

SPECIAL MEETING  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

175

April 23, 2007

Borough Clerk calls the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Borough Clerk reads the following statement: "Pursuant to Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by posting on the bulletin board at Borough Hall and by notification to the Asbury Park Press, the Newark Star Ledger and The New Coaster at least 48 hours prior to the meeting."

All present stand for the salute to the Flag.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Mr. Allen, Mrs. Barrett, Mr. Ford, Mr. Skudera, Mr. Tobin

ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Mayor Peter Maclearie  
W. Bryan Dempsey, Administrator  
James E. Berube, Director of Law  
Stephen Pfeffer, Chief Financial Officer  
Karen Mount-Taylor, Borough Clerk

Mr. Ford offers a motion to open Public Discussion, seconded by Mr. Skudera.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: ALL IN FAVOR

NAYS: None

ASBSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

**PUBLIC DISCUSSION NOW OPEN**

Beth Hesseck, 36 Frontier Way. She inquires about the Division of Health section of the budget. We are maintaining the same amount of money going into the First Aid when we now have a paid service during the day. Shouldn't this cost less if we are only doing half of the time?

Mr. Pfeffer responds that a couple years ago when the First Aid Squad came before the Council with a paid proposal, they had requested that we continue to fund them until they started to show a profit. We are still in that mode. However, we have requested in writing to them that we want them to give back some of their budget to the Borough. Basically the departments were giving back five percent (5%) because we asked for a five percent (5%) reduction. We have received notice from one (1) of the squads that this would not be a problem. We assume that this will not be a problem and are waiting to hear from the other squad.

Mr. Ford inquires what the First Aid's budget dollar is in that. Mr. Pfeffer responds that it is eighty five thousand (\$85,000).

Donald Romelfanger, 11 Gun Club Road. He inquires if there is any money in the budget for sewers going down his road, or if there will be.

Mr. Dempsey responds that there is no money in this budget, but there is the sewer trust fund. Mr. Pfeffer states that there is the sewer capital fund. Mr. Dempsey says that now that they have the sewer extension down in Green Grove for the new development in Ocean Township as discussed at the last meeting, he sent something to the Borough engineer to provide a proposal of what it would take to put sewer down Gun Club Road.

Ed Haran, 4 Gallant Fox Road. He knows that there were a lot of people that filed property tax appeals. He inquires as to what was factored into the budget on the assumptions of what is going to happen with those property tax appeals.

Mr. Pfeffer replies that at the time the budget was introduced, the appeals had not been filed. Subsequent to that, we now have some rough estimates appealed to him by the tax assessor. The assessor is indicating that right now they are looking at about eighty five thousand dollars (\$85,000). If this is all it is, it is a normal amount that we do not have to factor into the budget. We sustain a certain amount of tax appeals and cancellations every year. If this is the amount that it does come in at, we should be fine.

Mr. Haran questions if Mr. Pfeffer knows how many of the seventy (70) appeals that were done were factored in. Mr. Pfeffer responds that there were fifty six (56) residential that were done.

SPECIAL MEETING  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

176

April 23, 2007

Of the fifty six (56), a certain amount have already stipulated to a settlement. Approximately twenty eight (28) are going to be defended, but the assessor believes that we are going to win. The figure came from the eighteen (18) that we settled on. There are a few commercial and vacant properties. The commercial properties usually appeal every year. We started the year with ninety thousand (\$90,000) set aside for the commercials going to the State Tax Court. Because of the accounting in New Jersey and the way that municipalities account for tax appeals, you can set money aside for state tax appeals. Out of the ninety thousand (\$90,000) that we had set aside for the State, we have probably paid out about forty thousand (\$40,000) so far. The numbers are within the parameters that we can live with on a normal basis without having to adjust for the appeals.

There being no further comments from the public, Mr. Ford offers a motion to close the Public Discussion, seconded by Mr. Allen.

ROLL CALL:  
AYES: ALL IN FAVOR  
NAYS: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

**PUBLIC DISCUSSION NOW CLOSED**

\*\*\*\*\*

**RESOLUTIONS**

Mr. Ford offers the following Resolution and moves its adoption, seconded by Mr. Allen.

**R-07-148 RESOLUTION – Resolution of the Borough of Tinton Falls,  
County of Monmouth, State of New Jersey, to Amend Approved Budget  
in Accordance with the Provisions of 40A:4-9**

**WHEREAS**, the local municipal budget for 2007 was approved on March 6, 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, the public hearing on said budget has been held as advertised; and

**WHEREAS**, the Borough Council desires to amend said approved budget;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, by the Borough Council of the Borough of Tinton Falls, County of Monmouth that the following amendments to the approved budget of 2007 be made:

	<u>CURRENT FUND</u>	
<u>APPROPRIATIONS</u>	<u>FROM</u>	<u>TO</u>
(A) Operations – Within “CAPS”		
Police:	\$4,099,200.00	\$4,114,050.00
Detail:		
Salaries and Wages	\$9,255,257.00	\$9,270,107.00
Other Expenses		
	\$5,555,136.00	\$5,540,286.00

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that three certified copies of this resolution be filed forthwith in the office of the Director of Local Government Services for certification of the 2007 Local Municipal Budget as amended.

Mr. Allen states that the resolution says “approved budget.” We do not have an approved budget, do we?

Mr. Pfeffer responds that in State terms, the budget is approved when it is introduced, and then adopted when it is finalized.

Mrs. Barrett asks for some clarification on when this was negotiated. Mr. Pfeffer responds that this is part of the contract that has been in the contract for probably the last fifteen (15) years. We have to do a survey of the officers and ask them which way in the contract they would prefer to receive their uniform allowance. When we originally crafted the budget, we thought that they were going the other way, and when we finally resolved as to how they wished to receive their uniform allowance, we had to make this change. This is a standard part of their contract.

SPECIAL MEETING  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

177

April 23, 2007

Mrs. Barrett questions why this is under Salaries and Wages. Mr. Pfeffer responds that the police officers have the option to take this allowance either in their salaries or by voucher. They have their choice and the majority wanted to receive it in their salaries.

For the individuals that chose to put this in their salaries, Mrs. Barrett questions how this would affect the group insurance liability and the workman's comp now that this is included in the salaries. Mr. Pfeffer replies that they give the worker's comp the break down of the salaries. This way they know that there is the uniform allowance factored in, just like they know what the overtime is. Every year we have a survey from the worker's comp carrier that we have to fill out on all of the salaries.

Mrs. Barrett asks if the figure that they see does not include the increase on liability and workman comp. Mr. Pfeffer responds no. After a while, any impact at all of this would be so small that it would not be seen.

Chief Turning says that is a contractual agreement that has been in place for twenty five (25) years.

Mrs. Barrett says that regardless of this vote, this is going to be there. Mr. Pfeffer responds that it is merely moving it around to put it in the right place. Originally we put it in other expenses because we thought that they would want it by voucher, but when the final tally came in, "x" amount wanted it in their paycheck. We have the ability to put it in the budget and shift it through this mechanism. He states that if he knew in advance, if he had this back in time before we introduced the budget, this would not be necessary.

Mr. Ford questions if this will cost the town more money or is it just transferring money from one item to another. Mr. Pfeffer responds that this technically would not cost any excess except the one point four percent (1.4%) for Medicare.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Allen, Mr. Ford, Mr. Skudera, Mr. Tobin

NAYS: Mrs. Barrett

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

Ms. Mount-Taylor asks Mr. Pfeffer to explain to the Council that this type of amendment does not require advertisement or another public hearing.

Mr. Pfeffer replies that that is correct. This is a minor amendment that does not require anything but a vote by the Council.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Allen offers the following Resolution and moves its adoption, seconded by Mr. Ford.

**R-07-149 RESOLUTION – Approval of the 2007 Municipal Budget**

Mr. Ford states that he is concerned after there little discussion of surplus at the last meeting. Today he sent a note asking about developments coming on line. This email questioned what we anticipate coming on line and if we can anticipate what the surplus will be. He acknowledges that there is no way to forecast the surplus that will be built into the budget. He realizes that this may be an unfair question, but he asks what Mr. Pfeffer's best estimate would be based on the past.

Mr. Pfeffer responds that he wants to provide a little history first, and then he will give his answer. Rateables that come on line during the year generate different amounts of taxes depending on when they come on line. So a rateable that comes on in January or February would generate significantly more taxes than a rateable that comes on in October. In 2005, we brought on approximately twenty one million, (21,000,000) and it generated six hundred and eight thousand dollars (\$608,000) for the municipality. In 2006, we brought on almost twenty three and a half million (23,500,000), and generated five hundred and two thousand (\$502,000). This is influenced by when a rateable come on line and not the total amount of rateables during the year. We went through them and tried to factor in the largest rateables

SPECIAL MEETING  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

178

April 23, 2007

that we might pick up during the year. These were Fox Chase and Greenbriar, both of which estimated on the conservative side at around ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) each. We know that we are going to bring in approximately twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) just from those, not counting the miscellaneous items are added assessments, such as decks, finished basements, and pools. There are also some miscellaneous houses going up throughout the Borough. He cannot judge the prorated amount of what this will generate in taxes; it is way too early for that at this point in time.

Mr. Pfeffer provides that data: in 2002 – seven hundred twenty three thousand (723,000); 2003 – eight hundred eighty seven thousand (887,000); 2004 – one million, six hundred forty seven thousand (1,647,000); 2005 – six hundred and eight thousand (608,000); 2006 – five hundred and two thousand (502,000). Obviously these are rounded numbers. It is apparent that the rateables are slowing and the taxes that they generate are slowing with them.

Mr. Ford says that if we look at the surplus, the intent of that surplus is for a few things. One if for unexpected expenses and the other is to provide tax relief. He states that this is one of the areas that he would like to discuss tonight. He asks about what it would be to have a flat tax rate.

Mr. Pfeffer says that it is a hundred and twenty five thousand dollars (\$125,000) for a tax bill. Mr. Allen asks what the gross increase from 2006 to 2007 was. Mr. Pfeffer replies that the gross increase in municipal taxes is three hundred eighty three thousand, two hundred seventy two (\$383,272). Using the rateable base from the County, the actual tax point is now up to one hundred twenty eight thousand sixty (\$128,060). Factoring this in with the rateables is made the approximately two point four percent (2.4%).

Mr. Ford is suggesting a flat tax rate. Mr. Pfeffer replies that if we wanted a flat tax rate, we would have to reduce it approximately three hundred and eighty three thousand dollars (\$383,000).

Mr. Skudera questions if the commercial pickup and the garbage collection are factored in. Mr. Pfeffer responds that the commercial pickup is not factored in. Under the way that the budget law works with revenues, you are supposed to put in no more than what you realized in the prior year. This is a fee that we did not have in the prior year, and we will not have a true estimate until we actually start the billing cycle. All of the contracts have to come back in, everybody has to sign up, and we have to see where we are at. Only then will we be able to project the revenue.

Mr. Skudera states that we are anticipating, or looking at a significant amount of money that will be coming back to us. To add to Mr. Ford's point with the surplus, he says that that is extra money that will probably be coming in this year or next year.

Following what Mr. Skudera was asking, Mrs. Barrett questions when the money will start showing up. Mr. Pfeffer responds that he understands that May 1<sup>st</sup> is the anticipated start date. Billing will start at that point in time and collections will start after that. Mrs. Barrett inquires if they are billing on a thirty- (30) day, or if they are billing quarterly. Mr. Pfeffer states that he is unsure if that has been worked out yet.

Mr. Dempsey states that he thinks it was decided to bill quarterly. He thinks that the bills will be prorated so that they will be for the first two (2) months, and then they will be on a quarterly schedule for the calendar year.

Mr. Tobin says that there is no money in this year's budget to bring any additional police officers on. It takes between six (6) and nine (9) months to train an officer, and if you get one that lives in town, he goes to the academy and it still takes time after that. With everything that is coming on, there is a need for extra police. He does not know if rateables will help it out, but there is a deficiency at the very least for fire equipment, especially high-rise equipment, for Fire District No.1. We need to consider where we are going to get the money down the road to pay for these types of things as we add on. We are definitely going to need more people. It is indicated that we are going to need at least (6) police officers over a time period. He states that he cannot recall what that time period is.

Mr. Ford questions as to how Mr. Tobin knows that they will need six (6) officers. Mr. Tobin replies this information is based on conversations with the Chief of Police and things that were stated at meetings. At one point there was talk of fifteen (15) officers, but the Chief said that

SPECIAL MEETING  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

179

April 23, 2007

he does not need anymore than six (6) in this period over time. Mr. Tobin asks the Chief if he is correct in his assessment.

Chief Turning responds that he had handed Mrs. Barrett a copy of a news article that he had gotten, and presented one to Mr. Tobin as well. The article defines what we will probably need for the outlet mall. The reality is that we are talking about building fifteen hundred (1,500) to two thousand (2,000) new homes, a Home Depot, an outlet mall, and Seabrook Village. Without question, the number of personnel needed to police these and to provide the public safety for them, will need to increase. He has asked the administration to begin looking at this in September so as not to impact this year's budget. However if we are hiring them in September, they do not become useful to the Chief until probably June or July of 2008. This number can be moved back until January, but you have to think about six (6) to seven (7) months after you hire them. This will impact the 2008 budget.

Mr. Skudera inquires as to how much the town anticipates the outlet mall bringing in for the municipality. What would the Borough of Tinton Falls actually be getting for this? Mr. Pfeffer responds that he does not know because he has not seen the numbers yet.

Mr. Allen inquires what the dollar amount is for the 2007 surplus. He would like to know the gross dollar amount that is in the budget that has been prepared for them to approve. Mr. Pfeffer replies that the money that is anticipated in the surplus that has not changed since the introduction is two million, six hundred ninety eight thousand (\$2,698,000).

Mr. Allen inquires as to what percentage of the 2007 budget the surplus is. Mr. Pfeffer does not know exactly, but he responds that it is about twelve (12) or thirteen percent (13%). The budget is almost twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000).

Mr. Allen says that our reserve is three million (\$3,000,000) against twenty million (\$20,000,000), and in his opinion this is high. He states that he has a tendency to go along with what Mr. Ford said earlier. He thinks that we should hold the tax flat and take the money out of our almost three million dollar (\$3,000,000) surplus.

Mr. Skudera asks if someone would like to make a motion for this.

Mr. Ford offers a motion to amend the budget, seconded by Mr. Allen.

Mr. Skudera states that in order to give a flat budget, they want to apply the three hundred and eighty three thousand dollars (\$383,000) of surplus as tax relief back to the community so that they could have a flat tax increase.

Mr. Pfeffer inquires if they want to increase the surplus and decrease the amount of the tax.

Mr. Allen asks to articulate what it is that he thinks they want to do. He says that the current surplus is two million, six hundred and ninety eight thousand dollars (\$2,698,000). We have an increase from 2006 to 2007 of three hundred eighty three thousand, two hundred and seventy two dollars (\$383,272). He is saying to back the two million six hundred ninety eight thousand (\$2,698,000) off and keep a flat 2006 budget for this year using the moneys that are there in surplus. Or we could do it any way that we want. We talked about increasing police salaries. There percentage of increase is six point seven percent (6.7%) in his figures. This is already in there. We are going to talk about things at the end of the summer with regards to new hires. We are going to have other things coming on line. He thinks that it is time to give the taxpayers of the Borough a break. The schools are not giving us a break and the fire district has gone up. He states that he is sure that the County is going to be going up. He wants to give the taxpayer a break for this year. We have enough in surplus.

Mr. Tobin states that the surplus is thirteen point five four percent (13.54%).

Mr. Tobin states that there was a significant increase last year. The planning that went behind that was that we would stop the cycle that we have seen over the last nearly two (2) decades of massive increase, massive increase, none, none (by chance of election cycle), massive increase, massive increase, none, none (by chance of election cycle), and so on. He thinks that we are looking to smooth things out for the times when we again have things back in flow. The dollar amount that they came up with is figured in a number of ways. However, he is interested in what the thinking process is behind looking at what the numbers are and where they are now, and the numbers that they came up with, considering all of the cuts and everything else,

SPECIAL MEETING  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

180

April 23, 2007

to actually increase it to (\$383,272). He inquires of Mr. Pfeffer if there is something that they are anticipating that the Council does not know about, or if there is something that we saw after last year with fuel prices, or if there is something else that we should be aware of.

Mr. Pfeffer responds that they have followed what they had said last year for what they were going to do, which was to have slight tax increases to help build up the surplus and offset those years where we had that rollercoaster ride. In and around when we had those discussions, it was around two cents (\$0.02) a year. This is what we tried to do. We did try to grow the surplus last year, and the intent is to try to grow it a little bit more this year so that we would have money in the bank should we have one of those off-years again.

Mr. Tobin inquires if this is also in case if the State changes and puts in a maximum cap. Mr. Pfeffer responds that the cap is a completely separate issue. He is now seeing a two- (2) tiered cap: a cap on the tax levy as well as maintaining the present cap on expenditures. We will basically have to work between two (2) different caps to make the budgets work in the future.

Mr. Ford wants to clarify his motion from before. He states that he wants to make a motion to amend the budget to reduce the surplus three hundred eighty three thousand dollars (\$383,000) intact to the taxable rate for a flat tax rate.

Mr. Pfeffer wants to make sure that they are putting this the correct technical way. They want to increase the revenue line item called "Surplus" by approximately three hundred and eighty thousand dollars (\$380,000) and decrease taxes by three hundred and eighty thousand dollars (\$380,000) so that we do not have a tax increase. The end goal of Mr. Ford is to have no tax increase.

Mr. Ford adds and to not change the expenses. He says that of the amount of money in the budget that Mayor Maclearie had spelled out, the expense side will not change.

Mr. Skudera states that he would agree with this. Taxes went last year a lot and we should give the people back their money. This is their money that they paid into.

For the record, Mr. Berube says that while he understands that this might actually occur, he would caution them not to anticipate revenues that they are not allowed to anticipate under the statute. The reality might be that that money actually does come in and drop the surplus, but he does not want their revenue planning to be based on that because they are not allowed to anticipate those revenues. He states that he just wants the record to be clear.

Mr. Ford says that he supported the budget last year to make it right, and it was a big increase. He had spoken to Mr. Allen who was not on the Council at the time. The two really differed in opinions at the time, and Mr. Ford states that he understood his point of view. Going forward in this tax year, he states that his whole basis was that the schools were flat and decreasing. Looking at the big picture, we are one (1) town. This year the schools are going up. He thinks it is time to give the taxpayers a break; the timing is right to come in with a flat budget.

Mr. Ford states that at the School Board level, the State has played around with the surplus for years. For the last couple of years they have made the School Board carry almost no surplus which is very dangerous. This is one way to give direct tax impact back to the taxpayers. He says that they may do this on the municipal level at some point. They may make us give the thirteen percent (13%) back and that would set us up for a huge tax reduction, and then a huge tax increase the next year. If his understand is correct of what Trenton is doing, it is really important to manage that surplus in a fiscally responsible manner. He does not know if the thirteen (13) or fourteen percent (14%) is too high, but he thinks that it is. He suggests communicating with other towns and see what they are doing before going into the next budget cycle. Today's paper states that Colts Neck is taking some of money from surplus to reduce some of the taxes. He states that this is what is going on, he supports it and thinks that it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Tobin says that there was a one-time tax break at the State level to gut the schools under S-1701, a proposal that was so bad that they have had to change it twice. This proposal has left schools, as well as the people that voted for it, complaining that the kids do not have heat in the winter. Other services have been cut, teachers have been let go, and library staffs have been cut. We do not want to see this here, but at the same time he thinks that the roughly three hundred eighty four thousand (\$384,000) out of two million seven (\$2,700,000) is a good

SPECIAL MEETING  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

181

April 23, 2007

enough amount that we could let it go. The only thing that he is concerned about is if there is something that he is missing.

Mr. Pfeffer wants to review surplus to make sure that everyone understands how this is working. We started January 1, 2006 with three million, two hundred and ninety thousand (\$3,290,000) in surplus. We have appropriated the same number in the 2006 budget the same number that we are appropriating in 2007: two million six hundred and ninety eight thousand dollars (\$2,698,000). We regenerated two million, nine hundred thirteen thousand (\$2,913,000), and ended up with a surplus balance of three million, five hundred and five thousand (\$3,505,000). We have generated about two hundred and fifteen thousand dollars (\$215,000) of additional revenue. If this budget were to go through the way the way it is set up, when it is all said and done we would have hundred and seven thousand dollars (\$807,000) to start out rebuilding it from as opposed to the five hundred and ninety two thousand (\$592,000) that we had the year before. Our goal when we finished up with the budget last year was to do exactly what had happened during the year; try to rebuild surplus and try to regenerate. This is how we attacked this budget with this surplus. We kept it the same and left a little more in the bank. If we go through and readjust, we will probably have less in the bank that we had with the prior year.

Mr. Tobin adds that we had discussed the opportunity for more income where we were losing money before, such as with the trash pickup. Mr. Pfeffer responds that in 2007 we are going to have an increase in revenue from the trash side. There will be a bigger increase in 2008 because it will be a full calendar year. As for the rateables, he cannot say when the outlet mall or other projects come on line because they are at the discretion of the builders, and to some extent the economy.

Mr. Tobin asks if this will be R-07-151.

Ms. Mount-Taylor says that this is an amendment to the budget and does not have a number at this time.

Mr. Pfeffer states that from a technical standpoint, the amendment will have to be an advertised amendment with a separate public hearing on that amendment. The next meeting we would have a formal introduction of the amendment. The amendment has to be approved by Trenton.

Mr. Tobin inquires as to how long this is going to take. Mr. Pfeffer responds that it will probably take one (1) day to draft the amendment, and probably the same day to get approval. We will have this for the next meeting, and are going to have to notice that we are amending.

Mr. Allen questions if he is correct in saying that we are going to amend it and put it on the consent calendar for the next meeting. It only takes one (1) meeting to pass this, unlike an ordinance that is read twice.

Mr. Pfeffer responds that you have to introduce the formal amendment at the next meeting. It is then advertised. Amendments have a three (3) day waiting period, and then you have a public hearing and adoption.

Mr. Allen asks for confirmation that it will be two (2) more meetings before we pass this budget. Mr. Pfeffer responds that this is correct.

Mr. Tobin asks Mr. Berube if this description is accurate. Mr. Berube replies that you can put this in for real dates, assuming that you receive the State approval to go forward with this. Then you need three (3) business days of publication. He is not sure that we are going to make that for the May 1<sup>st</sup> meeting because we use The Coaster and they only publish once a week.

Mr. Pfeffer says that the amendment will be introduced on the May 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, and then we can advertise and then adopt it at the following meeting. Mr. Berube adds that the May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting is the likely date for the adoption and there will be plenty of time for the advertisement.

Mrs. Barrett questions why this is only advertised in The Coaster, which is only a weekly paper. Ms. Mount-Taylor replies because it is cost-efficient.

ROLL CALL:

SPECIAL MEETING  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

April 23, 2007

AYES: Mr. Allen, Mrs. Barrett, Mr. Ford, Mr. Skudera, Mr. Tobin  
NAYS: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

Mr. Tobin asks for a motion to carry the adoption of the budget to the May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. Skudera offers a motion to carry R-07-149 to the May 15, 2007 meeting, seconded by Mr. Ford.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Allen, Mrs. Barrett, Mr. Ford, Mr. Skudera, Mr. Tobin  
NAYS: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Allen offers the following Resolution and moves its adoption, seconded by Mr. Skudera.

**R-07-150 RESOLUTION – 2007 Emergency Temporary  
Appropriations #3**

**WHEREAS**, due to the expected delay of the adoption of the 2007 municipal budget and contractual obligations and no adequate provision has been made in the 2007 temporary appropriations for the aforesaid purpose, and N.J.S. 40A:4-20 provides for the creation of an emergency temporary appropriation for the purpose above mentioned, and

**WHEREAS**, the total emergency temporary resolutions adopted in the year 2007 pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 96, P.L. 1951 (N.J.S. 40A:4-20) including this resolution total:

CURRENT FUND APPROPRIATIONS:	\$4,337,249.59
MUNICIPAL SEWER UTILITY:	\$1,867,330.00
	-----
	<u>\$6,204,579.59</u>

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** (not less than two-thirds of all the members thereof affirmatively concurring) that in accordance with the provisions of N.J.S. 40A:4-20:

1. An emergency temporary appropriation be and the same is hereby made for the following appropriations:  
CURRENT FUND:  
See Attached Sheets \$ 469,983.59  
SEWER UTILITY:  
See Attached Sheets \$ 650,000.00
2. That said emergency temporary appropriation will be provided for in the 2007 budget under the following titles:  
CURRENT FUND:  
See Attached Sheets \$ 469,983.59  
SEWER UTILITY:  
See Attached Sheets \$ 650,000.00
3. That one certified copy of this resolution be filed with the Director of Local Government Services.

Mrs. Barrett states that it says to see attached sheets. She inquires if anyone else has them and just she does not.

Mr. Tobin replies no. He says it is of what has already been approved of the budget. We just need emergency appropriation to continue last year's budget. Mr. Pfeffer says responds that it is continue this year's budget. Mr. Berube adds that this is in absence of passing our current budget.

Mrs. Barrett questions if the numbers are written in stone and cannot be shifted later on once this is adopted. Mr. Pfeffer responds that this is only putting money in the accounts that actually need it, and not the full budget.

Mrs. Barrett inquires that when this bottom line amount is put in there, and then the amended budget is either passed or not passed, what will be done with what was not spent. You are putting money into the budget right now to cover our obligations and bills. Between this date and when the budget is adopted, what is being done with the moneys that are not being spent out of this? Mr. Pfeffer responds that the moneys are still part of the budget.

Mr. Allen inquires if this is operating expense money that has to be used on a day-to-day basis. Mr. Pfeffer replies "exactly." If all of the money is not spent, it remains part of the bigger budget that will get spent down the road in regular operating expenditures.

SPECIAL MEETING  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

183

April 23, 2007

So, Mrs. Barrett says, this is not additional money. Mr. Pfeffer replies that it is not additional above what was introduced in the budget.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Allen, Mr. Ford, Mr. Skudera, Mr. Tobin

NAYS: Mrs. Barrett

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Ford says that we have talked about a lot of rateables coming on line, and tonight there was discussion about additional employees. He does not know what this means. He states that we need to have an analysis, a report, or discussions on the directions of this. Our fiscal responsibility is to forecast in the future, including what we will look like in the next three (3) to four (4) years when it sounds like a lot of these housing developments will be on line. He asks for a workshop dedicated strictly to the budget or reports ahead of time. He says that they really need to talk about the budget. He knows that it is the Mayor's budget and his responsibility, but he is asking to be part of that.

Mr. Pfeffer responds that he thinks that we have to have further discussions going forward after the budget is adopted. One thing that is coming to light is that we really need a rateable projection over the next three (3) or four (4) years. He thinks that our planners can probably give us that and have a better idea of when these rateables will be coming on line. The starting of any discussion is a rateable projection.

Mr. Ford asks if this could be put on a workshop. Mr. Tobin asks if we can find out about getting this compiled and put it on a workshop.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Allen offers a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Skudera.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: ALL IN FAVOR

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

Time of Adjournment: 8:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

KAREN MOUNT-TAYLOR  
BOROUGH CLERK

Approved at a meeting held on: October 2, 2007.