

PUBLIC COMMENT

Comments from the public will be heard for a limit of one (1) hour. Each speaker will have four (4) minutes and shall be limited to one time at the podium.

Mayor Miller opened the meeting to the public.

Joyce Blay, NJ News and Views, 311 Floral Way, Toms River – Asked for an explanation of the Resolution with regard to a Right of Reverter.

Mr. Secare explained that the Yeshiva has a Deed Restriction with a Right of Reverter that existed when they were sold the land. They asked that the Right of Reverter be removed so that they can obtain financing on the property. The Township did the Right of Reverter and removed the Deed Restriction for financing purposes only.

Shlomy Klein, 189 Chateau Drive – Commented on a meeting he attended regarding the Toms River Master Plan. Asked about the status of the Lakewood Master Plan and if any public meetings have been scheduled.

Mr. Klein was advised that all hearings will be announced for the public to attend.

Gerry Ballwanz, Governors Road – Commented on the Master Plan meetings.

Joel Leibowitz, 210 East County Line Road – Commented on subject of taxes.

Seeing no one else wishing to be heard, Mayor Miller closed the meeting to the public.

CONSENT AGENDA

The items listed below are considered to be routine by the Township of Lakewood and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no formal discussion of these items. If discussion is desired, this item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and will be considered separately.

- 1. Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County Of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Accepting The Highest Bid At The Public Auction Held On August 4, 2016 For The Sale Of Property Owned By The Township Of Lakewood, Known As Block 445 Lot 9, From The Highest Bidder And Authorizing The Mayor To Execute A Contract Of Sale
Resolution No. 2016-337**
- 2. Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County Of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Awarding A Contract To U.S. Municipal For Roadway Maintenance Equipment.
Resolution No. 2016-338**

3. **Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County Of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Authorizing The Insertion Of A Special Item Of Revenue Into The 2016 Municipal Budget For Funding Of Alcohol Education Rehabilitation Enforcement Fund
Resolution No. 2016-339**
4. **Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County Of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Authorizing The Insertion Of A Special Item Of Revenue Into The 2016 Municipal Budget For Funding Of State Of NJ-Division Of Highway Traffic & Safety Click It Or Ticket 2016 Seatbelt Mobilization
Resolution No. 2016-340**
5. **Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Approving A Corrective Action Plan As Part Of The 2015 Annual Audit Process
Resolution No. 2016-341**
6. **Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County Of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Releasing A Right Of Reverter To Congregation Yeshiva Yesodei Torah, Inc.
Resolution No. 2016-342**
7. **Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County Of Lakewood, State Of New Jersey, Refunding Taxes To A Totally Disabled Veteran.
Resolution No. 2016-343**
8. **Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Releasing a Performance Guarantee Posted By Stamford Hill 54, LLC, In Connection With ZB #3694A, Block 1159, Lots 19, 42-44 & 85
Resolution No. 2016-344**
9. **Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Reducing the Performance Guarantee (First Reduction) Posted By Real Acquisition, LLC, In Connection With ZB #3816, For Block 1081, Lots 12 and 13
Resolution No. 2016-345**
10. **Resolution of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, Authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for 2016-2017 to Kimball Diner & Restaurant, Inc., T/A Chianti Ristorante, Liquor License No. 1514-33-010-003
Resolution No. 2016-346**

11. **Resolution of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, Authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for 2016-2017 to Javier Perez Hernandez, Liquor License No. 1514-33-001-011
Resolution No. 2016-347**
12. **Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County Of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Authorizing The Execution Of A Municipal Services Agreement Between The Township Of Lakewood And New Hampshire Avenue Investments, LLC, A Qualified Private Community, Pursuant To And In Accordance With N.J.S.A. 40:67-23.2, Et Seq.
Resolution No. 2016-348**
13. **Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County Of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Reappointing Members To The Municipal Alliance.
Resolution No. 2016-349**
14. **Resolution Of The Township Of Lakewood, County Of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Appointing Members To The Heritage Commission.
Resolution No. 2016-350**

Motion by Committeeman Coles, second by Committeeman D'Elia, to approve Resolution Nos. 1 through 14 on the Consent Agenda.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Committeeman Coles, Committeeman D'Elia, Deputy Mayor Akerman and Mayor Miller.

Resolution Nos. 2016-337 through 2016-350 – Adopted.

ORDINANCES SECOND READING

An Ordinance Amending Chapter XVIII, Zoning Districts (Unified Development Ordinance), Article IX (Zoning Districts and Regulations), Section 901(B)(1), Establishment of Zoning Districts and Zoning Map of the Code of the Township of Lakewood

Read by title only for second reading.

Mayor Miller asked for a Motion to carry the above Ordinance to the second meeting in September.

Motion by Committeeman Coles, second by Deputy Mayor Akerman, to carry the above Ordinance to September 15, 2016.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Committeeman Coles, Committeeman D'Elia, Deputy Mayor Akerman and Mayor Miller.

Second reading and public hearing on Ordinance No. 2016-33 carried to the meeting of September 15, 2016.

An Ordinance of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, Amending and Supplementing Chapter XVIII (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Revised General Ordinances of the Township of Lakewood, Specifically Article IX, Zoning Districts and Regulations, Section 18-902 Residential Zoning Districts, Subsection L.4. Design Regulations – For All Uses Except for Places of Worship.

Read by title only for second reading.

Mayor Miller opened the meeting to the public. Seeing no one wishing to be heard, the hearing on this Ordinance was closed to the public

The above Ordinance was offered by Committeeman Coles, second by Committeeman D'Elia.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Committeeman Coles, Committeeman D'Elia, Deputy Mayor Akerman and Mayor Miller.

Ordinance No. 2016-34 adopted on second reading.

An Ordinance of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, Releasing, Extinguishing and Vacating the Rights of the Public of Portions of Paper Street Known as Pinehurst Avenue and Nassau Avenue, in the Township Of Lakewood (Street Vacation)

Read by title only for second reading.

Mayor Miller opened the meeting to the public.

Joyce Blay, NJ News and Views, 311 Floral Way, Toms River – Asked why is the Township seeking to vacate these paper streets.

Mayor Miller responded that it will enhance the flow and development of the area.

Shlomy Klein, 189 Chateau Drive – Commented on this Ordinance as well as other Oak Street Ordinances. Stated they all refer to Oak Street Corridor, but he feels this development is not connected to Oak Street and therefore is misleading and should be named something else. He referred to Ordinances other than the subject Ordinance, and the proposed development of the Oak Street Corridor, but advised he looked into the proposed street vacation. Commented on the process for application to CAFRA in connection with this development. He also asked who requested the street vacation. Complained that the development does not contain any open space or recreation areas, and this street vacation will not create any areas for same.

The Municipal Manager, Thomas Henshaw, explained that the application for the CAFRA permit was submitted by Brian Flannery, not the Township Engineering firm of Remington Vernick.

Mayor Miller advised that the Attorney for the applicant is present this evening, and may be able to answer some of Mr. Klein's questions.

Michael J. Gross, Esq., Giordano, Halleran & Ciesla, representing the consortium of developers of this project. He advised they did not request this street vacation. He does not have knowledge as to who did. He does have comments on the following Ordinance, but not this one, as he feels this Ordinance is straight forward, and these streets are not needed for good circulation. He believes one small area of the vacation will be used for a detention basin.

Shmuel Rabinowitz – Advised he has been involved with this project from the beginning. He explained that the street vacation areas will be used for parks. As they are not necessary for the flow, they felt the areas would be appropriate for parks. No additional units will be built on these areas.

Kenneth Pape, Esq., representing a number of property owners in this area – Advised that when this CAFRA Permit was first put together, everyone in this area was given an open invitation to participate. The only property owners who are not part of the CAFRA permit, elected not to be part of it. Once the CAFRA permit was in place there was an opportunity to create a unified development plan. Because of the grid of roads and separate lot ownership, there are many separate property owners and they were given an opportunity to design a modern road and drainage system. Those two issues were facing the town. What was done was well organized and proper. All the property owners were given the opportunity to work together and all agreed to do a development plan. The town had the modern road and drainage system designed, and have asked the property owners to bear the cost and expense of putting in those improvements. The CAFRA permit created the opportunity; all property owners were given the opportunity to participate; The CAFRA permit represents all those who chose to stay in; those who chose to leave were allowed to leave. You now have a development plan, roads and drainage system, for this entire area. Now you have those property owners who are serviced by that road and drainage system who want to come in and develop the area consistent with the CAFRA permit. To suggest that these developers are coming in and want to overextend and go beyond what is contemplated by the development plan is not accurate.

Mr. Pape further advised that the request for street vacation is before the Committee. The request for transfer to private ownership is not. The lands are to be retained by the municipality and they are for utility easements and park purposes.

Noah Gordon – Confirmed that the property owners are giving up the lands from the street vacation, which are to be used for public parks.

Ed Liston, Esq., representing Laurie Leeds – He was not going to get involved with this discussion, but what he heard he feels was so disingenuous that it brings up a matter he will discuss in connection with the next Ordinance which is the unholy alliance between the municipality and a certain clique of developers in the Oak Street area, with secret agreements that are not part of the public record, and the reason that this vacation is being requested, is because they need a drainage basin. Whatever else is left will be a park. This is part of an unholy alliance he will be speaking about in

connection with the next Ordinance, which is totally illegal, and he will challenge it in Superior Court if the Committee is foolish enough to adopt it.

Bill Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane – Has a bad feeling about this Ordinance. Applicants will be able to work with the Planning Board in work session, but it will never have to come to public meetings, which denies the public the opportunity to oppose it.

Gerry Ballwanz, Governors Road – Commented on the process of approval of a street vacation, and how the land is divided among adjacent property owners. Feels this Ordinance should not be adopted at this time.

Michael Gross, Esq. – Advised that the basins are not near the street vacations. The developers do not need the street vacations in order to construct the basins.

Noah Gordon – Wants to be clear that the landowners are asking for the street vacation, and instead of using it for additional homes, they want to use the land for utility easements and parks.

Boruch Framowitz – Commented on the street vacation, and the intention to create a recreation area.

Jacob Mueller – Commented on the street vacation, and the intention is to create a recreation area. They are trying to do the right thing.

Mayor Miller and Deputy Mayor Akerman commented and agreed that the Ordinance should be amended to incorporate this intention.

Seeing no else one wishing to be heard, the hearing on this Ordinance was closed to the public.

Ordinance No. 2016-39 died due to lack of Motion.

An Ordinance of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, Amending and Supplementing Chapter XVIII (Unified Development Ordinance) Article IX (Zoning Districts and Regulations) of the Revised General Ordinances of the Township of Lakewood (Oak Street Core Residential Development)

Read by title only for second reading.

Mayor Miller opened the meeting to the public.

Ed Liston, Esq., on behalf of Laurie Leeds – Advised he wrote a letter to the Township Committee dated August 16, 2016. Asked if the Committee received and read it. Read the letter into the record, which letter is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Mr. Liston stated he feels this Ordinance makes no sense. It violates the Municipal Land Use Law in addition to making no sense. This is an illegal Ordinance, and should not be adopted. It is not even capable of being resurrected in an amended form.

Mayor Miller stated for the record that he disagrees with many of the allegations contained in Mr. Liston's comments and letter.

Joyce Blay. NJ News and Views, 311 Floral Way, Toms River – Asked if the approval under this Ordinance is for the purpose of approving 371 units without a Planning Board hearing.

Deputy Mayor Akerman responded that is the intention. It already went to the Planning Board and it is under CAFRA, and the intention is that they should not have to come back a second time.

Ms. Blay asked if there is a Planning Board application number that she can review.

Mayor Akerman advised that the Planning Board reviewed the entire plan. They commented on it, and made recommendations to the Committee.

Michael J. Gross, Esq., Giordano, Halleran & Ciesla – Explained why this Ordinance is perfectly proper. In March 2012, a CAFRA permit was issued to NJ American Water Company for a sewer line in this area. One of the conditions of this permit was that each separate property owner who wanted to connect to this sewer line would have to apply individually for a separate CAFRA permit. That would have meant hundreds of applications for CAFRA permits. So, on behalf of several property owners, along with the Township, he met with DEP who welcomed a procedure they formulated, for property owners who are interested in tying into the sewer line, to be addressed in one CAFRA permit. That is the history. Every property owner affected by that sewer line was given the opportunity to join in this application. Mr. Liston's client made a business decision not to join in on this application. In March 2015, a CAFRA permit was issued for 179 duplex units and 3 single family units, for a total of 361 units. This Oak Street Corridor is part of the Smart Growth Plan and is an integral part of Plan Endorsement. If this project does not go forward it impacts Lakewood's Plan Endorsement. The Ordinance allows minor subdivisions in accordance with the MLUL. It authorizes the Planning Board to waive notice and public hearing for an application for development if the Planning Board finds that the application for development conforms to the definition of a minor subdivision. The minor subdivision must conform to the minor subdivision requirements. Mr. Liston's client is not precluded from applying for a minor subdivision, and is not prejudiced by this Ordinance in any way. This Ordinance is perfectly legal, and is pursuant to the MLUL, and the Committee has every authority to enact this Ordinance despite the rhetoric, and he would ask the Committee to adopt the Ordinance accordingly.

Ed Liston, Esq., representing Laurie Leeds – Wanted to respond to Mr. Gross' comments as his name was used, as well as that of this client. The nuance that Mr.

Gross wants everyone to ignore is the fact that his client did not sign up for this CAFRA permit and recognizes that in order to develop her property, she will have to get her own CAFRA permit. But he feels that she should not be zoned out of any benefit that is given to the other land owners in this Ordinance, and in his view, she is, definitely. That deprives her of due process of law, it impairs her right to own property, and as far as he is concerned, she is being discriminated against.

Committeeman Coles asked what benefit is she being denied.

Mr. Liston responded she is being denied the benefits of this Ordinance. This Ordinance is limited in its scope to the properties that are listed in the CAFRA permit. It affects her because she does not get the benefit of the Ordinance, which is this scheme, which is going to allow minor subdivisions, is limited to only those properties that are in the CAFRA permit. That excludes her property. That is spot zoning. There is nothing you can do in this Ordinance that can solve that. If in the Ordinance, you were to take out the reference to only those properties listed in the CAFRA permit, and say it applies to all properties, in all zones, that at least solves one problem. He feels it is a shame that the Committee members did not have the opportunity to read his letter and consult with the Township Attorney. It is hope that this Ordinance is not adopted.

Shmuel Rabinowitz – If Laurie Leeds now wants to be a part of this, all he asks is that it is not delayed for everyone else. Being that it has been delayed, he urged the passage of the Ordinance at this time, and she can always request an amendment. If their only concern is that she is not part of it, please don't delay it for everyone else, since it was done by her own hand.

Ed Liston, Esq. – What he is saying is let her come back and ask for an indulgence. That is not the way Ordinances work. The Ordinance, if it is adopted in its present form tonight, in order to protect his client's interest, will be challenged in Superior Court.

Committeeman D'Elia responded that he came on the Committee after all this was started. He does not know what went on before he came on the Committee, but Mr. Liston is making claims of collusion. He knows of no collusion by any Committee member. As long as Mr. Liston has made that statement, he is open to any type of investigation you may want to have. He is not in collusion with anyone. They know some of the individuals involved, but he is not in collusion with any of them. He voted no on the previous Ordinance because he was advised at that time that it needed tweaking. Mr. Secare and Mr. Henshaw came on at the same time he did. They worked hard on this, to make sure the Committee had all the information, and in a proper manner. No collusion, just proper. He is comfortable with the Ordinance based on the fact that Mr. Scare and Mr. Henshaw have said it was OK to approve it now. He does take offense to the fact that Mr. Liston alludes that he is in collusion with the builders. That is totally wrong, and he finds it offensive.

Mr. Liston stated he did not use the word collusion. He spoke earlier about a conflict of interest, which did not involve Committeeman D'Elia. It involved the municipal government and Brian Flannery.

Mayor Miller stated that Committeeman D'Elia is part of the municipal government.

Mr. Liston continued that it did not involve Committeeman D'Elia because it occurred before he came on the Committee.

Mayor Miller asked Mr. Liston by the term "municipal government" who is he referring to.

Mr. Liston responded, the entire municipal government, that have fostered this. But he did not use the word collusion, and if Committeeman D'Elia took it to mean collusion, he apologized for that. And all he called on him to do was to explain why this Ordinance was different than the one he voted against.

Committeeman D'Elia responded because he was advised by the Attorney and the Municipal Manager that it was.

Mr. Secare cautioned everyone, since the threat to sue is out there. Mr. Liston has advised he will sue the Township. Therefore, he cautioned everyone to watch their comments carefully. He certainly thinks Committeeman D'Elia was correct to express his feelings about collusion, conspiracy and unholy alliances. If he took offense to that, he understands why. But to go beyond that, and go into your thinking as to why you are doing one thing or another, may resurface in the lawsuit.

Shlomy Klein, 189 Chateau Drive – Directed his question to Committeeman D'Elia, that he commented that last time he voted no, and after it was clarified he was more comfortable now voting yes. He is trying to find what is making him more comfortable now.

Mr. Secare directed Committeeman D'Elia not to answer that question. A lot of it has to do with attorney/client privilege in consult with Committeeman D'Elia and the rest of the Committee members. He advised them about certain things, and he would rather they not go into that because of the privilege of that communication.

Mr. Klein stated he would give his opinion on this issue, and continued his comments in opposition to the Ordinance.

Michael J. Gross, Esq. – As a Land Use Law attorney, he takes offense to someone making the comment to the Committee of something that is absolutely untrue. He believes that the last speaker's primary point was they were eliminating public notice if they pass this Ordinance. Nothing can be further from the truth, because in fact, for a minor subdivision, you don't give public notice. So his entire premise is incorrect. There is no public notice for a minor subdivision under the Land Use Law.

Gerry Ballwanz, Governors Road – Commented on the Ordinance, where it talks about attached maps. Since the Ordinance to vacate the streets was not adopted, how will the information regarding parks be designated on the maps and how will it impact this Ordinance.

Mayor Miller explained that street vacation information is not added to maps until after the vacation is adopted.

Boruch Framowitz, 6 Renee Court – Being involved in many real estate deals in town, and many projects in town, in his opinion, this will actually discourage many people from going for variances and trying to squeeze in another lot, or another house. Someone is always going to squeeze in whatever they can, if they have to go to the Planning Board, because they are spending their money, and all their time, so why not try to get whatever they can out of it. He feels that they are now creating a situation where you are encouraging conformity to many properties. By telling people they have to go to the Planning Board, he feels you are encouraging them to go for variances and to try to squeeze in more things.

Bill Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane – Asked that with hundreds of homes, what is the differentiation between a minor subdivision and a major subdivision. He would think that with this many homes, this sounds major to him. He feels they should get their terms down pat, because that term was used by the proponents and it does not look like a minor subdivision to him.

(Someone speaking from audience.....Could not hear response.)

Mr. Hobday stated that he is sure that the Committee would want to know if that term was correct. He asked again if it is a minor subdivision or major subdivision.

Mr. Secare asked Mr. Gross if this is a minor or major subdivision.

Mr. Gross responded they are all minor.

Mr. Hobday asked how is minor defined as opposed to major.

Mr. Gross responded that it is defined by Ordinance.

Mr. Hobday asked him to cite that Ordinance. Is it the number of houses.....the number of acres?

Mr. Gross responded they do not have the Code Book with them this evening.

Mr. Hobday continued that they are dealing with something here that they can not pin down the definition of. He does not think it is minor. He thinks it is major. When you have that many houses, it is major.

Mr. Gross stated that if it is a major subdivision, this Ordinance does not apply.

Mr. Hobday stated that the idea here is this. If you have a lot that is large enough to subdivide into two lots, that is minor. If he wants to build hundreds of houses, that is not minor, that is major.

Mr. Gross stated these are all individual lots.

Committeeman Coles explained they are talking about hundreds of property owners....hundreds of lots to be developed individually. Not one person coming in and creating a development like you usually see.

Mr. Hobday stated it is a consortium coming in and saying they are going to build a major subdivision, but they are going to call it minor.

Committeeman Coles explained he is not defending the Ordinance but what you have is a consortium made up of a lot of different people who will come in individually for their minor subdivisions.

Mr. Hobday stated that until he hears what the definition is of a minor subdivision, he thinks this is major.

Shlomy Klein – Commented again on the request for street vacation, and parks and recreational spaces, and his opinion as to why he feels they are trying to help the developers to save some money.

Ed Liston, Esq. – Commented that what this Ordinance does is allows an elite group of developers who own little lots in different LLC's, to subvert the MLUL and create a large development by calling it little minor subdivision developments. That, to him, violates not only the spirit, but the letter of the MLUL, and he does not think it will withstand a judicial challenge.

Seeing no one else wishing to be heard, the hearing on this Ordinance was closed to the public.

The above Ordinance was offered by Committeeman Coles, second by Committeeman D'Elia

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Committeeman D'Elia, Deputy Mayor Akerman and Mayor Miller.

Negative: Committeeman Coles

Ordinance No. 2016-40 adopted on second reading.

An Ordinance Of The Township Of Lakewood, County Of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Granting A Sewer Easement To New Jersey-American Water Company For The Purpose Of Constructing Sewer Mains For A Portion Of Lot 1 In Block 770 On The Tax Map Of Lakewood Township, Ocean County New Jersey.

Read by title only for second reading.

Mayor Miller opened the meeting to the public. Seeing no one wishing to be heard, the hearing on this Ordinance was closed to the public.

The above Ordinance was offered by Committeeman Coles, second by Committeeman D'Elia.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Committeeman Coles, Committeeman D'Elia, Deputy Mayor Akerman and Mayor Miller.

Ordinance No. 2016-42 adopted on second reading.

ORDINANCES FIRST READING – Second Reading and Public Hearing to be held on September 15, 2016.

An Ordinance Of The Township Of Lakewood, County Of Ocean, State Of New Jersey, Amending And Supplementing Chapter XVIII, Entitled “Unified Development Ordinance”, By Repealing Section 18-506, Entitled “Oak Street Corridor Improvement District” In Its Entirety, And Replacing It With New Section 18-506 Entitled “Oak Street Corridor Improvement District”

Read by title only for first reading.

The above Ordinance was offered by Committeeman Coles, second by Deputy Mayor Akerman.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Committeeman D'Elia, Deputy Mayor Akerman and Mayor Miller.

Negative: Committeeman Coles

Ordinance No. 2016-43 adopted on first reading. Second reading and public hearing to be held on September 15, 2016.

CORRESPONDENCE – Parks and Events

Per schedule of eleven (11) parks and events requests, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Motion by Committeeman Coles, second by Deputy Mayor Akerman, and carried, to accept and process the above correspondence items.

MOTION TO APPROVE BILL LIST OF: August 17, 2016

Motion by Committeeman D'Elia, second by Deputy Mayor Akerman, to approve the above Bill List.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Committeeman D'Elia, Deputy Mayor Akerman and Mayor Miller.

Not present for the vote: Committeeman Coles

Bill List approved.

COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mayor Miller advised there is an Agreement which has to be signed by Lakewood Township and the Board of Education with regard to the bussing Ordinance. The bussing Ordinance requires that Lakewood Township be responsible for making sure that the public school children have safe access to school with regard to even the non-mandated students. He repeated that this is not private schools, but public school students, the Township Committee has a requirement, per the Agreement.

Mr. Secare apologized that this did not make the Agenda. He just found out about it today from the School Board Attorney. It is necessary for the Committee to act on this. He would ask that there be a Resolution authorizing the Mayor to sign the Agreement with the School Board so the Governors Bill can go forward.

Mayor Miller asked that the Agreement include the fact that the Liaison to the School Board, Meir Lichtenstein, be included in all correspondence, and all types of calculations with regard to bussing for the public school students being mandated. A Motion was offered by Committeeman Coles, second by Deputy Mayor Akerman. On Roll Call – Affirmative: Committeeman Coles, Committeeman D’Elia, Deputy Mayor Akerman and Mayor Miller.
Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Committeeman Coles, second by Deputy Mayor Akerman, and carried, to adjourn the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 10:05 PM.