sewer. Ms. Shulski noted that compared to the other lot widths, the new subdivided lot would be consistent with the existing character of the neighborhood. *John Mullin, P.E., Mulling Engineering LLC*, stated that 80% of

parcels within 1,000 feet of the proposed lots have a lesser lot width. However, Carmen observed that this is probably due to the R-3 zoning district being located directly across the street.

Marty noted that a variance of this amount, in his opinion, does not meet the *de minimis* requirement. Senya had hoped that the neighbors got together, and added that he would be concerned if he were a neighbor. In the absence of neighbors' support, Senya stated that he couldn't support the variance.

Carmen said that he is very much for property rights, but this case is not *de minimis* and is a self-created hardship. Chuck observed that Mr. Grothman should have known when he bought the property, that it was of such a size that it could not be subdivided.

Senya made a motion to oppose the application and direct the solicitor to enter an appearance for the Township at the Zoning Hearing. Janet seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

#### **Consider Traffic Signal Improvements for West Chester Pike**

Rick explained that in order to apply for a PennDOT Green Light Go grant for interactive signal technology along Route 3, the Board would need to authorize him to send a letter to PennDOT attesting that the Board had approved matching funds for the project. He added that those matching funds would come from the Transportation Fund.

Marty asked Rick whether Westtown was interested in a joint grant application for traffic signal improvements along West Chester Pike, and Rick responded that they were meeting tonight as well and he will know the answer tomorrow morning.

Janet said that she is in favor of the proposal. She attended the DVRPC meeting and they were discussing buses and traffic on West Chester Pike. Chuck added that he is also in favor, and that he hopes other municipalities participate.

Chuck made a motion to direct the Township Manager to send a letter to PennDOT informing it that the East Goshen Board of Supervisors approved matching funds of 50% for a Green Light – Go grant in the amount of \$257,083. Senya seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

#### **Consider Drone Ordinance**

Rick added language about rockets to the draft drone ordinance as requested by the Board. He noted that the FAA recently came out with regulations for commercial drones, but that we are concerned with recreational drones.

Senya made a motion to advertise for a public hearing on an ordinance to regulate the use and operation of model aircraft in the Township. Chuck seconded the motion. Senya added that the drone issue is getting a lot of press, and is more complex than it may seem. The Board voted to approve the motion unanimously.

### **Consider Solar Ordinance Amendment**

The Board reviewed the revised draft amendment to the solar ordinance as recommended by the Planning Commission.

Senya made a motion to direct staff to advertise for a public hearing on an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance regarding solar energy systems that are built as an accessory use. Chuck seconded the motion. The Board moved to approve the motion unanimously.

### **Consider Destination Trip**

Rick explained that Collette Travel was the only respondent to our RFP for a destination trip. Senya asked if a request was sent to other local companies. Rick said it was sent to four or five companies, but he didn't know if they were local. Marty added that we would be agreeing to only one trip this year, and we could use this as a test to see if we want to continue offering destination trips.

Janet made a motion to select Collette Travel to offer one destination trip in 2015. At the conclusion of the trip, the Park Commission will evaluate participant satisfaction and decide to extend or terminate for 2016. Carmen seconded the motion.

Senya said he views this vote as an endorsement of the company, which the Township does not normally do. He also questioned whether this decision was being driven by revenue rather than service to the residents.

Carmen observed that Jason is driven to be revenue positive. Carmen was surprised that there were no other bidders. Senya added that there is something mercenary about the trip revenues that does not appeal to him. Carmen agreed that East Goshen residents would be paying an additional price so that Parks and Recreation can collect revenue, but Marty stated that if enough people want to participate, we should offer the trip.

The Board voted 4-1 to approve the motion. Senya voted "nay" because he feels we should not be in the business of making money off of our residents.

### **Consider Rooftop Structures**

Marty noted that the Board is in receipt of two proposed amendments from the Planning Commission for screening requirements for rooftop structures and the definition of a wooded lot.

Rick noted that the solicitor had combined the Rooftop Structures zoning ordinance amendment and the Wooded Lot subdivision and land development ordinance amendment into a single ordinance.

Carmen made a motion to direct the staff to forward the proposed amendments ("Rooftop Screening Requirements Amendment", and the Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance Amendment adding the definitions for "wooded Lot," "invasive trees," and non-invasive" trees, to the CCPC for their review and comment. Janet seconded the motion. The board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

### **Consider Community Day**

Marty acknowledged a memo from the Parks and Recreation Commission recommending a scaled down Community Day this year. He asked Jon how much revenue the Friends of East Goshen might expect to raise for Community Day. Jon estimated that based on the past two years, Friends might be expected to raise \$10,000, plus \$2,000 or \$3,000 from Jason from the sale of glowsticks and bumper stickers, and another \$1,000 from our profit sharing arrangement with the food vendor. All total, Jon estimated this would cover about 85% of the expected costs of a scaled down event.

The Board expressed its frustration with the failure of Friends of East Goshen to raise the funds necessary for this event. Carmen noted that the Parks Commission was upset that the Chair of Friends of East Goshen did not attend its last meeting and a new member of Friends was sent in her absence. Senya stated that he finds it difficult to explain to residents why the funds for Community Day should come out of their pocket. Senya said that unless we have the money for the event, we should not have Community Day.

Marty agreed that we should not do a full Community Day like last year, but he noted that assuming Jon's estimates are accurate a net cost of \$2,000 is a relatively small cost for a worthwhile event like Community Day, even if it is scaled down.

Carmen agrees that it is great to bring people together at our three main events: Community Day, The Harvest Festival, and the Easter Egg Hunt. He suggested we could skip Community Day and concentrate more on the other two events. He noted that Community Day draws a lot of guests from outside East Goshen, while the other two events attract more East Goshen residents. Carmen added that until we solve the 501(c)3 problem, we need to pursue an alternative funding strategy.

Janet stated that she attends all community events, and even if we cut back, we should still have Community Day. She added that if we had the money we should go for the full-blown event, but even if we reduce it, we should not cancel. Janet observed that we have a spring event, and a fall event, and we should have a summer event.

Chuck said that when the 501(c)3 was started, checks were coming in on a regular basis, but now the checks have dwindled to nothing. He would like to see some kind of Community Day, but not at an expense of the Township.

Marty noted that the Egg Hunt and Harvest Festival cost the Township money. He asked Jon how much those events cost, and Jon indicated that Pumpkin Fest costs about \$3,500, while the Egg Hunt costs less than \$2,000. Senya noted that there is much less burden on Police and Public Works for those two events. Marty agreed that the 501(c)3 problem needs to be resolved.

Senya made a motion to not have Community Day in absence of funds from the 501(c)3. Carmen seconded the motion. The Board voted 3-2 to approve the motion, with Marty and Janet against.

Chuck recommended that Jason explore options for having a free Community Day.

**Consider Ashleybrooke Estates Escrow Release #10**

As outlined in the memos from Mark Miller, Senya made a motion to approve the escrow releases of \$28,325.10 for Ashleybrook Estates and \$406,668.50 for Goshen Meadows. Janet seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

**Consider Recommendation to Replace Two Pick-up Trucks**

Marty noted that Mark Miller suggested that we are scheduled to replace two Ford F350 pick-up trucks. Three quotes were received:

Garnet Ford	\$101,195.00
Hoskins Ford	\$76,390.00
New Holland Ford	\$82,654.00

Senya made a motion to purchase two trucks from Hoskins Ford, including all trade-ins, plows and lighting packages. Carmen seconded the motion. The Board voted to approve the motion unanimously.

**Consider Keeping of Animals and Fowl Ordinance**

Rick explained that based on discussions with our solicitor, the Board may want to consider a curative amendment to the section of the zoning ordinance limiting the number of dogs on a property in order to provide justification for that limit.

Carmen made a motion that the Board declare Section 240-32.A (1) of the Zoning Ordinance substantively invalid pursuant to the procedures in Section 609.2 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, 53 P.S. § 10609.2 and authorize the township Solicitor to (1) prepare a Resolution which makes specific findings as to why Section 240-32.A (1) is substantively invalid; and (2) begin to prepare a curative amendment to correct the alleged invalidity.

Senya seconded the motion. The Board voted to approve the motion unanimously.

**Acknowledge Deer Management Program Report**

Marty acknowledged receipt of the Deer Committee's 2014 Deer Management Program Report, and noted that the Deer Management Group is doing a good job. He asked if we should continue the deer hunt in Grand Oak because they only harvested one deer. Rick suggested asking the hunters.

Rick reported that due to frequent member absences, there is a request to change the Deer Committee from five people to three people, enabling a quorum of two.

**Consider Butterfly Garden**

Rick explained Jason wanted to make the Board aware of a proposal from the West Chester Garden Club of America to have a butterfly garden in the Park. The club would

pay for and manage the garden for one year and then turn the garden over to the Township, which would be able to manage the garden at a cost of about \$200 per year.

Marty asked if the recommended location near the Tot Lot was the best place for the garden. Carmen responded that although this is one of the best areas in terms of water and sunlight, other areas would be considered. Chuck agreed that another area, away from the Tot Lot, would be better.

Janet noted that the Conservancy Board discussed this at its last meeting and there was some concern about the upkeep of the garden. She is concerned that the upkeep will fall to the Conservancy Board, which does not want to be solely responsible for the upkeep of the garden after the first year.

Carmen suggested that once established, the garden might not need much maintenance. Erich Meyer, Conservancy Board, said that it will need continuous maintenance. Carmen added that there will be more information coming, and that Jason Lang has lists of volunteers from local high schools. Marty added that the Board needs a better idea of the volunteer participation and the expense of maintaining the garden.

Senya noted that Monarch Butterflies are dying in a similar fashion to the bee hive colony collapse, and that the Buddleia is a hardy plant that is great for butterflies. Carmen added that butterflies are specific to certain plants, so that many species would need to be included.

Chuck would like to see educational signs about the garden installed. Rick responded that PECO grants are available for this purpose. The Board agreed to discuss the matter again.

### **Consider Tennis Courts Renovation**

Rick presented a memo from the Park and Recreation Commission recommending that the back three tennis courts be resurfaced as hard courts, so that the space could be used for a variety of activities such as tennis, pickleball and/or roller hockey.

Marty wanted to know how to control when the courts would be used for alternate uses, like pickleball or hockey, and Rick responded that Jason would create a schedule. Janet added that Hershey's Mill has their own pickle ball court, and it has been successful likely due to lessons at the site. Rick indicated that Jason would organize pickleball lessons for those new to the sport.

Marty noted that if the Township is going to spend \$32,000, we need to know how much revenue we can generate from the courts. Rick indicated that the current fee schedule for tennis keys was unlikely to generate a lot of revenue. Senya suggested that if having 6 courts would allow USTA to hold events in the Park, we should reach out to USTA to ask it to help pay for improvements to the courts.

Carmen proposed that the Parks and Recreation Commission give a presentation to the Board with more information. The Board agreed with this suggestion, and Rick stated that he would reach out to Jason about it for the next meeting.

### **Any Other Matter**

Rick advised the Board that he had identified goals for the various ABCs. It was the consensus of the Board that Rick should distribute his suggested goals to the various ABCs.

Senya made a motion to authorize the Chairman to execute the following stormwater management, maintenance, and operation agreements: 1604 Margo Lane, 1746 Towne Drive, 1531 East Strasburg Road, and 33 Ruth Circle. Carmen seconded the motion. The Board voted to approve the motion unanimously.

Senya asked about the legality and perception of the Township setting up a new 501(c) 3 to be governed by members of the Board of Supervisors. Chuck said that he would be willing to research this issue and would report back to the Board.

Rick asked if anyone had driven by the Dunkin Donuts site because a mock up sign and mock up landscaping was erected for us to get an idea of what a sign would look like. Senya saw it as he was approaching the intersection going east. Rick observed that if Dunkin Donuts lowered the sign by about 1 foot, you couldn't see the menu board. He encouraged the Board to drive by and email any comments to him.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The Board reviewed and corrected the draft minutes of the Annual Planning Meeting on January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015, and the East Goshen Bus Tour from January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015. Marty said the minutes would stand approved as corrected.

### **Treasurer's Report**

*See attached Treasurer's Report for January 15, 2015.* The Board reviewed the Treasurer's Report and the current invoices. Carmen moved to graciously accept the Treasurer's Report and the Expenditure Register Report as recommended by the Treasurer, to accept the receipts and to authorize payment of the invoices just reviewed. Senya seconded the motion. Senya thanked Jon his memo about the demographics of East Goshen Township. The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the Board adjourned at 10:15.

Pam Pastorino  
Recording Secretary  
Attachments: *Treasurer's Report*

February 12, 2015

**TREASURER'S REPORT  
2015 RECEIPTS AND BILLS**

**GENERAL FUND**

Real Estate Tax	\$228,156.23	Accounts Payable	\$434,896.84
Earned Income Tax	\$588,019.62	<u>Electronic Pmts:</u>	
Local Service Tax	\$12,819.69	Health Insurance	\$46,623.45
Transfer Tax	\$0.00	Credit Card	\$0.00
<i>General Fund Interest Earned</i>	\$364.79	Postage	\$1,000.00
Total Other Revenue	\$40,349.79	Debt Service	\$14,894.16
Total Receipts:	<b>\$869,710.12</b>	Payroll	\$88,393.05
		Total Expenditures:	<b>\$585,807.50</b>

**STATE LIQUID FUELS FUND**

Receipts	\$0.00		
<i>Interest Earned</i>	\$0.00		
Total State Liquid Fuels:	<b>\$0.00</b>	Expenditures:	<b>\$0.00</b>

**SINKING FUND**

<i>Interest Earned</i>	<b>\$425.64</b>	Expenditures:	<b>\$0.00</b>
------------------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------

**TRANSPORTATION FUND**

<i>Interest Earned</i>	<b>\$203.77</b>	Expenditures:	<b>\$0.00</b>
	\$0.00		

**SEWER OPERATING FUND**

Receipts	\$213,781.36	Accounts Payable	\$115,680.40
<i>Interest Earned</i>	\$44.74	Debt Service	\$33,440.94
Total Sewer:	<b>\$213,826.10</b>	Credit Card	\$0.00
		Total Expenditures:	<b>\$149,121.34</b>

**REFUSE FUND**

Receipts	\$67,964.19		
<i>Interest Earned</i>	\$18.62		
Total Refuse:	<b>\$67,982.81</b>	Expenditures	<b>\$62,786.74</b>

**SEWER SINKING FUND**

<i>Interest Earned</i>	<b>\$231.90</b>	Expenditures	<b>\$5,600.00</b>
------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-------------------

**OPERATING RESERVE FUND**

Receipts	<b>\$266.73</b>	Expenditures	<b>\$0.00</b>
----------	-----------------	--------------	---------------

**Events Fund**

Receipts	<b>\$0.69</b>	Expenditures	<b>\$0.00</b>
----------	---------------	--------------	---------------