

**MINUTES  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
TOWNSHIP OF MONROE  
MAY 2, 2018**

**A.) OPENING CEREMONIES**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Ordinance Committee Meeting of the Township of Monroe was called to order at approximately 7:00 PM by **Ordinance Chairman, Cncl. Joe Marino** in the First Floor Meeting Room of the Municipal Complex located at 125 Virginia Avenue, Williamstown, New Jersey.

This meeting was advertised pursuant to the New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act (*N.J.S.A. 10:4-6 thru 10:4-21*). Notices were placed in the official publications for the Township of Monroe (i.e.: South Jersey Times, Courier Post and The Sentinel of Gloucester County). A copy of that notice is posted on the bulletin board at the Municipal Complex and also on the Monroe Township website.

**SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

**Cncl. Marvin Dilks** led the Assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag.

**ROLL CALL OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS**

Cncl. Marvin Dilks	Present	
Cncl. Rich DiLucia	Present	
Cncl. Ron Garbowski	Present	
Cncl. Bob Heffner	Present	
Cncl. Bart McIlvaine		Excused
Cncl. Cody Miller		Excused
Ord. Chairman, Cncl. Joe Marino	Present	
Mayor Daniel Teefy	Present	
Solicitor, Louis Cappelli, Jr.	Present	
Business Administrator, Kevin Heydel	Present (7:05pm)	
Engineer Ray Jordan	Present	
Dir. of Public Safety, Jim Smart	Present	
Dir. of Comm. Dev./Code Enf., Rosemary Flaherty	Present	
Chief of Police, John McKeown	Present	
Deputy Municipal Clerk, Aileen Chiselko	Present	

**B.) APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted of the Ordinance Committee Meeting of March 14, 2018. The motion was seconded by **Cncl. Garbowski** and unanimously approved by all members of Council in attendance.

**MINUTES  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
TOWNSHIP OF MONROE  
MAY 2, 2018**

**C.) PUBLIC PORTION**

**Cncl. Garbowski** made a motion to open the Public Portion. The motion was seconded by **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** and unanimously approved by all members of Council in attendance. With no one wishing to speak, **Cncl. Garbowski** made a motion to close the Public Portion. The motion was seconded by **Cncl. Dilks** and unanimously approved by all members of Council in attendance.

**D.) ORDINANCES FOR REVIEW**

- **Chapter 107 “Charities”**

**Dir. of Comm. Dev./Code Enf., Rosemary Flaherty** explained this Ordinance is in regards to prohibiting charitable clothing bins to be placed on residential properties. She gave an example of a rental home along the Black Horse Pike who had a clothing bin on the property. **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** made a motion to move the Ordinance forward for First Reading at the May 14, 2018 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by **Cncl. Garbowski** and unanimously approved by members of Council in attendance.

- **Chapter 175 “Land Management” – Article XI “Guarantees, Inspections, Acceptance of Improvements” (MLUL Amendments)**

**Solicitor Cappelli** and **Engineer Ray Jordan** spoke in reference to this State Statute that has been amended by the former Governor, which prohibits municipalities from requiring performance bonds on work related to the public portion of a development. Solicitor Cappelli said this law does allow municipalities to do some Performance Guarantees, so we have gone back and we think giving the Township this amended language is the best protection we can have, absent of a performance bond, on projects under the existing law. Engineer Jordan said ARH had the opportunity to review this Ordinance prepared by the Solicitor’s Office and they did not have a problem with the language used, but had a few miscellaneous concerns. He explained, with projects where the Township does not own the street, the engineers can inspect it, but there is no provision that the developer has to finish the project. Mr. Jordan said wording to the amended Ordinance could protect the homeowners. He said they looked at the matter of issuing Temporary Certificates of Occupancy, which the new law allows, and probably should be included in this Ordinance. This allows the Township to grant a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy if the developer puts up a bond for the unimproved improvements that may not have been covered by the original bond. ARH came up with several options for the privately owned residential developments that maybe the Township can put in the Ordinance, which is to have the developer install the top pavement prior to any CO’s given, and also for the developer to provide base pavement up to the level of where the top would be so they can get Temporary CO’s, or put up a bond for that amount. **Cncl. Dilks** believes developers will not agree with the options about the top and base pavement and spending that kind of money, but maybe putting up a bond would be a better option. The Township needs to have some sort of protection to have the developer finish their punch list before they can top pave; they are not going to top pave before the houses are built.

**MINUTES  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
TOWNSHIP OF MONROE  
MAY 2, 2018**

**D.) ORDINANCES FOR REVIEW (cont'd)**

Mr. Jordan agreed it would not make sense, and added, before any Temporary CO is issued, they would have to post at least a performance bond if they want to get people in on a temporary CO. **Cncl. Dilks** asked if this would protect us in the end. **Engineer Ray Jordan** thinks the way it is written, it protects the HOA or homeowner, but does not think the Township has any liability because of the Ordinance, but more or less to protect the people purchasing the home. **Mayor Teefy** said the main thing is that we need to be protected, so the developer does not walk away and not do the top coat of a street. **Solicitor Cappelli** said no matter what we do, we are not going to have as much teeth as we had before the Statute was approved, however he can review the suggestions made this evening and may be able to get more teeth in this Ordinance. He will change more language in the draft amended Ordinance and bring it back before Council. **Cncl. Heffner** asked what other municipalities are doing. Mr. Cappelli said there are all doing the same, he has spoken with other solicitors, and there seems to be no standard language yet that everyone is using. Cncl. Heffner asked the Solicitor how we put more responsibility on the engineer in this case, that maybe we need to put more responsibility on them also, because they are getting paid to inspect these projects. He has seen inspections get done and a couple of years later, the storm drain collapses and research shows it was an intern doing the inspections. He questioned maybe some things need to be put back on the engineers, because they are getting paid and we lost the right to go after the developers. Solicitor Cappelli said that might be more of an issue with the contract we have with the engineer. Cncl. Dilks asked how we could make this suggestion legal. The Solicitor said any professional is subject to malpractice claims, so a lot is already covered by Case Law but he understands what Cncl. Heffner is saying, which is to add some language to enforce this concept of doing the work properly, to which he confirmed. Solicitor Cappelli and Engineer Ray Jordan will discuss suggested changes for this draft amended Ordinance and will present it again for the next Ordinance Committee Meeting.

- **Chapter 230 “Peddling and Soliciting” and Chapter 74-27 “Fees” – Peddling and Soliciting (Chapter 230)**

**Dir. of Comm. Dev./Code Enf., Rosemary Flaherty** spoke in reference to the draft amended Ordinance about peddling and soliciting, provided by the Solicitor’s office. She explained her concerns with language for vending carts in reference to the administrative aspect and the process of an appeal against her decision. She would like to further amend this draft amended Ordinance with more changes and present it again for the next Ordinance Committee Meeting. Mrs. Flaherty mentioned she encourages vending carts along Main Street to start helping these vendors operate. She noted, under the fees section, she came up with her own fees that would be applicable. She thinks the fees are what are hurting the vendors, people are trying to operate illegally due to the cost of paying \$600 a year, per person, and \$50 for a badge. For the cost of the badge, she suggested the fee of \$25 and not having a refund of a security deposit. For a one-day event, such as selling flowers on Mother’s Day, she suggested charging \$25, instead of \$100, because vendors will be more apt to pay and be compliant. Instead of paying a yearly fee of \$600, she suggested charging \$200, to encourage people to start off small but also encourage businesses to make enough money to open a business here in the Township; all employees in the business would be listed under that one license for the year. She said these fees

**MINUTES  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
TOWNSHIP OF MONROE  
MAY 2, 2018**

**D.) ORDINANCES FOR REVIEW (cont'd)**

will help businesses who are not along roads with a lot of exposure; it would give them more exposure by getting these permits so they can be at different locations, sell their commodities and not have to worry about their business being on a desolate road and people not being able to see them. She noted Veterans would be exempt from fees. **Cncl. Heffner** asked how these fees would affect the business, Mr. Softee. Mrs. Flaherty explained Mr. Softee would pay the \$200 license fee for the year, listing all of the employees under his business, they would all get background checks, and pay \$25 for each badge; we would be making it reasonable for them to properly license and if they do not, that is when enforcement would have to be made in court. She said, currently, at the cost of \$600 per employee, this is why he is not doing the right thing and not licensing. Cncl. Heffner said he is not doing the right thing because he is not getting ticketed/sited. Mrs. Flaherty explained if somebody called the police, the police are dispatched and issues a ticket, it puts the responsibility with the police. She said it is financially cumbersome right now, because people are not doing the right thing. Cncl. Heffner asked Mrs. Flaherty if \$650 covers the whole business for Mr. Softee or per truck. She clarified it is per employee and he asked if the fee was changed to \$200, would it be per truck and she explained it would be per business. Cncl. Heffner clarified with Mrs. Flaherty that Mr. Softee could have five trucks under one permit at the price of \$200. He feels that for the cost of a license for \$200, including background checks, he would not open a business in town, he would just keep purchasing a peddling and soliciting license because it costs less than opening a business in this town. He said he is still trying to figure out how this is fair for business owners in town who are already selling that product. Mrs. Flaherty said she understood what he was saying, however, she said nothing stops Dairy Fresh or Stio's Water Ice from getting a mobile unit and taking their products around as well. **Police Chief McKeown** explained his concerns with the draft amended Ordinance. He did express some practices with the current Ordinance need to be adjusted. He said the Police Department is not permitted to run motor vehicle checks, for the application of a peddling and soliciting permit, but could for example, if Mr. Softee was driving erratically on the streets and they were pulled over. He explained the current process with those seeking a permit. The Police Department gives the applicant a form to get their fingerprints processed, the fingerprints results are electronically sent to the Police Department, and they can run checks on domestic violence and warrants in Monroe Township; after this process, they issue an approval for the peddling and soliciting permit and badge. The Chief mentioned new wording of requirements on the part of the Police Department in the amended Ordinance, such as validating an applicant's good character within a certain amount of time before issuing a permit. He also mentioned a requirement of the applicant's driver's license being valid; a check cannot be run by the Police Department. He pointed out a section entitled "Record of Breaches of Solicited Contracts", is not a record the Police Department would have and also mentioned the time limitation of five days for record checks on an applicant in this Ordinance. **Mayor Teefy** asked Mrs. Flaherty what typically happens when a vendor comes in to apply for a permit to start peddling and soliciting. She said, usually, if a person comes in for a one-day event, she will get the application approximately two weeks before. She said people are sometimes shocked and alarmed that they need to do a background check. Also, if they have had one done in another town, they want to use this same one and exempt themselves from doing it again, to have this same background check submitted with their application. Mrs. Flaherty is fine with this and

**MINUTES  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
TOWNSHIP OF MONROE  
MAY 2, 2018**

**D.) ORDINANCES FOR REVIEW (cont'd)**

thinks it makes sense to do. Mrs. Flaherty mistakenly explained to Council that a peddling and soliciting license application gets placed on a Council Meeting Agenda for approval by Council before she issues a license. She asked if we need to have a repetitive vendor to do a background check every year, or is it overkill. She explained driver abstracts can be obtained online. **Solicitor Cappelli** said he did not think she can do this for this process. Mrs. Flaherty said there are applicants who are not pleased with the fees, she does not want to hurt them with the cost of the fees and she thinks the intent of modifying the Ordinance is to not change the process, but to help the vendors financially when they come in for a license, so they can do the right thing upfront. She said if the vendor does not do the right thing, then they do not have a lot to complain about. **Cncl. Marino** asked where this Ordinance stemmed from, because it is very long and laborious. **Solicitor Cappelli** said a review of other towns and their Ordinance was done. He said if only minor changes need to be done to the existing Ordinance that can be done instead. **Cncl. Marino** questioned if this process is being handled through Zoning or Community Development, noting both are mentioned throughout the Ordinance. **Dir. of Comm. Dev./Code Enf., Rosemary Flaherty** said it is not Zoning and it would be more for Community Development. **Cncl. Marino** also agrees with the Police Chief about validating an applicant's character, which is subjective. He also feels there is a lot of verbiage within this Ordinance about carts, such as a parking time limit and distance requirements. **Cncl. Marino** asked if we currently have a problem with carts around town. Mrs. Flaherty said we do, she would like to see more of them, that we need more to have more liveliness on Main Street. **Cncl. Marino** clarified he is asking in general, not specifically Main Street, and Mrs. Flaherty said she understood. She said if we are going to amend this Ordinance, she would like to take her time and do the Ordinance correctly, to include some other changes with the process. She clarified her initial request for the Ordinance amendment was to give some relief on the fees, to get vendors legal and not operating illegally and the end result of running them out of town. **Police Chief McKeown** asked about a section in reference to exemptions and the fingerprinting process. He believes it exempts them from fees and background checks; however, another section is in reference to contributions and donations, which we have charitable organizations, such as Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, who ask for food donations to be left in a bag for donation to our food bank. He said in past practice, these organizations would call the Police Department and let them know they will be knocking on doors in a development in town, with no requirement of doing a background check, fees or permitting. He feels, with this proposed amended Ordinance, it seems to add a few more requirements. The Solicitor suggested we start with the current Ordinance and make some changes to it. **Mayor Teehy** confirmed this Ordinance deters someone from setting up a BBQ pit on a street corner and selling their goods, to which Mrs. Flaherty also confirmed it does. He then clarified these changes were made because someone might open up a BBQ restaurant and then someone places a stand down the street from his building and could take business away. He asked if these changes would allow this situation again. Mrs. Flaherty said the only changes that she is proposing this evening is relief of the fees and she wants to go through the Ordinance to make changes and do an overlay that makes sense throughout the Township. She said we are trying to get economic development, and from time to time, be able to amend that map. **Cncl. Marino** clarified we would have different roles for different parts of the Township. Mrs. Flaherty confirmed, saying

**MINUTES  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
TOWNSHIP OF MONROE  
MAY 2, 2018**

**D.) ORDINANCES FOR REVIEW (cont'd)**

we do not want people setting up on a highway with no shoulder, with vehicles driving at 65MPH. Cncl. Marino said his concern is also with carts going up and down Main Street, such as having enough room on the sidewalk. Mrs. Flaherty agreed, making suggestions such as it cannot be on the sidewalk, access for handicap, not allowed on grass because of grease, use of generators with the Fire Official's approval, adding there are many other matters involved here. **Cncl. Heffner** mentioned food trucks are becoming popular, suggesting incorporating guidelines for them into the Ordinance as well. He said a food truck is coming to 13<sup>th</sup> Child Brewery on Saturday. Mrs. Flaherty noted there is a vacant building next to and two vacant buildings across from this brewery. She said we would not want to encourage them to continue to keep doing this on a routine basis, so maybe we should limit these businesses from having it a certain amount of times per year, because it would deter businesses from moving into these buildings. Cncl. Heffner asked if the Ordinance would exclude the vendors from setting up on Township property, such as the parks. Mrs. Flaherty said this would not have anything to do with the Parks & Recreation process and their one-day events. Cncl. Heffner clarified he is asking, for example, about a vendor going into Owens Park on a Wednesday night and being able to sell. Mrs. Flaherty replied that they cannot unless the Mayor signs the application for him to go through the process. She said no one should be going in there anyway without the application regardless of the Mayor signing it and saying they are okay to be any vendor. Cncl. Heffner asked if we would be issuing them a badge. She said they should be issued one, but does not know what Mr. Bonder does. **Cncl. Garbowski** suggested with the changes to be made, to protect the existing businesses, the vendors are prohibited from setting up shop in front an existing business in a building, such as a certain distance/radius from the business. For example, an ice cream vendor setting up a cart in front of Dairy Fresh, Uncle Mike's or Stellaccio's. Mrs. Flaherty agreed it should not be the same commodity of what the business in the building is selling. **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** asked Mrs. Flaherty if this is going to affect our ability to enforce soliciting and hustlers. She said it will not and when this Ordinance has its final amendments, it will give us a lot more teeth and should help bring and generate the economic development to the areas we want to see some start-up in. This is not to hurt businesses, but to promote business where it is necessary, and it is needed to put the restrictions on how many times a year a vendor cart can be in front of a business. Cncl. Pres. DiLucia clarified he meant he was questioning soliciting at doors of residential homes. Mrs. Flaherty said the peddlers are the ones who are concerned about the fees, so what they do is have one employee come in and get a license and the rest do not get licenses. She confirmed this will stop that, because it will make it economical and they will be informed of the rules and violations of the Ordinance. Cncl. Pres. DiLucia asked what the penalty is for not obtaining a license and badges. Mrs. Flaherty explained if a person calls the Police Department about a person peddling and soliciting at their door and the police go out to the property, she could pull the license for the year and there will be a fine, a report would be generated and a summons issued. **Solicitor Cappelli** confirmed it would be a fine of up to \$1,000 with the discretion of the judge. Cncl. Marino asked what we collect annually in fees for this license. Mrs. Flaherty said very little is collected in fees, because they do not want to pay the \$600. While polling of Council, **Cncl. Heffner** said he does not agree with the new fees, because he thinks the fee should be per vehicle (in cases such as Mr. Softee) and not one fee covering all trucks the business has. A business who has one vehicle, would be

**MINUTES  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
TOWNSHIP OF MONROE  
MAY 2, 2018**

**D.) ORDINANCES FOR REVIEW (cont'd)**

paying the same as a business who has six vehicles, which does not make sense to him. **Cncl. Dilks** suggested charging a fee on a range of how many vehicles the business has, such as a price for one to four vehicles, a price for more than four vehicles, etc., to which **Cncl. Marino** also agreed. **Cncl. Heffner** again did not agree and stated he would like to see a fee charged for each vehicle. **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** stated he is against writing Ordinances that are so restrictive, that we end up choking ourselves with them. **Mr. Softee** is the only business that he knows of that has a fleet of trucks. He said if we end up needing to revise this Ordinance later, we can revise it. **Dir. of Comm. Dev./Code Enf., Rosemary Flaherty** agreed. **Cncl. Marino** polled the Council Members in attendance and all were fine with making these changes, with the exception of **Cncl. Heffner**. **Mrs. Flaherty** summarized the changes she is suggesting to the Fee Ordinance for Peddling and Soliciting, which are to change the Badge Fee from \$50 that includes a refundable security deposit of \$25 per badge, to a fee of \$25 with no requirement of a security deposit, the License Fee Per Day from \$100 to \$25 and the License Fee Per Year from \$600 to \$200 and the license will cover the business, not the operator of the business on site and all employees who work under the license must have a background check and badge, and include verbiage in the Fee Ordinance to state that special event days may be exempt from the fees if approved by Resolution. She will email her suggested changes to Council and the Solicitor.

- **Chapter 243 "Signs"**

**Solicitor Cappelli** stated he was asked to interpret the Sign Ordinance and give a constitutional opinion on it. He provided a memo, stating he thinks the Ordinance is unconstitutional, that it is not something that can be enforced in any Court in the United States of America. **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** questioned if **Mr. Cappelli** was speaking about the portion of the Ordinance in reference to time and **Mr. Cappelli** clarified he was speaking about the entire Ordinance. **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** asked why other towns in the area adhere to it. **Mr. Cappelli** said they have it and if candidates want to voluntarily agree to it and comply with it, he thinks that is up to them. In most towns, they can never be enforced. **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** questioned what makes this Ordinance unconstitutional. **Mr. Cappelli** said political speech is given every First Amendment possible right be it hit or miss. In order to restrict a freedom of speech, there needs to be some real public safety or overriding matter to do that; there's really not when we already have a full Sign Ordinance in place, not related to political signs, that really addresses our signs in town. He said what is happening is we are picking on political speech in the Ordinance, which cannot be done. He said a lot of towns have this, but no one enforces it. The one thing that does get enforced from time to time, which can be covered in our Sign Ordinance, is setting how many days after an election, the signs are to come down, which is currently covered in our Sign Ordinance. **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** asked if there is a line of demarcation between political signs and non-political signs. **Mr. Cappelli** said our Sign Ordinance covers every type of sign imaginable. He said our current Ordinance, that he is asking to rescind, is stating that this particular type of sign (*political signs*), which is protected at the highest level of the United States Constitution, is being singled-out and the Township is saying when they can be put up; it is not enforceable. A resident in attendance (*later identifying himself after request for the record, Joe Camioni, President of the Monroe Township Republican Club*) asked if there is

**MINUTES  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
TOWNSHIP OF MONROE  
MAY 2, 2018**

**D.) ORDINANCES FOR REVIEW (cont'd)**

currently a fine if there is a sign posted, to which the Solicitor replied yes. The resident further said most law-abiding citizens will look at this and say “well, we don’t want to offend that Ordinance...”, asking if other people aren’t? Solicitor Cappelli told him he was not sure what he meant. The resident clarified he was saying that most law-abiding citizens would say “oh, there’s an Ordinance, well, I guess we should respect that...” He asked if the Police have fined anyone for putting signs up. Mr. Cappelli said he did not know the answer to that question. **Police Chief McKeown** said he could not imagine the Police enforcing it. **Cncl. Marino** stated we are getting off-tract and asked that we try to stay on point. He hopes that signs will not be going up in January, or sitting out from June to November, for example. Mr. Cappelli said the current Ordinance references temporary signs and what they are. He said that language would cover political signs and **Dir. of Comm. Dev./Code Enf., Rosemary Flaherty** clarified it would cover all temporary signs. **Cncl. Marino** polled the members of Council in attendance and all were in favor of moving the Ordinance forward for First Reading at the Regular Council Meeting of May 14, 2018. At this point, Solicitor Cappelli asked the resident to identify himself for the record. **Cncl. Marino** informed Mr. Camioni the Public Portion in reference to Ordinances had already been closed.

- **Chapter 162 “Housing Standards”**

**Dir. of Comm. Dev./Code Enf., Rosemary Flaherty** explained the changes were only a change in verbiage, such as changing “license” to “Certificate of Registration” for yearly rental registrations. **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** asked if the verbiage has any substance, to which Mrs. Flaherty replied it does not, and **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** asked why it was then being changed. She said, basically, the State says we cannot call it a “license”. **Cncl. Marino** polled the members of Council in attendance and all were in favor of moving the Ordinance forward for First Reading at the Regular Council Meeting of May 14, 2018.

- **Bond Ordinance O:13-2018 Correction**

**Business Administrator, Kevin Heydel** explained the corrections to Ordinance O:13-2018. The changes made under the heading “Purpose/Improvement”, the words “Construction of a new Fire Building for the Cecil Fire Department” shall be deleted and be replaced with “Improvements and Repairs to the Cecil Fire Department facilities”. Also, under the heading “Period of Usefulness”, the number “40” shall be deleted and be replaced with “20”. **Cncl. Marino** said these changes did not change our interest rate, to which **Solicitor Cappelli** confirmed it did not. **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** asked Mr. Heydel what the interest rate on the bond is. Mr. Heydel said we did not go out to bond yet, we have to wait until the Ordinance is passed, then during the Summer we will go out for Serial Bonds, because we are up to \$14 million. **Cncl. Garbowski** made a motion to move the Ordinance forward for First Reading at the May 14, 2018 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by **Cncl. Pres. DiLucia** and unanimously approved by members of Council in attendance.

MINUTES  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
TOWNSHIP OF MONROE  
MAY 2, 2018

E.) MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

- Chapter 65 – Article V “Antinepotism”

**Solicitor Cappelli** said he was asked to provide samples of Antinepotism Ordinances from other municipalities. He read aloud other Ordinances, specifying which family relation to a municipal employee are prohibited from being hired for employment with the municipality. **Cncl. Heffner** said the issue he has with our Ordinance is the word “cousin”, that it is too vague. He was informed our Ordinance does not read “cousin” and instead it does read “first cousins”. The Solicitor said he thinks our policy is fine and does not need to be amended. **Cncl. Heffner** clarified it was his mistake and all members of Council in attendance were in favor of keeping the current Ordinance and not making amendments to it.

F.) OLD BUSINESS

**Cncl. Marino** reported he spoke with the Solicitor and Chief of Police in reference to a Request for Proposal for an analysis on the radio communication within the municipal building and the schools. The consultant would do an analysis and provide a finished product that gives the township a way to fix the radio communication issues; this is considered to be the design. The equipment and installation for the design now needs to be purchased. **Cncl. Marino** clarified that the consultant who did the design, also gave the price because it is their design. He said this is very critical where these are placed and the consultant has to do it based on his study. There are other companies that bid on this project and if they did a design, they may not be in the same spot and the same equipment, so we are not comparing apples to apples. **Business Administrator, Kevin Heydel** explained we would bid out that design for the purchase and installation in accordance with the design we have. **Cncl. Marino** said his issue with this, is if there is a problem and they did not do the study, this is very critical where these are placed. If the radios are not placed in the correct spot, it will affect the radio in a negative way. In his opinion, we need to have these two tied together. **Cncl. Dilks** asked what kind of guarantee they are going to give if someone else did the study and they put it where they want. **Mr. Heydel** said this is everything that gets put into the bid specifications. **Mayor Teefy** said he thinks before the company is paid, we go around to the areas and see if we can communicate and if we cannot, it has to go back to the drawing board. **Mr. Heydel** said that does not preclude the person who did the design from bidding on it. **Cncl. Marino** agreed it does not, however the bid may not come in with the same number as we have right now and we could possibly spend more money on this project. **Cncl. Marino** said even if it does work the one time, as the Mayor said, that does not guarantee it is going to continue to work and that there is not going to be a problem and when there is a problem, there is a guy that did the study and a guy who did the install. He said, in his experience that could be a problem. **Cncl. Marino** said there is a chance we have to rebid and change the specifications, to include goods and services.

**MINUTES  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
TOWNSHIP OF MONROE  
MAY 2, 2018**

**G.) ADJOURNMENT**

With nothing further to discuss, **Cncl. Garbowski** made a motion to adjourn the Ordinance Committee Meeting of May 2, 2018. The motion was seconded by **Cncl. Dilks** and unanimously approved by all members of Council in attendance.

**Respectfully submitted,**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Deputy Municipal Clerk, Aileen Chiselko**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Presiding Officer**

*These minutes were prepared from excerpts of the recorded proceedings and hand written notes taken during the Ordinance Committee Meeting of May 2, 2018 and serve only as a synopsis of the proceedings. The official recording may be heard in the Office of the Township Clerk upon proper notification pursuant to the Open Public Records Law.*

Approved as submitted Asc Date 7/11/18  
Approved as corrected \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_