

REGULAR MEETING
BOROUGH COUNCIL
BOROUGH OF RUMSON
June 23, 2015

A regular meeting of the Borough Council of the Borough of Rumson was held in the Charles S. Callman Courtroom of Borough Hall on June 23, 2015 at 7:30 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance.

Present: Mayor Ekdahl, Councilwoman Atwell, Councilmen Broderick, Conklin, Day, Hemphill and Rubin.

Absent: None.

Thomas S. Rogers, Municipal Clerk/Administrator, was present.

Martin M. Barger, Borough Attorney, was present.

David Marks of T & M Associates was present.

The Mayor declared a quorum present and announced that the notice requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been met by the posting and mailing of a schedule of all regular and work meetings of the Borough Council for the year 2015 to the *Asbury Park Press* and the *Two River Times*.

On motion by Councilman Rubin, seconded by Councilman Day, the minutes of the previous meeting were approved as written, copies having been forwarded to all Council members. All in favor.

COMMUNICATIONS:

LETTER FROM FAIR HAVEN BOROUGH CLERK ADVISING THAT THEIR BOROUGH COUNCIL ADOPTED RESOLUTION 2015-130 AUTHORIZING THE INTERLOCAL SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR BRUSH DISPOSAL, PARKS AND GROUNDS MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE, STREET SWEEPING, CATCH BASIN CLEANING AND ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS SERVICES AND RESOLUTION 2015-131 AUTHORIZING AN AMENDED AGREEMENT FOR SHARED CONSTRUCTION CODE SERVICES:

The Municipal Clerk/Administrator advised of a letter dated June 17, 2015 from Allyson M. Cinquegrana, Fair Haven Borough Clerk, enclosing copies of Resolutions 2015-130 and 2015-131 and the fully executed Agreements for Interlocal Service Agreement for Brush Disposal, Parks and Grounds Management and Maintenance, Street Sweeping, Catch Basin Cleaning and Engineering and Public Works Services and Resolution 2015-131 authorizing an Amended Agreement for Shared Construction Code Services.

On motion by Councilman Rubin, seconded by Councilman Hemphill, this communication was ordered received. All in favor.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

None.

NEW BUSINESS:

RESOLUTION 2015-0623-88 AUTHORIZING TO SET THE 2015 SALARIES OF CERTAIN BOROUGH OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES AND APPOINTEES:

Councilman Broderick offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

**RESOLUTION FIXING SALARIES OF CERTAIN
BOROUGH OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES AND APPOINTEES**

WHEREAS, an ordinance entitled “AN ORDINANCE FIXING COMPENSATION OF BOROUGH OFFICERS AND CERTAIN BOROUGH EMPLOYEES IN THE BOROUGH OF RUMSON, NEW JERSEY” has been adopted following public hearing; and

WHEREAS, said ordinance provides for salary ranges of various job titles and positions; and

WHEREAS, it is the intention of the Mayor and Council to fix the salaries of those individuals who hold such positions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Rumson that the salaries of the officers and employees holding the positions set forth below, and subject to the salary ranges set forth in the aforementioned ordinance, are hereby fixed effective January 1, 2015, unless stated otherwise, as follows:

<u>TITLE OF POSITION</u>	<u>2015 SALARY AS OF JANUARY 1, 2015</u>
Borough Administrator	\$ 88,301.00
Administrative Secretary	\$ 43,591.00
Receptionist/Secretary	\$ 32,252.00
Municipal Clerk	\$ 88,919.00
Deputy Municipal Clerk	\$ 60,343.00
Chief Financial Officer/Qualified Purchasing Agent	\$ 83,948.00
Finance Assistant/Payroll Clerk (Hope Richardson Pro-Rated 01/01/15-06/30/15)	\$ 41,243.00
Finance Assistant (Melissa McGuire Pro-Rated 06/22/15-12/31/15)	\$ 32,000.00
Payroll Clerk (Marie Kuhlthau Pro-Rated 07/01/15-12/31/15)	\$ 4,000.00
Tax Assessor	\$ 35,028.00
Tax Assistant to the Tax Assessor (Sabine O’Connor Pro-Rated 01/01/15-06/30/15)	\$ 11,774.00
Tax Collector	\$ 26,289.00
Tax Assistant to the Tax Collector & Assessor	\$ 41,838.00
Deputy Tax Collector	\$ 4,162.00
Clerk of Zoning Board	\$ 6,294.00
Zoning Board Attorney	\$ 6,747.00
Zoning Board Clerical Assistant (Up to a two-hour meeting)	\$ 116.00 per meeting
Zoning Board Clerical Assistant (Meeting over two hours)	\$ 174.00 per meeting
Secretary to the Planning Board	\$ 6,294.00
Planning Board Attorney	\$ 6,747.00
Planning Board Clerical Assistant (Up to a two-hour meeting)	\$ 116.00 per meeting
Planning Board Clerical Assistant (Meeting over two hours)	\$ 174.00 per meeting
Zoning Officer	\$ 40,922.00
Tree Ordinance Official	\$ 3,896.00
Code Enforcement Officer	\$ 7,197.00
Code Enforcement Assistant (Sabine O’Connor)	\$ 2,000.00
Construction Official, Electric Subcode Official, Building Inspector, Alternate Building Subcode Official, Flood Plain Manager (Dennis Peras)	\$103,913.00
Alternate Building Subcode Official, Electric Inspector Alternate Electric Subcode Official (Nicholas Fabiano)	\$ 20,560.00
Plumbing Subcode Official (James Ammaturo, Jr.)	\$ 12,735.00
Plumbing Inspector	

(Eugene Ferry, Jr.)	\$ 7,429.00
Fire Subcode Official	
(Fred Migliaccio)	\$ 10,404.00
Fire Protection Marshall	
(Vito Marra)	\$ 5,722.00
Building Subcode Official	
(Paul Reinhold, Jr)	\$ 30.00 per hour
Technical/Clerical Assistant to Construction Official	
(Lynda Doyle)	\$ 71,815.00
(Sabine O'Connor Pro-Rated 07/01/15-12/31/15)	\$ 60,000.00
Clerical Assistant to Building Department	
(Sabine O'Connor Pro-Rated 01/01/15-06/30/15)	\$ 48,226.00
Municipal Prosecutor	\$ 12,240.00
Alternate Municipal Prosecutor	\$ 350.00 per session
Custodian	\$ 47,644.00
Registrar of Vital Statistics	\$ 4,709.00
Deputy Registrar of Vital Statistics	\$ 2,355.00
Police Dispatchers (Full-time)	
(Shannon Marie McCurdy)	\$ 30,418.00
Police Dispatchers/Special Class II Officers (Full-time)	
(Michael Berger)	\$ 30,127.00
(Ryan Leahy)	\$ 27,040.00
(Grace Maggiulli Pro-Rated 01/01/15-05/31/15)	\$ 26,000.00
(Grace Maggiulli Pro-Rated 06/01/15-12/31/15)	\$ 27,040.00
(Donald Morse Pro-Rated 01/01/15-06/30/15)	\$ 27,040.00
(Donald Morse Pro-Rated 07/01/15-12/31/15)	\$ 27,581.00
Police Dispatchers (Part-time)	
(Jenna Danbrowney)	\$ 12.00 per hour
(Scott Lorensen)	\$ 12.25 per hour
(Kyle McCartney)	\$ 12.00 per hour
(Darren McConnell 01/01/15-06/30/15)	\$ 12.00 per hour
(Darren McConnell 07/01/15-12/31/15)	\$ 12.25 per hour
(Jennifer Noonan)	\$ 12.50 per hour
(Michael Volker 01/01/15-06/30/15)	\$ 12.00 per hour
(Michael Volker 07/01/15-12/31/15)	\$ 12.25 per hour
Police Records Clerk	
(Shannon Marie McCurdy)	\$ 9,582.00
Police Matrons	
(Jennifer Brennan-Trivett)	\$ 17.34 per hour
(Mary Nichols)	\$ 17.00 per hour
(Jennifer Noonan)	\$ 17.00 per hour
Guard for Boat Launching Ramp	
(Lee West)	\$ 14.53 per hour
Recycling Special Police Officer	
(Donald Manning)	\$ 15.99 per hour
(John P. Tucker)	\$ 12.50 per hour
Recreation Director	\$ 67,626.00
Recreation Monitors	
(Lawrence D'Angelo)	\$ 15.00 per hour
(Robert Micieli)	\$ 15.00 per hour
(Marie Kuhlthau)	\$ 15.00 per hour
(Robert Savoth)	\$ 15.00 per hour
Summer Recreation Program Coordinator	\$ 5,202.00 per season
Summer Recreation Assistant Program Coordinator	\$ 3,329.00 per season
Municipal Judge	\$ 23,825.00
Alternate Municipal Judge	\$ 500.00 per session
Municipal Court Administrator	\$ 50,000.00
Municipal Court Assistants	
Court Personnel (Part-time)	
(Dale Connor 01/01/15-03/31/15)	\$ 60.45 per session
(Janice Swaggerty)	\$ 60.45 per session
(Mary Jane Sedlak 01/01/15-04/17/15)	\$ 60.45 per session
(Mary Jane Sedlak 04/18/15-12/31/15)	\$ 16.22 per hour
Public Defender	\$ 2,589.00

Custodian of Fire Equipment	
(Robert Marass)	\$ 5,275.00
(Nick Luiten)	\$ 4,682.00
Custodian of First Aid Equipment	\$ 5,275.00
Animal Control Warden	\$ 4,617.00
Superintendent of Public Works	\$110,920.00
Public Works Foreman	\$ 82,807.00
Public Works Assistant Foremen	
(Robert Anderson)	\$ 77,286.00
(Lawrence D'Angelo)	\$ 74,285.00
(Daryl Kochel)	\$ 77,286.00
Public Works Assistant Foreman/Recycling Coordinator	\$ 77,286.00
Public Works Assistant Foreman/Borough Mechanic	\$ 75,771.00
Public Works Assistant Foreman/Wastewater Management	\$ 71,400.00
Borough Mechanic	\$ 52,500.00
Laborers	
(Kevin Anderson)	\$ 67,714.00
(Michael Bouthillier (Pro-Rated 01/01/15-04/30/15))	\$ 66,386.00
(Richard Campanella)	\$ 67,177.00
(Patrick D'Amelio)	\$ 67,177.00
(Steven Davidson)	\$ 67,177.00
(Adam Domorski)	\$ 41,250.00
(Michael Guinan)	\$ 67,714.00
(Christopher Halstead)	\$ 66,688.00
(Robert Morley)	\$ 53,060.00
(James M. Peluso)	\$ 67,177.00
(Robert Savoth)	\$ 63,283.00
Police Chief	\$130,529.00

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in addition to the above, the Chief of Police shall receive \$6,050 per year effective January 1, 2015 for longevity; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in addition to the above, the Chief of Police shall receive \$750 per year Educational Incentive effective January 1, 2015; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the above rates shall be retroactive to January 1, 2015.

Resolution seconded by Councilman Hemphill and carried upon the following roll call vote:

In the affirmative: Atwell, Broderick, Conklin, Day, Hemphill and Rubin.

In the negative: None.

Absent: None.

RESOLUTION 2015-0623-89 AUTHORIZING THE APPOINTMENT OF TWO SUMMER RECREATION PROGRAM JUNIOR COUNSELORS:

2015-0623-89

Councilman Hemphill offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION FIXING SALARIES OF CERTAIN
BOROUGH OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES AND APPOINTEES

WHEREAS, an ordinance entitled "AN ORDINANCE FIXING COMPENSATION OF BOROUGH OFFICERS AND CERTAIN BOROUGH EMPLOYEES IN THE BOROUGH OF RUMSON, NEW JERSEY" has been adopted following public hearing; and

WHEREAS, said ordinance provides for salary ranges of various job titles and positions; and

WHEREAS, it is the intention of the Mayor and Council to fix the salaries of those individuals who hold such positions; and

WHEREAS, the Borough of Rumson through its Recreation Commission has decided to hire part-time employees for the Borough's summer recreation program;

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of the Borough to pay said employees on an hourly basis;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Rumson that the hourly rate for the 2015 part-time Summer Recreation Program employees be fixed as follows:

Junior Recreation Counselor	\$ 7.25 per hour
Devon Borden	
Victoria DiPalma	

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the Payroll Clerk and Chief Financial Officer.

Resolution seconded by Councilman Day and carried on the following roll call vote:

In the affirmative: Atwell, Broderick, Conklin, Day, Hemphill and Rubin.

In the negative: None.

Absent: None.

RESOLUTION 2015-0623-90 AUTHORIZING THE APPOINTMENT OF FOUR COACHES FOR THE RUMSON RECREATION SUMMER CREW PROGRAM:

2015-0623-90

Councilman Rubin offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Rumson Recreation is in need of four (4) part-time Coaches for the Summer Recreation Crew Program; and

WHEREAS, Christopher Seslar, Andrew Hudson, Kate Edwards and Mary Clare Condon have coached as volunteers for the Recreation Crew Program; and

WHEREAS, it is the Recommendation of the Recreation Director to hire the four coaches for the Summer Crew Program; and

WHEREAS, the Recreation Commission has approved these appointments; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of the Borough to pay the Crew Coaches on an hourly basis;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Borough Council of the Borough of Rumson hereby approves the appointment of Christopher Seslar, Andrew Hudson, Kate Edwards and Mary Clare Condon as Crew Coaches for the Recreation Summer Crew Program effective July 6, 2015; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Crew Coaches be paid twenty (\$20.00) dollars per hour to Chris Seslar and Andrew Hudson and thirteen (\$13.00) dollars per hour to Kate Edwards and Mary Clare Condon; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a certified copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the Chief Financial Officer and Payroll Clerk.

Resolution seconded by Councilman Broderick and carried on the following roll call vote:

In the affirmative: Atwell, Broderick, Conklin, Day, Hemphill and Rubin.

In the negative: None.

Absent: None.

RESOLUTION 2015-0623-91 PROVIDING FOR THE INSERTION OF A SPECIAL ITEM OF REVENUE IN THE 2015 BUDGET OF THE BOROUGH OF RUMSON IN THE SUM OF \$48,327.50, WHICH IS NOW AVAILABLE FROM THE BOROUGH OF FAIR HAVEN, THROUGH A SHARED SERVICES AGREEMENT FOR A SHARED CONSTRUCTION OFFICE:

2015-0623-91

Councilman Day offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING APPROVAL OF ITEMS OF REVENUE AND APPROPRIATION N.J.S. 40A:4-87

WHEREAS, N.J.S. 40A:40-87 provides that the Director of the Division of Local Government Services may approve the insertion of any special item of revenue in the budget of any county or municipality when such item shall have been made available by law and the amount was not determined at the time of the adoption of the budget; and

WHEREAS, the Director may also approve the insertion of an item of appropriation for equal amount; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Borough Council of the Borough of Rumson in the County of Monmouth, New Jersey, hereby requests the Director of the Division of Local Government Services to approve the insertion of an item of revenue in the budget of the year 2015 in the sum of \$48,327.50, which is now available from the Borough of Fair Haven, through a Shared Services Agreement for a Shared Construction Office; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a sum of \$11,399.50 is hereby appropriated under the caption "Fair Haven Shared Service Agreement – Construction Office Other Expenses;" and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a sum of \$36,928.00 is hereby appropriated under the caption "Fair Haven Share Service Agreement – Construction Salary & Wages;" and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the above is the result of an Interlocal Service Agreement with the Borough of Fair Haven.

Resolution seconded by Councilman Hemphill and carried on the following roll call vote:

In the affirmative: Atwell, Broderick, Conklin, Day, Hemphill and Rubin.

In the negative: None.

Absent: None.

RESOLUTION 2015-0623-92 PROVIDING FOR THE INSERTION OF A SPECIAL ITEM OF REVENUE IN THE 2015 BUDGET OF THE BOROUGH OF RUMSON FOR A \$18,091.01 STATE OF NEW JERSEY CLEAN COMMUNITY GRANT:

2015-0623-92

Councilman Rubin offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE INSERTION OF A SPECIAL ITEM OF REVENUE IN THE BUDGET OF THE BOROUGH OF RUMSON PURSUANT TO N.J.S.A. 40A:4-87 (CHAPTER 159, P.L. 1948)

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 40A:4-87 provides that the Director of the Division of Local Finance may approve the insertion of any special item of revenue in the budget of any county or municipality when such item shall have been made available by law and the amount thereof was not determined at the time of adoption of the budget; and

WHEREAS, said Director may also approve the insertion of any item of appropriation for an equal amount;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Borough of Rumson hereby requests the Director of the Division of Local Finance approve the insertion of an item of revenue in the budget of the year 2015 in the sum of \$18,091.01, which item is now available as a revenue from the State of New Jersey, Clean Communities Grant, pursuant to the provisions of statute; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a like sum of \$18,091.01 be and same is hereby appropriated under the caption of Clean Communities Grant.

Resolution seconded by Councilman Hemphill and carried on the following roll call vote:

In the affirmative: Atwell, Broderick, Conklin, Day, Hemphill and Rubin.

In the negative: None.

Absent: None.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE MAYOR:

Mayor Ekdahl made the following Announcement:

1. Borough Hall will be closed on Friday, July 3rd in observance of Independence Day. However, there will be garbage collection on July 3rd.

Thank you for your cooperation and best wishes for an enjoyable and safe July 4th holiday.

FINANCIAL OFFICER'S REPORT:

The Financial Officer's Reports disclosed the following as of May 31, 2015:

Borough of Rumson
Chief Financial Officer Report to the Mayor and Council

Analysis of Cash for the Month Ending: May 31, 2015

Funds	Beginning Balance	Cash Receipts	Disbursements	Ending Balance
1. CURRENT FUND				
Current Fund Checking	\$ 18,923,091.83	\$ 9,476,468.23	\$ (7,023,822.00)	\$ 21,375,738.06
Change Funds	\$ 300.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 300.00
Certificates of Deposit	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ —
Total Current Fund	\$ 18,923,391.83	\$ 9,476,468.23	\$ (7,023,822.00)	\$ 21,376,038.06
2. CAPITAL FUND				
Capital Fund Checking	\$ 3,476,775.78	\$ 0.00	\$ (40,552.00)	\$ 3,436,223.78
2007 Capital Improvement Bond Proceeds	\$ 165,270.83	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 165,270.83
Total Capital Fund	\$ 3,642,046.61	\$ 0.00	\$ (40,552.00)	\$ 3,601,494.61
3. PAYROLL & PAYROLL AGENCY				
Payroll	\$ 2,981.86	\$ 273,848.57	\$ (273,848.57)	\$ 2,981.86
Payroll Agency	\$ 10,905.91	\$ 165,101.42	\$ (165,101.42)	\$ 10,905.91
Total Payroll & Payroll Agency	\$ 13,887.77	\$ 438,949.99	\$ (438,949.99)	\$ 13,887.77
4. TRUST FUNDS				
Trust Fund Checking	\$ 801,381.85	\$ 5,675.16	\$ (2,546.00)	\$ 804,511.01
Unemployment Trust	\$ 103,574.79	\$ 69.12	\$ (9,630.99)	\$ 94,012.92
Recreation Trust	\$ 395,570.67	\$ 73,250.00	\$ (4,491.73)	\$ 464,328.94
C.O.A.H. Trust	\$ 1,851,189.31	\$ 33,886.87	\$ (16,331.38)	\$ 1,868,744.80
Law Enforcement Trust Fund	\$ 434.06	\$.30	\$ 0.00	\$ 434.36
D.A.R.E.	\$ 12,969.11	\$ 8.81	\$ 0.00	\$ 12,977.92
Cafeteria Plan	\$ 10,776.87	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 10,776.87
Animal Control Trust Fund	\$ 23,496.63	\$ 678.00	\$ (256.40)	\$ 23,918.23
Public Assistance Trust Fund	\$ 839.35	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 839.35
Total Trust Funds	\$ 3,200,232.64	\$ 113,568.26	\$ (33,256.50)	\$ 3,280,544.40
TOTAL ALL FUNDS	\$ 25,779,558.85	\$10,028,986.48	\$ (7,536,580.49)	\$ 28,271,964.84

Respectfully submitted by:

Helen L. Graves

Helen L. Graves, Chief Financial Officer

On motion by Councilman Broderick, seconded by Councilman Hemphill, the Financial Officer's Report was ordered received and carried on the following roll call vote:

In the affirmative: Atwell, Broderick, Conklin, Day, Hemphill and Rubin.

In the negative: None.

Absent: None.

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS AND CLAIMS (RESOLUTION):

Councilman Hemphill offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

\$	43,941.00	Hoffman Equipment Inc
\$	43,941.00	Capital Account
\$	195.00	Michael B Steib PA
\$	1,329.50	Jeffrey R Surenian & Assoc LLC
\$	2,105.22	T & M Associates
\$	3,629.72	COAH Trust Fund
\$	2,064.57	Irwin Law Firm Atty Trust Acct
\$	2.00	Acme Locksmith Service
\$	4,478.38	Allied Oil LLC
\$	975.60	Americanwear Indust Uniforms
\$	134.45	AR Communications
\$	104.00	Asbury Park Press
\$	463.08	Stephen Barrett
\$	186.00	Bayshore Fire & Safety LLC
\$	462.50	Boxwood Gardens
\$	61.98	Builders General Supply Co
\$	152.00	Butch's Auto Car Wash Inc
\$	285.00	Central Boiler Repair Co Inc
\$	354.00	Circle Chevrolet Inc
\$	1,555.52	Cleary Giacobbe Alfieri
\$	26.50	Custom Tire Associates
\$	5,833.88	Edwards Tire Co Inc
\$	416.74	Emergency Medical Products Inc
\$	3,642.00	Environmental Systems
\$	670.68	Fastenal Co
\$	4,360.00	Fibar Systems
\$	122.00	Gann Law Books
\$	77.40	WW Grainger Inc
\$	2,800.00	Holman Frenia Allison PC
\$	9,388.49	JCP&L
\$	68.00	Jersey Truck
\$	365.20	Johnny on the Spot Inc
\$	504.00	Kencor Inc
\$	98.45	Kepwel Natural Spring Water
\$	196.83	Lawes
\$	799.00	Life Savers Inc
\$	240.00	Marin Consulting Associates
\$	489.40	Mid-Atlantic Truck Centre Inc
\$	2,220.00	Mitchell 1
\$	389.75	Monmouth County Treasurer
\$	20.64	Monmouth Truck Equipment
\$	1,769.69	Moore Medical LLC
\$	419.00	National Business Furniture
\$	5,639.49	New Jersey American Water

\$	218.50	NJ Natural Gas Co
\$	50.00	NJ Police Traffic
\$	436.72	One Call Concepts
\$	450.00	Penn State University
\$	450.00	Penn State Justice/Safety Inst
\$	185.84	PEP Express Parts
\$	721.67	Ricoh USA Inc
\$	48.18	Thomas S Rogers
\$	1,572.56	R & R Radar Inc
\$	470.00	Rutgers the State University
\$	880.00	Ryser's Landscape Supply
\$	233.53	Hamilton Shippee
\$	250.00	State Shorthand Reporting Serv
\$	299.42	Staples Advantage
\$	3,625.00	Michael B Steib PA
\$	385.00	Stewart's Plumbing
\$	35,129.83	Suburban Disposal Inc
\$	179.76	Timmerman Equipment Company
\$	51,931.12	T & M Associates
\$	63.24	The Two River Times
\$	284.45	Verizon
\$	160.33	Verizon Wireless
\$	134.99	Verizon Business Fios
\$	32,079.60	Pashman Stein PC
<hr/>		
\$	182,075.96	Current Fund
\$	141.00	Bartlett Tree Experts
\$	424.12	Guaranteed Plants & Florist
<hr/>		
\$	565.12	Endowment Inc Account
\$	1,293.90	Athlete's Alley
\$	270.12	Stephen Barrett
\$	120.00	Patricia M Diaz
\$	75.00	Molly Gilmore Lake
\$	15.02	Lowe's
\$	36.39	Sarah Orsay
\$	120.00	John Sieg Sr
<hr/>		
\$	1,930.43	Recreation Account
\$	234.00	Michael B Steib PA
\$	366.69	T & M Associates
<hr/>		
\$	600.69	Trust Account
\$	38,599.08	Current Fund Appropriations
\$	143,476.88	Current Fund Appropriations
\$	43,941.00	Capital Fund Disbursements
\$	565.12	Endowment Disbursements
\$	1,930.43	Recreation Disbursements
\$	4,230.41	Trust Fund – Other Expenses
<hr/>		
\$	232,742.92	Total Of All Funds

Resolution seconded by Councilman Broderick and carried on the following roll call vote:

In the affirmative: Atwell, Broderick, Conklin, Day, Hemphill and Rubin.

In the negative: None.

Absent: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE COUNCIL:

The Mayor afforded the members of the Council an opportunity to be heard at this time and no one responded.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

The Mayor afforded the public an opportunity to be heard at this time and the following residents responded:

Kevin Kirwan of 31 Center Street thanked the Mayor and Council for selecting Center Street for the Borough's repaving, curb and sidewalk replacement project. He stated that, in light of the protests of some of the Center Street residents regarding the removal of trees during the project, a door-to-door survey was conducted last weekend by several of the neighbors to find out the concerns of the people. The survey asked three questions: 1) Do you endorse the removal of Borough trees in front of your property during the construction project in 2015? 2) If you do not endorse the removal of the trees, would you be willing to discuss entering into an agreement with the Borough for taking responsibility for maintaining new trees planted in front of your property? 3) Would you be interested in the Borough planting a senior tree on your property?

Mr. Kirwan stated that the overall results of the vote were for the Borough to proceed with the paving/curb/sidewalk project with trees planted by the Borough; approximately 75% (17 out of 23) of the residents surveyed were in favor of the planned tree removal. He added that 4 of the residents did not endorse the tree removal because the trees were special; but 3 of the 4 were interested in entering into an agreement with the Borough. Mr. Kirwan stated that the purpose of his attending tonight's Council meeting was to present the views of the residents of Center Street and to let the Council know that the majority of the residents were in support of the Borough, Borough Council, the plan for the repaving/curb and sidewalk replacement of Center Street and the outline of the project in the letter sent to the residents. Mr. Kirwan gave a copy of the survey sheet to the Mayor and Council.

In answer to a question from Councilman Broderick, Mr. Kirwan stated that he thought the issues of the residents with smaller trees in front of their property could be addressed and that there were trees that need to be removed because they were a hazard or created a hazard with the broken and/or uplifted sidewalks. He added that the Borough's offer to plant trees on the property of any resident who had a Borough tree removed was very generous and the residents appreciated it. He thanked the Mayor and Council.

The Mayor and Council thanked Mr. Kirwan for his efforts and support.

Chuck Hopkins of 29 Center Street stated that he wanted to note that there have been injuries over the years with people tripping and falling on the broken/uplifted sidewalks on Center Street. He stated that he was in favor of trees, but the safety of the people, especially children, was more important. Mr. Hopkins stated that he appreciated the Council's concern for the welfare of the people.

Mayor Ekdahl thanked Mr. Hopkins and stated that any resident who had a tree in front of their property and wished for it to remain, would be offered a contract with the Borough taking full responsibility for the maintenance and care of the tree.

Borough Attorney Martin Barger stated that the qualified residents who wished to have a tree remain in place would have to sign a contract with the Borough that the tree would belong to the property owner and they would assume responsibility for the care of the tree and any associated liability. He added that the property owner would have to make a decision whether he or she wished to keep it under those circumstances. Mr. Barger stated that the contract would be recorded with the County.

Mayor Ekdahl stated that Avenue of Two Rivers had been the first paving project to be undertaken and was much easier because there were no sidewalks. He added that the Avenue of Two Rivers Project was underway and the curbing had almost been completed. Mayor Ekdahl stated that Center Street was second on the contractor list, with Washington Street and Ward Lane to follow. He stated that Washington Street would be treated in the same manner as Center Street and asked if anyone in attendance wished to comment or ask questions regarding the paving project on Washington Street.

The following residents responded: Lesley Warrin of 59 Washington Street, Carol Boyer of 94 Bingham Avenue, Frank Pevis (SPELLING) of 46 Washington Street (property owner Lisa Sherman Dow), Pat Cassidy-Zimel of 84 Washington Street, Dean Kontometros of 51 Center Street, Doris Brophy of 90 Bingham Avenue, Carol Kelleher of 48 Washington Street, Denise Kelleher of 41 Center Street, Elizabeth Waters of 62 Washington Street, Christine Schweitzer of 100 Washington Street, John Halligan of 33 Center Street, John Sullivan of 100 Bingham Avenue and Deborah Dutcher and Donovan Mannato of 13 Tuxedo Road/92 Washington Street. The residents made the following comments and posed the following questions:

- At first happy to see that the street would be repaved
- Upset that all the trees on the street were to be removed and residents not notified
- The tree removal will change the look of the street with all the telephone poles and wires showing
- Mature, healthy trees being removed and replacement trees will take decades to mature
- Lower property values

Mayor Ekdahl clarified that every resident on Washington Street was sent a letter inviting them to a preconstruction meeting and asked the Borough Engineer to confirm.

Borough Engineer David Marks stated that T & M Associates generated the list of residents from the Borough Tax Records including Washington Street within the limits of the construction project, Church and Narumsunk Streets that were impacted by the drainage, Avenue of Two Rivers, Center Street and Ward Lane. The list was sent to the Borough for the letter to be prepared and mailed to the residents.

Mayor Ekdahl stated that there were a number of residents from Washington Street at the preconstruction meeting when the entire project was laid out. He added that referring to every tree on the street being removed was not correct; it was only the ones in the Borough right-of-way between the curb and sidewalk.

The residents continued their comments and concerns asking the following:

- What would be the cost to keep the trees and work the sidewalks around the trees?
- Removing the trees would lower the property values, so would the Borough be lowering the property taxes on Washington Street?
- There are a lot of streets in town that have sidewalks on only one side of the street, so would it be possible to just replace the sidewalk on the east side and remove the sidewalk on the west side where most of the largest, most beautiful trees are located and leave those trees in place?

Councilman Broderick stated that with the redesign of the County Tax System, the properties would be reassessed each year under the new system, but his guess would be that the removal of the trees would not change it at all. He added that she could call the Borough Tax Assessor when he is available on Friday morning to ask that question.

The Borough Engineer stated that in developing the concept of the project, they worked with the Borough officials to develop a plan that it was felt to be best suited to the needs of the residents with the following considerations:

- What it would take to keep the trees with respect to roadway configuration and the following options were eliminated:
 - Narrow the roadway – not an option due to the current narrowness
 - Remove/replace the sidewalk
 - Eliminate the sidewalk on one side or the other to save the trees and as a potential cost saving measure – was rejected due to the impact it would have on the streetscape where historically there have been sidewalks on both sides of the road
- The health and wellbeing of the trees – As part of the evaluation, a tree arborist was brought in to evaluate every tree on Washington Street as well as the other streets in the project
 - The arborist used is not associated with a tree cutting company, but a third party private individual who only evaluates trees and provided a report on the condition of every tree with respect to the type of work to be done with the sidewalk, curb and pavement reconstruction
 - The arborist took into account the current health of each tree and how it would fair through construction
 - The arborist's report was considered in deciding which trees could remain and which trees would have to be removed

Mr. Marks stated that the trees have had a tremendous impact on the existing curbs and sidewalks and will continue to do so if we replace the curbs and sidewalks with the trees intact. He added that the removal of the curbs and sidewalks during the construction project could destabilize those trees by impacting the root system and cutting the roots to accommodate the current grades in order to make the road work properly. Mr. Marks stated that at the end of the day, all but a select few trees would survive the construction.

Mr. Marks stated that removing the sidewalk from the west side of the street limits access to the homes.

Continued comments were made by the residents:

- Looking down Washington Street, and other streets in Rumson, the trees give a feeling of community and a feeling of wanting to live here that has attracted residents to this area of Rumson
- Perhaps a compromise could be made to keep as many of the trees as possible to try to preserve the look and feel of the street
- Perhaps the arborist could recommend a type of tree that was not so fast growing or large that could be planted—such as was done along Bingham Avenue between the curb and sidewalk that look lovely

Mayor Ekdahl stated that the trees that would be planted by the Borough on the resident's property in the front yard would be such a tree and then be the responsibility of the property owner.

The Borough Engineer stated that there were 6-12 different types of trees that the members of the Rumson Shade Tree Commission would help the Council choose for the residents to select, if they choose to have a tree planted on their property. He added that the trees would be the phase after the curbs and sidewalks have been completed and a landscaper would plant the trees in the more suitable whether in the fall. Mr. Marks added that Bingham Avenue is a County road and the trees that were planted between the curb and sidewalk were done by the County. He stated that the recommendation received from the Monmouth County Shade Tree Commission was that there should be a 24-36 inches minimum of space between the curb and sidewalk to plant small trees and the space between curb and sidewalk is only 18-24 inches to accommodate a tree.

In answer to a question, Mr. Marks stated that the Borough would need permission from the property owners to move the sidewalk away from the curb and onto the property owners' property to allow the space to get around the trees making the distance wide enough to plant a tree between the curb and sidewalk. He added that this would require an easement or dedication from the property owner in perpetuity to accommodate the sidewalk placement.

Mr. Barger stated in that case, the property owner would have to give some of their property to the Borough as an easement and it would need to be recorded at the County. He added that it would be a big job to go through the process to get the affected neighbors to agree, have surveys completed, the paperwork prepared and recorded with the County and it would take time to get it completed, which would hold up the project.

Mayor Ekdahl stated that we could take that into consideration.

Mr. Barger stated that was something to review, but they would be giving up some of their property; if 50% of the residents wanted to do it and 50% did not, it would create chaos.

Councilman Broderick stated that it could drag on for years for everyone on the street to come to an agreement.

The residents continued their comments and concerns:

- The process defined in the letter received from the Borough was fair and reasonable, but it was suggested that the timing of the process be done after a resolution for the trees was found
- The residents love the beautiful, mature trees and would like as many saved as possible
- Could the road be repaved and the sidewalks be done at a later time?

Borough Engineer David Marks stated that we could just do the paving of the road and not touch the curbs or sidewalks, but he thought that everyone would regret doing it that way because it would be a job half done. He added that doing the curbs and sidewalks at a later date would have a major negative impact on the pavement. Mr. Marks stated that from a construction standpoint, it makes sense to do all the work at the same time. He added that the curbs and sidewalks are at a state

that they really need to be done and there is an element when a public entity resurfaces a street, it is required that handicap accessibility upgrades be made and some curb work would be required at the intersections where the sidewalk meets the pavement. Mr. Marks stated that it was not his recommendation to the Council to only pave the street.

In response to a comment on the early hour of the preconstruction meeting in May and that a lot of working people couldn't make the meeting, Mr. Marks said that the meeting continued until after 7:00 p.m. and that a number of people attended—approximately two (2) dozen property owners.

The residents continued their comments and concerns:

- Many residents have landscaping for shaded areas that will be adversely effected if the trees are removed
- The mature trees should be kept where possible even if the sidewalks have to be moved back
- Not all of the trees that were marked were shown on the plan that had been presented

Mr. Marks stated that the plan did not contain every tree that was to be removed because his fear was that the contractor would get to the location ahead of him and not provide for the full evaluation of each tree as we went along. He added that the trees noted on the plan were the ones that definitely had to be taken down due to disease and decay for the bid proposals; for the actual awarded contract, and the budget, every tree was included in that budget amount; and this process afforded the Borough the time to further evaluate each tree. Mr. Marks stated that, unfortunately, taking into consideration the extent of construction, the condition of the trees, the sidewalk, the root systems, the utility lines and other issues that impact the trees on the east side of Washington Street, it was determined that each tree would need to be removed.

The residents continued their comments and concerns:

- Thanked the Mayor and Council for the repaving, new safe sidewalks and young trees to give Center Street a fresh start
- The letters to the residents said that “some” trees would be removed was misleading when all the trees were going to be removed
- Other streets have trees in the Borough right-of-way between the curb and sidewalk although it is the Borough's policy to not plant trees there now
- In researching property values on tree-lined streets, it shows a negative effect on the property values of those on streets with no trees

Councilman Broderick stated that looking forward, spending all the money on the paving, curbing and sidewalks and then planting trees that will damage those streets, curbs and sidewalks is not a good investment. He agreed that property values were probably higher on streets with trees.

The residents continued their comments and concerns:

- The existing trees are large and beautiful and without them the street would look empty
- Thanked the Council for keeping the communication open
- We need to find a way to keep the residents and the Borough happy
- Could the sidewalk be curved around any large trees that might be preserved?

The Municipal Clerk/Administrator stated with grade changes, the Borough wasn't sure if we could preserve some of the trees and place the sidewalk around it. He stated that some of the puddles on Washington Street are caused by tree roots pushing the road up; with the removal of the old pavement during milling and regrading of the street to eliminate the puddling, some of the tree roots would be exposed and damaged and that would compromise the tree. He reported that keeping the large, existing trees with the damaged roots would be a problem in a storm for the trees on the west side of Washington Street with damaged roots on the street side of the trees, the trees would be less stable with damaged root systems and could be blown into the houses during a severe storm. The Municipal Clerk/Administrator added that we were concerned about this and looking into the matter to see if it was feasible to keep existing trees and curving the sidewalk around them.

In response to a resident wanting to keep the tree in front of his home and have the sidewalk curve around it as a selling feature when he sells his home in the near future, Councilman Broderick stated that the person purchasing the home would assume the responsibility for the tree and any liability for damage that it might cause to the street, sidewalk or curb because the deed of easement would apply to all future owners, which might not be a selling point.

The Borough Engineer stated that another thing that would have to be considered in order for a tree to remain and have the sidewalk curve around it was the health of the tree and the age of the tree with respect to the average life span. He added that an easement could be recorded with the County, but extinguishing it was more difficult and could take some time; if the tree were to come down at some point, the owner would be left with the easement, a curved sidewalk and no tree. Mr. Marks added that the impact on the property owner was something to be considered as well as the life expectancy of the tree. He stated that if this option was to be considered, we should bring the arborist back to take core samples to determine the health of the tree.

Councilman Broderick stated that even if the property owner had an easement for the sidewalk to be curved into his or her property, and the property owner assumed the responsibility for damage caused by the tree to the sidewalk, curb and street, the tree would still be a Borough tree and if it became diseased, we would take the tree down.

The Borough Engineer stated that the other consideration that the Municipal Clerk/Administrator made reference to earlier, was the actual curb construction with the depth of the curb to about 18 inches, there would be an impact on the street side of the tree root system. He stated that he had not pointed out before that we were doing a full-depth pavement reconstruction, which means that the pavement would be milled out and fully replaced, so any roots impacting the pavement now would in turn be impacted as the street was milled. He added that any trees that remained would be impacted by this process and the impact of the construction on the trees was included in the arborist's report.

Councilman Conklin stated that he had previously served on a Borough Board and been an advocate for saving trees. He stated that he personally had a couple of 100-125 year old oak trees on his property that looked great, but when a full-bore of the tree was done to check the health of the tree, half of the middle of the core was rotten. Councilman Conklin stated that, even though it was a healthy looking, full blooming tree, in a year or two in a big storm limbs or the whole tree could be downed and people need to take that into consideration.

The residents continued their comments and concerns:

- It was suggested that pear trees that bloom and don't grow too large be planted and the sidewalk width be reduced so that the room between the curb and sidewalk could be increased to 24 inches to accommodate the pear trees. A street lined with blooming pear trees would be a gorgeous border.
- Was the Borough going to check the health all of the trees on Washington Street?
- Was the Council willing to consider some options and would the residents of Washington Street be kept informed of the Council's decisions?
- What was the schedule for the work to be done on Washington Street?
- Would the information going forward on the Washington Street Project be on the Borough's Website?

Mayor Ekdahl stated that we had not planned on checking the health of every tree only the ones in question, but we could do it in situations where we really need to know. The Mayor stated that the Borough would be considering options and, like the residents of Center Street, the Washington Street residents would be sent a letter; if any property owner wished to "adopt a tree" those individuals would receive a separate letter with a copy of the contract, as explained earlier by the Borough Attorney, to sign or not. At that time, if the property owner decided to "adopt a tree," that would be the time the tree boring would take place to determine the health of the tree and if it was worth saving.

The Borough Engineer reported that the work on Washington Avenue was scheduled to begin in early August, so we do have time to work on it.

In answer to a question, Councilman Day stated that the minutes for this meeting would be posted on the Borough's Website following their approval at July 14th Council meeting.

The Municipal Clerk/Administrator advised that he had several calls questioning why the drainage work had been done prior to the beginning of the paving and he reported that the ground had to settle after the work was completed to avoid divots in the paving. He said that when some of the utility companies do road work, they don't always pack it down properly resulting in speed bumps or divots. He added that it makes for a better job in the long run to allow the ground to settle prior to paving.

Final comment from a resident:

- Trees, although beautiful, can be dangerous. Even pear trees can fall or lose limbs in a storm.
- The fact that all the trees were going to be removed was not communicated to the Washington Street residents.
- The Mayor and Council don't seem to engage with the residents beforehand, but only after something has been decided do the residents get a chance to voice their opinions.
- A bit more effort should be put into saving the trees.
- The residents seem to have voiced their opinion that a sidewalk on just one side of the street would be preferred instead of removing all the trees on both sides of the street.

Mayor Ekdahl stated that a letter will be sent to the Washington Street residents once all the information is weighed and a decision has been made. He added that the next Borough Council meeting would be on July 14th at 7:30 p.m. and we should have some solutions by then. He said that the Borough had come to a pretty good understanding with the residents of Center Street and expected the same with the Washington Street residents to save some of the trees and come up with a workable resolution.

Mayor Ekdahl thanked everyone for their comments.

ADJOURNMENT:

On motion by Councilman Day, seconded by Councilman Broderick, the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas S. Rogers, R.M.C.
Municipal Clerk/Administrator