### A.) OPENING CEREMONIES & ROLL CALL

The regular scheduled Work Session Meeting of the Monroe Township Council was called to order by Council President, Rich DiLucia at approximately 7:00 PM in the Conference Room on the first floor 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 (NJSA 10:4-6 thru 10:4-21). Notices were placed in the official publications for Monroe Township (i.e.: South Jersey Times, Courier Post and the Sentinel of Gloucester County). A copy of that notice has been posted on the bulletin board at the Municipal Complex.

SALUTE TO OUR FLAG - Cncl. Garbowski led the Assembly in the Salute to Our Flag.

### ROLL CALL OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Cncl. Marvin Dilks	Present	
Cncl. Ronald Garbowski	Present	
Cncl. Bob Heffner	Present	
Cncl. Joe Marino	Present	
Cncl. Bart McIlvaine	Present	
Cncl. Cody Miller	Present	
Cncl. Pres., Rich DiLucia	Present	
Marray Daniel D. Woofer	Present	
Mayor, Daniel P. Teefy		
Business Admin., Kevin Heydel	Present	
Solicitor, Louis Cappelli	Present	
Eng., Ray Jordan, ARH	Present	
Dir. of Finance, Karyn Paccione		Excused
Dir. of Public Safety, Jim Smart	Present	
Dir. of Public Works, Mike Calvello	Present	
Dir. of Comm. Dev/Code Enf. Rosemary Flaherty	Present	
Dir. of Parks & Rec, Jim Bonder	Present	
Deputy Mayor, Andy Potopchuk	Present	

#### B.) MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

Chief of Police, John McKeown Municipal Clerk, Susan McCormick

### • Sustainable Monroe - Grant Recipient

Patrick McDevitt - Sustainable Monroe reported that we are the recipients of a \$10,000 grant from the Great Egg Harbor River Council and Watershed Association. This will enable us to get Rutgers here to do a project as well. We are the first town in Gloucester County to take advantage of this funding.

Present

Present

## B.) MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION (cont'd)

Fred Akers, Administrator - Great Egg Harbor River Council and Watershed Association advised that Monroe Township has been participating on the River Council because of the wild and scenic sections in Monroe and we are on our eighteenth year with the council. He explained we have a quiet relationship where we have been protecting the river and trying to educate the public adding we do a lot of education outreach in the Williamstown schools. We took an interest because of the water supply deficient issues at the top of the watershed in both Winslow and Monroe. In Winslow there have been memorandums of agreement with the Pinelands Commission about moving water from the watershed out of the basin in through the Camden County treatment plants (treated wastewater) and into the Delaware. This has been kind of a problem but the Pinelands Commission has done a good job in compromising with Winslow and letting them take about 1.3 million gallons per day of an out of basin transfer. Winslow aspires to maybe have some 4 million gallons per day of build out and they are going to get the rest of that water from NJ American Water. Mr. Akers explained he was involved with the process by invitation of the Pinelands and it occurred to him if we could get more water into the ground it would be beneficial for many reasons. There would be more water in the aquifer to recharge the improved water quality. He spoke of Rutgers and their involvement with green infrastructure projects, doing a lot of work in Camden and it seems to be pretty popular and successful. He was able to come up with \$10,000 in federal funding, this comes into his organization to run the council and protect the river and Chris Obropta, PhD from Rutgers was able to match that with \$5,000 to do a \$15,000 project for Winslow. He then spoke of the project consisting of three parts, mostly done by students and interns at Rutgers. The first part is an Impervious Cover Assessment (ICA) with the second part being a Reduction Action Plan (RAP) and the third part being Green Infrastructure Projects which he elaborated on. He spoke on how the River Council has been funding different things. Mr. Akers noted he was happy to entertain any questions and happy to come back at any time to give an update on the process/progress. Mayor Teefy questioned the timeframe involved. Mr. Akers advised the next River Council meeting is scheduled for June 20th, I need to get the council's approval as that is a step in his process. Once I get the approval, I can sign the proposal and start the project. The first phase could possibly begin by the end of June, beginning of July. Business Administrator, Kevin Heydel questioned exactly how this grant would work, does the funding go directly to you or to the township who would then disperse those funds. Mr. Akers explained the federal funding would come to the Great Egg Harbor Watershed Association who will then do a contract with Rutgers.

### • Traffic Study

Cncl. Pres., DiLucia spoke of Resolution R:84-2018 Resolution Of The Township Council Of The Township Of Monroe Requesting Assistance From The Gloucester County Freeholders To Have The County Of Gloucester Conduct A Traffic Study For The Intersection Of Fries Mill Road And Arrowtrail Drive And Stanger Avenue Within The Township Of Monroe which was approved at the council meeting of March 26th. He then referred to a letter dated April 25, 2018 from the County Engineer, Vince Voltaggio indicating that a traffic study would be at our

## B.) MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION (cont'd)

expense and subsequently if a traffic light is needed, that would also be at our expense. Cncl. Pres., DiLucia then noted he was able to receive some clarification on this from Freeholder Director that the commitment for the study would be for the study itself and although the maximum cost for this as noted in the letter was \$5,000.00, the study would probably come in at about \$3,000.00. Then if you elect to do anything after that, then of course, that would require more money. He spoke with a number of people from the surrounding area and he agrees that we should hold off on the study because the day care center probably will not open until sometime in 2019 (that was his understanding). He felt we would get a better study with the activity from the day care center included, as this additional traffic will have an impact on the study. He referred to the study that was conducted by our Police Department indicating the peak hours appeared to be between 7:00AM-8:00AM and if that stays true then the additional cars would actually feed into that. Cncl. Pres., DiLucia explained what the county is actually saying is that in order for them to do a study they would want us to send them a letter guaranteeing we would pay up to \$5,000.00 for a study. If the study showed that a traffic light was warranted that we (township) would have to pay for that also. His question was as there are many variables on that site, one being the exit could have very easily came out onto Fries Mill Road and south of where the exit is. The way they designed this placing it on Stanger Avenue which is the only way out from the Ridings and all that traffic from the day care center has to funnel out onto Stanger. He spoke of the number of staff that would be employed at the day care center as well as the number of parents dropping off their children. Cncl. Pres., DiLucia requested that council members forestall the study as he did not think it would be money well-invested now because he felt we would not get an accurate study. He then requested clarification from the solicitor on why the cost of both the study and traffic light (if needed) would fall to the township since it is a county road. Solicitor Cappelli advised first off regarding the study, it is really at the discretion of the county, if they thought at this time that a study was warranted they may be more inclined to do it on their own. On the traffic light itself, under state law, that is your responsibility. Mr. Cappelli will forward the state statute on this. Business Administrator, Kevin Heydel noted he was not quite sure that the cost for the installation of a traffic signal is the responsibility of the township. It is the overall cost of running it as we pay all the electric bills for traffic lights. He added in his 15 years we have never paid for the putting up a traffic light. we pay the electric bills but it is not our cost to install. Cncl. Pres., DiLucia again spoke on the letter received from the county and it sort of implies because that thing was approved in its present form, then that is the reason it falls on us. It appears to have said that, he was not totally sure. Mr. Heydel noted, the way he read that letter, if we want to contest it sure go right ahead, but you will pay for the study. We (county) don't feel it is warranted at this time but if you want to put it in it's at your cost so go ahead. Cncl. Pres., DiLucia noted that someone has to put in writing why it is our responsibility on this project. If the burden falls on us for asking for the study, then Council has a different decision to make.

## B.) MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION (cont'd)

Solicitor Cappelli noted depending on the traffic study which have certain engineering standards (could not speak on exactly what those standards are) that warrant a traffic light and under those circumstances where the standards are met, the county pays. When the standards are not met if the municipality wants one, the municipality (inaudible).

Cncl. Pres., DiLucia noted the study that was conducted by the county was done before the impact on the area. He felt it was not a realistic study and that is why I don't think we should do it now because it is not timely. If the county is trying to put us in the position where we are liable for the cost because we are asking for the study now as opposed to later, I would like to know that and what would shift it to their responsibility.

Cncl. Pres., DiLucia then polled council members on delaying the study. Cncl. Garbowski noted he was ok with waiting on a study as there is a lot happening on that road with some major changes that will affect the traffic. Cncl. Marino noted he was in agreement with waiting as he would like to see an accurate study. Cncl. Heffner, Cncl. Miller and Cncl. McIlvaine were in agreement to wait on the study. Cncl. Dilks noted he felt when the state opens the Rt. 322 & Fries Mill Road intersection that this will help the cause big time and the people are going to realize when the intersection is fixed a lot more people may start using it. Cncl. Pres., DiLucia noted he felt it will have a greater impact because right now there is a bottle-neck there so you tend to get one car at a time sneaking by. Once there is a light that would allow people to just go it will cause a tremendous amount of traffic. He advised he has been at the location and in the morning hours from East to West there is already a bottle-neck, so when vehicles are coming from Stanger Avenue onto Fries Mill Road they have to sit there wait for traffic coming in both directions. Cncl. Marino questioned the speed limits along Fries Mill Road. Chief of Police, John McKeown advised 45 mph. Cncl. Marino questioned if there was signage approaching the neighborhoods that say "reduce speed ahead" he felt this may be a way to calm down the speeds before getting to that intersection (Stanger & Fries Mill). There was continued discussion on the traffic conditions in the area. It was the consensus of council members to delay the traffic study until the day care center is complete.

#### • Records Custodian

Municipal Clerk, Susan McCormick advised what prompted this matter for discussion was the need to draft a resolution making an amendment to the current resolution naming an "Alternate Records Custodian" for the Monroe Township Police Department. With the retirement of Captain Miraglia there was never a resolution drafted to designate a new sub-custodian. In reviewing this I questioned the Solicitor, for clarification purposes, if in deed via resolution we are naming a Records Custodian as well as an Alternate Records Custodian why am I doing all the administrative functions on this, why am I signing the actual OPRA requests, I do not have access to those records.

### B.) MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION (cont'd)

Solicitor Cappelli advised if there is going to be someone responsible in the Police Department we would do this via resolution however the Municipal Clerk is still the chief custodian. Mrs. McCormick explained the process in place even though she does not have access to those records the Clerk's Office is logging-in all requests, forwarding them to the Police Department, the information requested is sent back to the Clerk's Office at which time it is sent to the requestor with the Clerk signing as the custodian. Mr. Cappelli advised the process was correct. Mrs. McCormick questioned just what was the purpose of adopting a resolution and naming Police Records Custodians? Solicitor Cappelli advised because you are going to rely on that person when you sign off on the requests. Cappelli noted under state law he believes the Clerk must sign off on the requests, however he will look into this. Chief McKeown noted this conversation started over a year ago with then Solicitor Fiore as we wanted to organize our records and the process. In light of a number of court cases surrounding OPRA by a gentleman named Paff, naming one case in particular (Paff v. Township of Little Egg Harbor) where it stipulates on page 4 of the decision and how the request was not signed off by the Clerk, which under the OPRA law is the custodian of records. He spoke of our current ordinance and how we may want to tweak/review the verbiage. The Chief acknowledged he understood the concerns posed by the Clerk. He then advised that in speaking with one of the experts who represents the State Chiefs, his suggestion was to clarify the language on the paperwork that is signed off by our sub-custodian, adding a type of certification that this true and accurate information. If in the event the Clerk is questioned on a response she would have a sworn document saying yes we gave you everything to the best of our ability. Solicitor Cappelli noted he would look into the case law and prepare a draft resolution.

#### C.) PUBLIC PORTION

Cncl. Miller made a motion to open the Public Portion. The motion was seconded by Cncl. Dilks and unanimously approved by all members of Council.

Janene Geiss, 1959 Steeplechase Drive approached council members to speak on the traffic study issue (Stanger Avenue/Fries Mill Road). She wanted to extend her thanks to the council for their consideration throughout this ordeal. We had to work very hard for our issue to be recognized, we attended meetings, circulated petitions and did letters. I spoke with the county, we had our neighborhood show up and we did what we had to do to be heard and you heard us and took action and approved a resolution for us which supported a traffic study, thank you for that, we felt that our message reached you. Now there is issue with construction at the site. Actually, I was reminded today on just how locked in we are back there off of Stanger Avenue (Ridings Development) because the work being done today affected Stanger Avenue. We had one very skinny lane to get by with persons directing us coming in and out. Ms. Geiss expressed her concerns with the school buses getting through and it was such a reminder that we have no other way out, we are stuck back there. Again, she thanked council for hearing their message. She then referred to the letter from the county (as referred to above) that says there are traffic studies already done that this improvement is not warranted. If there was a traffic study for

## C.) PUBLIC PORTION (cont'd)

Hunter Woods, when was it done? If there was a traffic study for the Ridings, when was it done? Exactly which day care center traffic study are they referring to because they did not require one? She explained that she went to the county and sat at a conference table and I looked at every single piece of paper on file with regard to this day care center and they did not require a traffic study. She then questioned why the county was digging in their heels on this issue? Because they advised all along, and I had many conversations with Mr. Voltaggio (County Engineer), why now that we have support from our township officials are they going to dig in their heels and refuse to pay for a study, then placing the responsibility of a light back on us. Ms. Geiss expressed her frustration with the county, because you do what they tell you to do and now they send a letter like this, I am offended. It is not as if we haven't tried, they said if we got the township to request the study, then that's how a study would happen. Now that we are learning how this works I think we can go about it in a smarter way. Again, she expressed her thanks to the township and noted we will continue to meet raising our voices until this happens. She was very concerned that all the work we have done up until this point will get lost. I spoke with many of my neighbors and we do agree and realize what the improvements to Rt. 322 & Fries Mill Road will do to the gap. What gaps in traffic are going to allow us to reduce the stacking on Stanger Avenue so we can get out onto Fries Mill Road? If we study this now we are not going to know what the true improvement will be there and we won't know the effect on the day care center other than working with estimated numbers. Until the day care center has their population built out and is fully realized we also won't know that. Ms. Geiss noted she did agree that delaying a study is best. She again reiterated that she is frustrated with the attitude the county is taking and it is very frustrating to live in the "Ridings" right now. If we delay this study, I would hope that when we come back, at the right time that you will all remember our neighborhood and the work we did and continue to support us. We are very nervous, we are fighting for our neighborhood.

Cncl. Pres., DiLucia spoke of a rumor that the distance from the Rt. 322 intersection to Stanger Avenue may be such that even if it warrants a light they may not approve it because of stacking lights. He requested that Mr. Cappelli verify this before we go too much further and whether we are going to hit that barrier if the study comes up and shows that a light is warranted then we will hear you can't have a traffic light because there are too many lights. He questioned what would be the alternative at that point, if you have a dangerous situation, is it stop signs is it placing a guard out there? There has to be a solution. He felt before we go any further we have to find out what is down the road. Mr. Cappelli will look into this.

Director of Parks & Rec, Jim Bonder spoke on a presentation he gave at a prior work session meeting on the merits of a recreation center. He noted there is a simple step that would be involved that being determination if the property can be used for an indoor recreation center. This would go back to ARH to determine this and Mr. Bonder questioned council if we can move forward with this step. It has been three weeks since his presentation and nothing has been done on that. Mr. Bonder felt this was a simple step to determine if the site we are talking about can be used for such a facility. He explained how the Pin Oaks development is willing to donate 12 acres, this is why we are considering it.

### C.) PUBLIC PORTION (cont'd)

Cncl. Pres., DiLucia noted when he read the proposal/conceptual plan it was noted parents would have an opportunity to watch their children from the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and when you made the presentation you did not allude to a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, questioning if a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor is being considered. Mr. Bonder noted everything included in the conceptual plan/proposal is from me gathering information over the last 14 years from various entities. It is also his experience in what takes place at events. It is just a suggestion for a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and it is just a plot plan obviously this is going to go to a designer as these are nothing more than recommendations on my part. Cncl. Pres., DiLucia noted his question would be when you said it was a 90,000 sq. ft. facility, was that with a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor or without a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. Mr. Bonder responded, it would be with the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. Cncl. Pres., DiLucia advised when the committee charged with this (Miller, Marino Garbowski) that you invite Mr. Bonder to participate, then the question will be addressed of whether we need engineering now, because when you talk engineering you talk costs. Whether it is to the point where you want to invest money in moving forward. There was continued discussion with Cncl. Pres., DiLucia added if we are going to move forward with the project than certainly you will have to bring in engineering. If their decision/recommendation to council is not to move forward with the project (for whatever reason) then I don't see where we should be spending money. Mr. Bonder noted the first step would be to put a survey together because nothing is going to be done without the support of the people. Cncl. Marino questioned if it would make sense if we talk about a petition being circulated or get this out there to see how much of a real driving force we have behind it. The last thing I want to do is put a referendum out there that gets destroyed in the public. Cncl. Miller suggested that he and Mr. Bonder can create a form and go over this through survey monkey and it can then be posted on the township's social media page as well as other avenues to try and get the residents to partake in this, to poll them to see if this is something they would actually consider. We have to figure out what questions would be appropriate. Cncl. Heffner noted that all Mr. Bonder wants is to find out if the Pinelands will approve this. He did not think we need schematics, details just a simple letter to the Pinelands questioning if we are allowed to develop this piece of property. For the sake of what is needed now, why can't the letter go out? Cncl. Pres., DiLucia felt the starting point is with the committee, the committee goes forward from there and gives a recommendation back to council. Mayor Teefy then advised, one thing you have to understand is that the developer has not received any approvals through the Planning Board to do this development, they want to cluster the development and give us twelve (12) acres and they have not brought any plans to the Planning Board at all. We don't have this land and he did not want people to be under a misnomer, start running studies and have a big discussion. He explained if the Planning Board were to say no you have to go with the final approvals you had, then we Cncl. Pres., DiLucia noted we will listen to any will not get the 12 acres. recommendation the committee may have and advised to take one step at a time as this is a big project. He noted the committee will meet and get back to council.

Mr. Bonder then spoke on our current ordinance dealing with no dogs at Owens Park. Chapter 226-4B(2) "Parks and Playgrounds" – Domestic Animals (Dogs in Township Parks). He would like to amend the ordinance to saying you can have a dog there but they must be on a leash. Including that the town reserves the right to ask you to leave if your dog doesn't

## C.) PUBLIC PORTION (cont'd)

behave. Cncl. Marino advised this has already been scheduled under "Matters for Discussion" at the Thursday, June 7<sup>th</sup> Ordinance Committee Meeting.

Mr. Bonder then spoke on a potential problem out at Owens. He explained on Friday night there were close to 25 kids on bikes, not in the skate park but they are riding the bikes all around the horse shoe area. This has become a nice walking area for people and it is the entrance and exit for people. When you have some 25 kids on bikes just riding all around it could get potentially out of control. He voiced his concerns with safety and the township may have to address this. Literally, one Friday night there were over 1,000 people at Owens Park.

Mary Cote, 1710 Biden Lane posed a question with regard to St. Matthews (day care center) and how the construction is moving along as the sign indicates early 2019. She questioned Director of Community Development, Rosemary Flaherty if there was an anticipated timeline. Mrs. Flaherty noted not that she was aware of however they have been submitting time stamped reports/dates on the construction and water was actually installed today. Mrs. Cote posed a question to Mayor Teefy with respect to Rt. 322 & Fries Mill Road as he had commented in an email that these two projects probably wouldn't be going on simultaneously and do we have an estimate of some sort with the state. Mayor Teefy advised he had no estimate, at all. Mr. Cappelli advised we have been in contact and calling to the state for a month now and still have not heard back. The mayor noted we are still waiting to hear back from the state to be able to send the developer's agreement to them. Once the information is received it will take time for the state to approve.

Cncl. Garbowski made a motion to open the Public Portion. The motion was seconded by Cncl. Marino and unanimously approved by all members of Council.

#### D.) NEW BUSINESS - None

#### E.) OLD BUSINESS

Cncl. Marino questioned Mr. Heydel on the status of the radio issue on the lower level (bi-directional antennas). Mr. Heydel advised his recommendation would be to bid this project. Solicitor Cappelli noted he is leaning that way and if you want a written opinion we can put that in writing but I am pretty sure we have to bid. Cncl. Marino noted if we have to bid he would like to get the ball rolling. Mr. Cappelli noted the original RFP was only for the study and was just not broad enough to cover the actual work. Business Administrator, Kevin Heydel noted if you were to read the RFP it actually says they were going to give us something in order for us to be able to go into the next phase. Cncl. Marino advised in talks he had it is very difficult to take that out and have someone justify that exact study, to keep those devices exactly here with a guarantee they are going to work based on someone else's study. Mr. Cappelli felt that we have to go through the RFP process again. Mr. Heydel noted at the last council meeting he requested both the final reports and the study so he had something to look at so he could start to build something and to date he has not received anything from the final results of what we

### E.) OLD BUSINESS (cont'd)

already received. Cncl. Marino requested that Chief of Police, John McKeown send those results to Mr. Heydel. He then further explained most of these companies perform both the study and the installation, we did not bid it out that way. Chief McKeown noted at the time we did not have the finances for anything more than the study. Cncl. Marino noted it sounds to him like we should start over with the study and repair and combine the two. The solicitor indicated that he did not know enough about the technology to make that call. We have a study, we can present that study and put it out to the world and see who responds, we can always reject. Cncl. McIlvaine noted he would hate to spend this money a second time. The whole object of doing the RFP and doing the study was so they would report back to us what we needed to do to alleviate the problem. So now we are going to do it again hoping that this same company that gets the bid will also bid on doing the repairs. He felt what we should do is go out to bid for somebody, give them what we have and say bid on making these repairs. As far as he was concerned if you bid on it you are responsible to make sure that it works and it works properly. What was happening here is that we were hoping to get this done by September and now we are into May and it is still not getting accomplished. Hurricane season is coming, we need to get this done so that the OEM center can operate down in the basement right now they have no communications so it is imperative we get this done soon. Discussion continued. Cncl. Miller noted his concerns with the process.

### F.) COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

### G.) QUESTIONS REGARDING RESOLUTIONS SCHEDULED

Cncl. Marino referred to Resolution R:105-2018 Resolution Of The Township Council Of The Township Of Monroe Awarding A Contract For Professional Services To The Municipal Engineer For The Completion Of An Electrical Service Evaluation For The Underground Irrigation Project At Owen's Park Within The Township Of Monroe, County Of Gloucester, State Of New Jersey. He spoke of some verbiage included in the Resolution that states we are hiring MPE through ARH, (Adams, Rehmann & Heggan) we also brought in MPE with another project on a generator work up and design, his question being should we sole source directly with them and what is the role of ARH in this. Engineer, Ray Jordan explained MPE (electrical engineer) is doing the electrical, we are doing the civil work (everything else), MPE is sub-consultant to us.

## H.) QUESTIONS REGARDING ORDINANCES SCHEDULED - None

#### I.) ADJOURNMENT

With nothing further for discussion, Cncl. Garbowski made a motion to adjourn the Council Work Session of May 14, 2018. The motion was seconded by Cncl. Miller and was unanimously approved by all members of Council.

Respectfully submitted,  Susan Marmick	M. Juan
Susan McCormick, RMC Municipal Clerk	Presiding Officer
of the Council Work Session of May 1	e-recorded proceedings and the hand written notes 4, 2018 and serves as only a synopsis of the may be heard in the Office of the Township Clerk pen Public Records Law.
Approved as submitted Annoyed as corrected	Date