

The Lakewood Township Committee held a Public Meeting on Thursday, April 14, 2016 in the Lakewood Municipal Building, Auditorium, at 7: 30 PM with the following present:

Mayor.....Menashe P. Miller
Deputy Mayor.....Albert D. Akerman
Committee Members.....Absent.....Raymond Coles
Michael J. D’Elia
Meir Lichtenstein
Municipal Manager.....Thomas Henshaw
Municipal Attorney.....Steven Secare, Esq.
Municipal Clerk.....Kathryn Hutchinson

Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided in accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-6, and published in the Asbury Park Press on January 6, 2016.

ROLL CALL

CLOSED SESSION - None

ROLL CALL

SALUTE TO THE FLAG AND PRAYER

OPEN SESSION

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES OF: None

MOTION TO APPROVE WORKSHOP AND CLOSED SESSION MINUTES: April 7, 2016

Motion by Committeeman Lichtenstein, second by Committeeman D’Elia, and carried, to approve the above Closed Session Minutes.

PRESENTATIONS - None

PUBLIC HEARING-FIRE BUDGET

Mr. Secare advised that the record shall reflect that Committeeman D’Elia has removed himself from the dais, on his recommendation, and will not be participating in this Public Hearing.

Mayor Miller requested the Township Manager, Thomas Henshaw, to explain the amendments to the Fire Budget.

Mr. Henshaw advised that what he had cut from the Budget was \$238,119.00. From Salaries and Wages he deducted \$145,391.00. From Health Insurance, he deducted \$84,428.00. From _____ Taxes he deducted \$8,300.00, again for the total of \$238,119.00.

Mayor Miller opened the meeting to the public.

Larry Loigman – Advised this matter is before the Township Committee because the Court essentially advised Mr. Secare that there were questions about the previous adoption. The notice in this case continues to be defective. The Resolution continues to be defective, and the fact that he is speaking this evening should not be considered in any way to be a waiver of his objections as to the Notice and the Resolution. Nor are they to be construed as a waiver of Mr. D’Elia’s continued participation, even though he has stepped down for the moment, his apparent continued participation in deliberations regarding this matter. But he does want to get to the substance of this particular Resolution. He did have the opportunity to meet with the Manager and the Attorney earlier today to go over some of his concerns. He does not know if he was able from the short time between that meeting and now to convey all those concerns to the Committee, and he was not permitted by Mr. Secare to meet with any member of the Committee, or talk with any member of the Committee, but he thinks that the Committee should be aware that this reduction in the Fire District’s Budget is completely inappropriate. He is not sure what it is that the Committee intends to accomplish by doing this. The figures that he has seen which were not contradicted by the Manager would suggest that the reduction in the tax rate as a result of this particular Resolution would be approximately zero so that no taxpayer in this Township is going to pay anything less as a result of this Resolution being passed. On the other hand, what the taxpayers in this Township will be paying is a greater sense of fear because the Fire Department is going to be less able to deal with the threat of fire, the threat of property damage, the threat of injury, and even possibly, we would hope not, but possibly the threat of deaths from fire. The reduction may be a small amount, in terms of absolute dollars, but it is a large amount in terms of what the Fire Department is going to be able to do this year, and in coming years. When he spoke with the Manager earlier today, he told him that he should have, but apparently did not, review the recently completed report from VFIS, which is the Fire District’s insurance carrier, and that report is over one hundred pages in length, and that report also relies upon a report from the insurance services office, the ISO, which was completed last year, and both of those reports very strongly indicate from independent experts, people who have no affiliation with the Township or its politics, both those reports indicate that the greatest problem that the Fire District has to deal with is the shortage of man power. By doing what has been done, or will be doing with this Resolution, you are not going to be assisting the taxpayers and you are not going to be assisting the Fire Department. What you are going to be doing is making sure that a Township that is growing in terms of population, in terms of number of buildings, in terms of businesses, this Township is going to have to work with a Fire Department that was inadequate last year, and the year before, and

the year before that, and will continue to be inadequate. These reports clearly demonstrate that there is a tremendous need for looking into and planning ahead so that the Fire Department will be ready to deal with the problems for this year and for coming years. And one of the reasons that it is necessary to have this money in the budget, particularly in the Salary and Wage account, is to make sure that the paid firefighters are not subject to the type of stress that can contribute to injuries and even to death. By reducing the requested amount in the budget, you are essentially saying that the Township isn't growing, it is not going to have any new buildings, is not going to have any new people, it is just going to be _____, and that is unrealistic. It is unrealistic because we all know how rapidly Lakewood is growing, and we know how there are needs in this Township that have to be _____. So what you are going to do essentially is to increase the fire insurance rates for everybody. There are not going to pay anything less in taxes as a result of this Resolution, but they are going to start seeing that their fire insurance bills, their homeowner's insurance bills, will be going up. So it is like a hidden tax that you are imposing on the residents. And they may not come back to you. They may not come to the Township Committee and say their insurance bill went up, why is that. But the answer is, and it is going to be clear to everybody, the answer is that this Committee's action can ensure that they are not going to pay those high rates; they are not going to have to be subjected to that greater danger. And there are, as he pointed out to the Manager earlier today, there are other places in this Budget that could safely be reduced if you found it necessary to make reductions of some small amounts. Even to come up to this amount. And apparently, the Manager has decided, because this Resolution comes up with an exact number that we say in the previous Resolution, so he really did not do a lot of work, and he knows it was a busy day for him because it is a meeting day, and it is a complicated issue, so he probably did not have the time to go through all the reports and look at all the numbers as carefully as perhaps he would have wanted to, if he had the time to do it, but there are clearly other places where he could have said they can cut \$10,000 out of here, cut \$10,000 or \$20,000 out of here, cut \$5,000 out of here, and it won't have the same impact, it won't have the same negative consequences, it won't have the same cause for harm to the residents and the taxpayers in this town as what you may be doing tonight. So he would urge them not to pass this Resolution, and to go back to the Manager, and ask him if there is a possible way to reduce this Budget by some number, apparently people have some number in mind, is there a way to do that without harming the public. Can you say there is an increase here in the advertising budget, from \$13,000 to \$50,000, what is all that money for? Is there some way that we can still protect the public and not have as much devoted to advertising all of a sudden. Is there some way that maybe they can cut back on that promotional type of stuff. If there is some way they can say, there is money in here, \$35,000 for a new secretary, maybe they do not need to have a new secretary, the Fire District has not has this particular secretary since the beginning of time, they have had a Manager, and there has not been the need for a secretary in addition to the Manager. Maybe this is not the year to spend \$35,000 on a secretary. And maybe if he went through this carefully, line by line, with the interest of the public in mind, he might be able to come up with some monies that can reduced without harming the public safety. This Resolution does harm the public safety and he knows all members of the Committee better than to think that they

would want to do that. And he is sure if they thought this through, if they look through the reports, if they look at this Budget, they would realize that there are better ways to accomplish this small savings than to do what they are planning on doing.

Bill Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane – Advised he is a taxpayer of Lakewood and he is not in fear. The professional services that are rendered in Lakewood Township are second to none. The professional paid and volunteer fire department people here in Lakewood are excellent, as are the Police, EMS.....they feel safe here, and they feel very safe in the Committee's judgment, especially the Township Manager. He is a wise man with great decisions, and he would never suggest they have not done the right thing. He asked that they keep up the good work, and protect them, and do the right thing.

Ralph Portnoy, 120 Autumn Road – Advised he serves on the Board of Fire Commissioners. It is the third year of his three year term. He is here this evening to ask a few basic questions as to how the cuts were determined, and also to give a suggestion to the Township moving forward.

Mayor Miller asked that Mr. Portnoy direct his questions to the Township Manager and Township Attorney.

Mr. Portnoy asked about the cuts, what reference point did the Township utilize in determining their cuts.

Mr. Secare stated that he is advising the Manager not to answer any of these questions, for two reasons. One, they are in litigation with Mr. Loigman, who has sued the Township, and two, the deliberative process of the governing body and the administration is not subject to disclosure.

Mr. Portnoy asked that in making their cuts, did the Township review all of the line items in determining where the cuts could come from, safety as opposed to non-essential.

Mr. Secare again advised that the Manager is not going to answer questions about anything that is in litigation or part of the deliberative process and the administration.

Mr. Portnoy asked again, in cutting the paid personnel salary costs, was there any type of scheduling analysis done.

Mr. Secare repeated that he not going to permit the Manager to answer any of these questions.

Mr. Portnoy clarified that the answer is that this is based on the fact that it is in litigation.

Mr. Secare added that they are not permitted to find out about the deliberative process of the administration or the governing body. It is protected by law.

Mr. Portnoy responded, so in a sense, when they are paying under the current schedule and budget, over 6,000 hours of overtime, and the budget as proposed, that was voted on unanimously by all of the Fire Commissioners, by adding four men, they could cut over \$3,000 of that overtime. He asked if that made a difference.

Mr. Secare asked if that was another question?

Mr. Portnoy responded that the question is that the three 3,000 hours that they would have cut by adding four men, versus scheduled overtime, and that is before any firefighter got hurt, there are 6,000 hours of overtime that they are paying under the current Contract, and a new Contract needs to be negotiated.

Mr. Secare responded that is a statement, and Mr. Portnoy can make any statement that he wishes to make, if permitted by the Mayor, but he is not going to let him ask any questions.

Mr. Portnoy continued that by adding four men, and in conjunction with the man that prepared the schedules for the paid side of the fire company, they would have eliminated almost 3,000 hours of that scheduled overtime. And that almost is a wash in the addition of four men at the base salary level. So by cutting just the personnel line back to two people, or a limit of two people, for no additional cost they could have had four people. And he can tell them that adding four people affects their firefighters, their paid side, dramatically. Because when you read the study that will be coming out next week, and he hopes that all the Township Committee members will review it, as well as the public, they will see that the firefighters, at present, are at capacity in their stress level. That affects their safety, that affects their performance, and that affects the residents ultimately. The safety of the residents, the safety of both their paid and volunteer side, and he wants to make another statement about the study that will be coming out. There are a lot of false allegations going around how some fire committee members don't want volunteers. That could not be further from the truth. As a matter of fact, this study was prepared by experts. They are all volunteer firefighters. They are all leaders in the State of New Jersey. It is their insurance company who also is an arm, and they have done so for hundreds of fire departments, with similar situations as Lakewood has, in terms of growth and population, density, traffic, response times, increase in calls. So, if anything, he asks that when this study is published, and it is coming next week, that all of the leaders of the Township please review it carefully so in the future they can make sound decisions in terms of the safety of the residents, their volunteer firefighters, and their paid firefighters.

Mayor Miller responded that he would also ask in the future, to give more time as this budget hearing has been going on for quite some time and he feels it is the eleventh hour when everyone is running forward. He would certainly ask that if were to happen again where the public votes down a budget, to come earlier on so they really do have a

chance, although he has full faith in the Municipal Manager who has done all the work, but he feels like he would like to hear from them before it goes to a lawsuit. He would like to have the opportunity earlier on in the process instead of it coming to the eleventh hour. But he appreciates it.

Mr. Portnoy responded he would do that.

Seeing no one else wishing to be heard, Mayor Miller closed the Public Hearing on the Fire Budget.

Deputy Mayor Akerman stated he thinks this if the first year that they did not have meetings with the Fire Commissioners before the budget. Other years, they spoke about things before, and never came to a lawsuit. Before they did the budget they always sat down with the Fire Commissioners and heard what they had to say about the budget, and they always worked things out before. It is shame that this year there was contention.

RESOLUTION DETERMINING THE LAKEWOOD TOWNSHIP FIRE BUDGET

Motion by Committeeman Lichtenstein, second by Deputy Mayor Akerman

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Committeeman Lichtenstein, Deputy Mayor Akerman and Mayor Miller.

Recused: Committeeman D’Elia

Resolution No. 2016-176 – Adopted.

Committeeman D’Elia returned to the dais.

ORDINANCES FOR DISCUSSION - None

QUALITY OF LIFE

Mayor Miller reviewed quality of life items from the previous meeting.

Mayor Miller advised they were awaiting a status report (from Chief Lawson and Mr. Staiger) with regard to the request by Committeeman Lichtenstein for the Chief of Police and Engineering Department to review the request by residents by petition, for traffic control at the intersection of West County Line Road and Teaberry Court.

Committeeman Lichtenstein advised they received a letter from the County Engineer that they are reviewing this matter at this time.

Mayor Miller advised they were awaiting a status report (from Chief Lawson and Mr. Staiger) with regard to the request by Committeeman D’Elia that they approach the County to re-stripe Central Avenue.

Committeeman D'Elia advised that the Engineering Department has a report for the Committee that he would like to be read.

Ally Morris explained that with regard to the approach from Central Avenue to Route 9, Mr. Staiger has been in touch with the County representatives, and he is awaiting a response from them as to the best way to move forward with changes to that intersection. Moving forward, regarding the request from Committeeman D'Elia with regard to the request to the State concerning left turn signals along Route 9. Mr. Staiger does have a full report on a number of intersections that have come up at the Committee meetings over the years. There are a number that have gone through various stages at DOT, starting with Central Avenue and Route 9, heading east on Central Avenue there is a dedicated left turn lane, and a left turn signal; no changes are proposed at that intersection. Also, at Central Avenue and Route 9, when heading north on Route 9, there is a dedicated left turn lane, but no dedicated left turn signal. There was a Resolution indicating that the Township was willing to pay 20% of the cost for the improvements at that intersection. That was forwarded to the DOT in October. Mr. Staiger has followed up by e-mail but has not heard anything since then.

Mayor Miller requested that the Committee be advised if they do not get a response; they will forward it to the Senator's Office.

Ally Morris continued that with regard to the intersection of Prospect Street and Route 9; they form a T-intersection. When heading east on Prospect, there is a dedicated left turn lane and no left turn signal, but no one can go straight, you have to go either north or south. There are no changes proposed to that signalization. However, when heading North on Route 9, there is a dedicated left turn lane, as well as the left turn signal. No changes are proposed there. With regard to the intersection of James Street and Route 9, the County and State were both on board to make improvements to that intersection. However, they were requiring that the Township extend the No Parking zone in the area of that intersection. There had been some progression on that; letters were written to the property owners, and it was believed that the property owners were not interested in conveying additional property, or No Parking, to the Township in that area. So the Township did not pass any No Parking zone in that area which is the reason this came to a stand-still.

Committeeman Lichtenstein stated that he thinks they should revisit that, because he personally knocked on some doors over there. Maybe the traffic has gotten heavy enough that now the homeowners would be willing to do that, and maybe they can figure out how they can help with additional parking there.

Committeeman D'Elia agreed.

Mayor Miller added that is on the west side of Route 9. On the East side of Route 9 there is actually Township land on the corner there. And if necessary, why doesn't the Township consider possibly chopping off some of that property.

Committeeman Lichtenstein added that they have told the State they would do that.

Ms. Morris responded that they have been part of it. But it may have been an all or nothing deal and if they did not get the No Parking Ordinance passed then they could not complete those intersection improvements.

Committeeman D'Elia added that he remembers that was the hold up. They were having a problem with the residents.

Ms. Morris responded that she would note they are looking at revisiting that.

Committeeman Lichtenstein stated he would go back out there, with DPW as well as Engineering, and will see what they can figure out.

Ms. Morris continued that with regard to Kennedy Boulevard and Route 9 intersection, heading south on Route 9, there is a dedicated left turn lane onto Kennedy, and a dedicated left turn signal. No changes are proposed. Heading north on Route 9, no left turns are permitted onto Kennedy. No changes are proposed. Heading east on Kennedy, onto Route 9, there is a dedicated left turn lane, but no left turn signal. The Resolution regarding Township contribution to the cost was forwarded to the DOT. Mr. John Case had responded to them, and he is asking their Traffic and Engineering Unit for an update. They have not year back as of yet.

Committeeman D'Elia added that maybe they need to see the Senator.

Ms. Morris continued that similarly heading from the other direction on Kennedy heading west there is a left turn lane but no dedicated signal for the left turn. That is the same intersection. That was included in the e-mails from John Case, and they are awaiting his response.

Ms. Morris continued that regarding County Line and Route 9, heading south on Route 9, no left turns are permitted and no changes are proposed. Heading north on Route 9, there is a dedicated left turn lane and a left turn signal onto County Line Road. No changes are proposed. Heading east on County Line Road, onto Route 9, there is a dedicated left turn lane but no dedicated left turn signal. The Resolution regarding the Township being willing to contribute 25% of the cost of the improvement was sent to the DOT in October. Mr. Staiger has recently followed up by e-mail. They are awaiting them to respond. Heading west on County Line from the other way, same situation, dedicated left turn lane onto Route 9 but no left turn signal. Also waiting for a response from the DOT after they had sent the Resolution back in October.

Ms. Morris continued that as a final overview regarding signal optimization along the Route 9 corridor, the DOT was in the Township in October of 2014 to take traffic counts at most, if not all of these intersections, to improve movement through them. The person from the DOT was James Hayden, who has since been assigned to other projects and this project was being completed by _____, who was e-mailed by

Mr. Staiger recently as well as other DOT representatives, all looking for an up-date. _____ replied back that he is also no longer working in that unit but that _____, who was included in Mr. Staiger's e-mail will hopefully follow up.

Committeeman Lichtenstein stated he believes that the Township has passed an Ordinance to put up Four-Way Stop Signs at Ninth Street and Monmouth Avenue. He asked the Clerk to forward a copy of that Ordinance to DPW to install the signs.

Committeeman Lichtenstein asked the Engineering Department if they can take a look at a traffic light at the intersection of Vermont and Locust. He asked Mr. D'Elia if that should be a regular traffic light now that the area is picking up. Committeeman D'Elia agreed that something is needed there because there was another bad accident there a couple of weeks ago.

Committeeman Lichtenstein added that he believes that Locust Street is a County road. He asked if Engineering can reach out to the County and request them to look at that intersection to see if they think a Four-Way Stop or traffic light is warranted at that intersection, and the Township could enter into a Shared Services Agreement with the County.

Committeeman D'Elia stated that with the amount of growth in that area, there should be a traffic light installed there.

Committeeman Lichtenstein stated he has one more request for a traffic light at First Street and Clifton Avenue, which has become an incredibly busy intersection, where basically cars just drive into the intersection. He does not know if they can do a traffic light there, they may have a problem with the State because it is one block from Route 88. But he would like to see if they can put one up there. And at the same time, perhaps a quicker fix would be, as you can now make a left turn onto First Street, perhaps they can do a left turning lane starting at First Street and take it all the way down to Route 88. That entire block, from First Street to Route 88, add a left turning lane, where there is plenty of room for it. The cars all jam up there because the lanes are not delineated. In lieu of waiting for a traffic light, maybe they can get one long left turning lane from halfway between First and Second, going all the way down to Route 88, out from the middle of the block and then all the way down, from the Post Office all the way back to the middle of the block between First and Second. He thinks that will alleviate a lot of the traffic there. And he requested that it be painted like a grid, like a "Do Not Block the Box" type of thing, so it would help line the traffic up.

Seeing no one else wishing to be heard, Mayor Miller closed the Quality of Life portion of the meeting.

At this time, the professionals left the meeting.

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 how much Lakewood is proposing to budget towards these proposed infrastructure and signalization changes in town.

Mayor Miller responded he did not have that information with him.

Alice Kelsey – Commented regarding the need for funding for services by the Lakewood Puerto Rican Action Board provided to the Latino population of Lakewood.

Bill Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane – Commented on a recent Board of Education meeting.

Dr. Mary Sorensen-Allachi – Commented on the matter of funding for services by the Lakewood Puerto Rican Action Board provided to the Latino population of Lakewood.

Dana Kermis, 14 Cathedral Drive – Advised he has noticed signs going up all over the Township at all intersections. He advised there is an Ordinance against putting up these type of signs, and asked if there is anything that can be done to take these signs down.

Mayor Miller responded there are some signs that have a permit number on them. If they do not, the signs will be taken down, and he will make sure of that. He clarified that the intersections are at MLK and Pine Street, and James Street and Sunset Road.

Mr. Kermis further advised that he is working at the Industrial Park now, and drives down Pine Street every morning. There are many people who hitch-hike, who are right in the middle of the road, and cars are stopping right in the middle of the road. Cars are pulling over half the way and jamming up the road. He asked if they can get someone out there to check this out.

Mayor Miller agreed.

Mr. Kermis further advised that he did see a Police Officer on South Lake Drive, and he spoke with him. Between 8:00 and 8:30 every morning, cars are going 50 to 55 miles per hour down South Lake Drive. There is no way cars should be going more than 35 miles per hour.

Mayor Miller responded they will send someone out there in the morning, and they will take care of the signs.

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 Authorizing the Execution of an Agreement With AFSCME District Council 71 Local 3790 .
Resolution No. 2016-177**
- 2. Resolution of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean State of New Jersey, Authorizing Emergency Temporary Appropriations for the Period Between the Beginning of the Current Fiscal Year and the Date of the Adoption of the 2016 Budget.
Resolution No. 2016-178**
- 3. Resolution of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean State of New Jersey Accepting a Bid for Block 466 Lot 3 as a Result of the Private Land Sale in the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:12-1 Et Seq.
Resolution No. 2016-179**
- 4. Resolution of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, Awarding a Contract to DataBit for the Purchase of 2016 Information Technology Support Service Pursuant to and in Accordance with N.J.S.A. 40A:11-1 Et Seq.
Resolution No. 2016-180**
- 5. Resolution of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, Releasing a Performance Guarantee Posted by Park Ave Realty, LLC, in Connection with SD #1839, Block 224, Lots 7 and 9
Resolution No. 2016-181**
- 6. Resolution of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, Releasing a Performance Guarantee Posted by CS Management, in Connection with SD #1417, Block 423, Lot 1
Resolution No. 2016-182**

7. Resolution of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, Releasing a Performance Guarantee Posted by Moshe Becker, in Connection with SD #1921, Block 774.02, Lot 8 Resolution No. 2016-183

Motion by Committeeman D'Elia, second by Deputy Mayor Akerman, to approve Resolution Nos. 1 through 7 on the Consent Agenda.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Committeeman Lichtenstein (with the exception of Not voting on Resolution No. 3), Committeeman D'Elia, Deputy Mayor Akerman and Mayor Miller.

Not Voting: Committeeman Lichtenstein as to Resolution No. 3

Resolution Nos. 2016-177 through 2016-183 – Adopted.

ORDINANCES SECOND READING

Mr. Secare advised with regard to the following Ordinance, they are waiting to have a Meeting with a representative of the Shore Builders Association. They agree that they need to have a TID Ordinance but they would like to meet with them to make sure it is fair and equitable.

An Ordinance of the Township of Lakewood, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, Amending and Supplementing Chapter XVIII of the Revised General Ordinances of the Township of Lakewood 1999, entitled “Unified Development Ordinance of 2005” Article V Entitled “Off-Tract Improvements”, Section 18-505 Entitled “Transportation Improvement District”, Specifically Sub-Section D Entitled “Impact Fees” and Amending Exhibit B Attached Thereto
Ordinance No. 2016-3 died due to lack of Motion.

ORDINANCES FIRST READING – Second Reading and Public Hearing to be held on May 5, 2016 - None

CORRESPONDENCE – PARKS AND EVENTS

Per attached schedule of thirteen (13) parks/events requests, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Motion by Committeeman D'Elia, second by Committeeman Lichtenstein, and carried, to accept and process the above correspondence items.

MOTION TO APPROVE BILL LIST OF: April 13, 2016

Motion by Committeeman Lichtenstein, second by Deputy Mayor Akerman, to approve the above Bill List.

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

Bill List approved.

COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committeeman Lichtenstein asked that if on Pine Street and MLK, should they still hope that Vine Street is going to go through one day.

Mayor Miller thanked Committeeman Lichtenstein for reminding him. He wanted to tell the public that they have some progress going on with Vine Street. The private homeowners in the area have gotten together. They have made an application to the DEP and hopefully they will see some progress with Vine Street, so they will be able to assist another through-way in Lakewood. Route 9 is horrendous, and they all have been hoping that Route 9 will be dualized. They have been looking for alternate routes. Years ago the Township had funding for it, but that did not go anywhere. But finally they have some good news about Vine Street, which will create another access road aside from Route 9.

Mayor Miller further advised he is working with the group that does the bike-a-thon each year, and he will advise the Committee of the progress.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Committeeman Lichtenstein, second by Committeeman D'Elia, and carried, to adjourn the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 8:21 PM.