

**PUBLIC MEETING
MINUTES**

The Public Meeting of the Mayor and Council was held in Council Chambers and called to order at 7:30PM. Adequate notification was published in the official newspaper of the Borough of Montvale. Eagle Scout Colin Hill led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and roll call was taken.

OPEN PUBLIC MEETING STATEMENT

Adequate notice of this meeting was provided to The Bergen Record informing the public of the time and place according to the provisions of the Open Public Meeting Law (Chapter 231, P.L. 1975).

Also Present: Mayor Mike Ghassali; Borough Attorney, Dave Lafferty; Borough Engineer, Andy Hipolt; Administrator, Joe Voytus; and Municipal Clerk, Fran Scordo

ROLL CALL:

Councilmember Arendacs - absent	Councilmember Lane
Councilmember Cudequest	Councilmember Roche
Councilmember Koelling	Councilmember Russo-Vogelsang

Eagle Scout Project – Colin Hill

Proposed to build an information board by Huff Pond, it will be covered with benches on each side 9ft tall also included will be a bicycle repair station. The time table will by baseball season. The engineer mentioned a permit is needed for the project, which the fees will be waived. All councilmembers agreed on the project.

ORDINANCES:

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCE NO. 2024-1551 AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOROUGH OF MONTVALE AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING CHAPTER 181 OF THE BOROUGH CODE TO PROHIBIT THE SALE OF DOGS AND CATS BY RETAIL STORES
(public hearing 2-27-24)

A motion to Introduce Ordinance 2024-1551 for first reading was made by Councilmember Russo- Vogelsang; seconded by Councilmember Lane; Clerk read by title only; Councilmember Roche made a motion that this ordinance be passed on first reading and advertised in The Bergen Record; seconded by Councilmember Cudequest - a roll call was taken – all ayes

MEETING OPEN TO PUBLIC:

Agenda Items Only
Motion to open meeting to the public by Councilmember Cudequest; seconded by Councilmember Lane – all ayes

Carolee Adams

Mentioned that today is National Boy Scout Day, 114 years of the Boy Scouts. Shout out to Troop #334.

Lacey Ackerman, Woodcliff Lake

Mentioned that Woodcliff Lake already passed this ordinance as well as some surrounding towns. The ordinance is beneficial to public health, studies showed that animals put up for adoption through shelters and rescue organizations are much healthier.

Bonnie Dickenson

She runs a small animal rescue store. Bergen County Animal Shelter has a new Director. Encouraged council to pass ordinance.

Motion to close meeting to the public by Councilmember Lane; seconded by Councilmember Koelling – all ayes

MEETING CLOSED TO PUBLIC:

Agenda Items Only

MINUTES:

Budget Meeting, January 29, 2024

A motion to accept minutes by Councilmember Lane; seconded by Councilmember Cudequest Cudequest – all ayes

January 30, 2024

A motion to accept minutes by Councilmember Lane; seconded by Councilmember Roche – all ayes

CLOSED/EXECUTIVE MINUTES:

None

RESOLUTIONS: (CONSENT AGENDA*)

*All items listed on a consent agenda are considered to be routine and non-controversial by the Borough Council and will be approved by a motion, seconded and a roll call vote. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Council member(s) so request it, in which case the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered in its normal sequence on the agenda.

60-2024 Resolution Of The Borough of Montvale, County Of Bergen, Opposing Assembly Bill No. 4/Senate Bill No. 50, Which Proposes To Overhaul The Fair Housing Act (“FHA”) In A Way That Imposes Unrealistic Obligations With Unrealistic Deadlines Based Upon Onerous Standards

WHEREAS, in 1983, the Supreme Court decided a landmark case, commonly referred to as Mount Laurel II, wherein it created an easy standard for developers to satisfy to secure a “builder’s remedy” and also established standards to provide general guidance to the newly appointed Mount Laurel judges as to an appropriate fair share formula; and

WHEREAS, the State exploded with builder’s remedy lawsuits in the wake of Mount Laurel II seriously depriving many municipalities of their home rule power to zone and control their destiny; and

WHEREAS, in 1984, Judge Serpentelli decided the AMG case in which he established a fair share formula that generated high fair share responsibilities that were widely regarded as grossly excessive; and

WHEREAS, the combination of the avalanche of builder’s remedy lawsuits precipitated by Mount Laurel II and the grossly excessive fair share responsibilities generated by the AMG formula fueled a movement for a legislative response to the Mount Laurel doctrine; and

The Fair Housing Act of 1985

WHEREAS, a week after Judge Serpentelli issued the AMG decision, committees of the Legislature started to meet to develop affordable housing legislation; and

WHEREAS, the legislators on both sides of the aisle recognized that any legislation had to be bi-partisan to work; and

WHEREAS, those efforts culminated in the adoption of the Fair Housing Act (“FHA”) by both houses early in 1985; and

WHEREAS, on July 2, 1985 -- less than a year after Judge Serpentelli decided the AMG case -- former Governor Kean signed the New Jersey Fair Housing Act (“FHA”) into law to curb the excesses caused by Mount Laurel II and to restore balance to legitimate public purposes; and

WHEREAS, more specifically, the Legislature enacted the FHA to restore home rule, to bring the fair share numbers back to reality and to reduce the burdens of Mount Laurel compliance; and

WHEREAS, more specifically, the FHA sought *to restore home rule* by imposing a moratorium on the builder’s remedy and by providing an administrative process that municipalities could voluntarily pursue wherein they would be insulated from developers seeking builder’s remedies to try to compel them to capitulate their zoning demands; and

WHEREAS, the FHA sought *to bring the fair share numbers back to reality* by among other things defining the prospective need as the need “based on development and growth which is reasonably likely to occur” and by calling for the fair share to be adjusted to a number lower than the fair share formula generated if the municipality lacked sufficient land to satisfy the obligation generated by the fair share formula; and

WHEREAS, the FHA sought *to reduce the burdens on municipalities* by prohibiting any requirement for municipalities to expend their own resources to comply; and

The New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing

WHEREAS, the FHA created COAH and conferred “primary jurisdiction” on COAH to administer the FHA and to implement the affordable housing policies of our State; and

WHEREAS, FSHC argued “that COAH’s enabling legislation established such a delicate balance of control, as evidenced not only by its use of the phrase “in but not of,” but also by its detailed attention to the composition of its Council. Accordingly, the Legislature could not have intended to allow the Governor to unilaterally disrupt that balance” *In re Plan for Abolition of Council on Affordable Hous.*, 424 N.J. Super. 410, 419-420(App.Div.2012) 419-420; and

WHEREAS, COAH adopted regulations for Round 1 in 1986 and for Round 2 in 1994 to implement the FHA and processed applications by municipalities for approval of their affordable housing plans in accordance with the regulations it adopted; and

WHEREAS, all acknowledged -- even Fair Share Housing Center (“FSHC”) -- that COAH functioned just fine in Rounds 1 and 2; and

WHEREAS, the regulations COAH adopted in Round 2 made the obligations for Rounds 1 and 2 cumulative and adjusted the cumulative number downwards because the State did not grow as much as was anticipated in Round 1; and

WHEREAS, COAH’s new construction obligation for Rounds 1 and 2 **averaged 5,034.5 units per year**, or 50,345 units for every 10 years as noted in 36 N.J.R. 5748(a) (November 22, 2004), COAH’s comment regarding 5:94: Appendix A; and

WHEREAS, COAH’s Round 1 and/or 2 regulations permitted a 1-for-1 rental bonus credit for up to 25% of the obligations and provided flexible standards for adjustments predicated upon lack of adequate vacant developable land; and

WHEREAS, the same expert who calculated the Round 2 obligations provided a technical appendix in 2014 when COAH proposed regulations for Round 3; and

WHEREAS, COAH’s expert in 2014 calculated a prospective need obligation (then 2014-2024) of less than 40,000 units for the 10-year cycle, plus roughly an additional 23,000 units for the “gap” which were to be phased in between 2014-2034 due to concerns over what could be reasonably anticipated as a result of market absorption; and

WHEREAS, housing advocates attacked the regulations COAH adopted for Round 3 the first time it adopted them in 2004, the second time it adopted them in 2008 and the third time it proposed them in 2014, thereby crippling COAH’s ability to certify the plans that municipalities petitioned COAH to

approve because the FHA required that COAH only certify municipalities consistent with its regulations; and

WHEREAS, COAH's inability to certify Round 3 plans severely limited the production of affordable housing in Round 3 because COAH found itself fending off attacks instead of certifying affordable housing plans that municipalities could implement; and

Mount Laurel IV

WHEREAS, in 2015, the Supreme Court issued a decision, commonly referred to as Mount Laurel IV, in response to a motion to transfer the responsibilities of COAH back to the courts; and

WHEREAS, in Mount Laurel IV, the Supreme Court returned the task of implementing the doctrine back to the Courts because COAH had failed to do its job; and

WHEREAS, notwithstanding the foregoing, the Court emphasized that it preferred the administrative remedy created by the FHA to a judicial one and hoped that one day COAH would be effective so that towns could comply once again through the administrative process created by the FHA; and

WHEREAS, transferring the implementation of the doctrine from COAH back to the courts deprived the citizens of our State of an evenly balanced administrative body with four representatives of municipalities and four representatives of low- and moderate-income ("LMI") households adopting regulations consistent with the FHA and processing petitions for substantive certification; and

WHEREAS, the Court process proved to be far more expensive than the COAH process and was ill-suited for resolving comprehensive planning disputes over affordable housing; and

WHEREAS, even municipalities that complied voluntarily in the newly minted court process were subject to intervention from developers, who were then able to leverage the process, litigate the municipalities into the ground, and often obtain site-specific rezoning contrary to one of the overriding public purposes of the FHA; and

WHEREAS, the judicial process the Supreme Court fashioned in Mount Laurel IV required municipalities to spend municipal resources not only on their own attorneys and planners, but also on Court appointed masters in a litigation process that was much more expensive than the administrative process the legislature established in the FHA; and

WHEREAS, as if that was not bad enough, FSHC routinely demanded that municipalities make a payment to them; and

WHEREAS, the Round 3 process was a disaster with judges pressing municipalities to comply before even establishing the obligations with which they must comply; and

WHEREAS, ultimately, on March 8, 2018, after a 41-day trial in Mercer County, Judge Jacobson issued an opinion in which she set forth a fair share methodology; and

WHEREAS, in that trial and in various other instances throughout the state, FSHC took the position that the Statewide obligation should exceed 300,000 affordable units to be produced between 2015 and 2025; and

WHEREAS, municipalities, through Dr. Robert Powell, presented evidence that the State could only absorb less than 40,000 affordable units, in a best case scenario, and thus argued that FSHC's calculations was not grounded in reality whatsoever; and

WHEREAS, the Court, having been constrained by the Supreme Court to prescriptively utilize a formula from 1993, ultimately concluded that the Statewide obligation to be constructed between 2015-2025 was roughly 153,000 units; and

The 354 Settlements with FSHC

WHEREAS, FSHC reports that it entered 354 settlements in Round 3; and

WHEREAS, many municipalities are reeling under the burden of satisfying their obligations under those settlements entered between 2015 and 2023; and

WHEREAS, Round 4 is set to begin in 2025 and there is no comprehensive analysis on the impacts of the 354 Round 3 settlements and over-zoning described above; and

WHEREAS, indeed, the A4/S50 Bill fails to consider the impact from affordable housing projects that were approved during the Third Round, but are still not yet under construction, as said projects, as well as additional future projects, will impact legitimate public concerns like infrastructure, the environment, schools, traffic, parking and open space; and

WHEREAS, the Round 3 process destroyed the balance achieved by the Fair Housing Act in 1985; and

A-4/S-50

WHEREAS, against the above backdrop, on December 19, 2023, the Housing Committee of the Assembly unveiled the Legislation (A-4) that it stated it had been working on for a long time and scheduled the bill for a vote at a hearing scheduled less than 24 hours later; and

WHEREAS, on December 19, 2023, the Administrative Office of the Courts wrote to the Legislature and made clear that it could not structure the bill in the manner set forth in the proposed legislation; and

WHEREAS, notwithstanding the foregoing, the Housing Committee of the Assembly voted the bill out of Committee and announced that the bill needed to be ready for signing by the Governor before the end of the lame duck session on January 8, 2024; and

WHEREAS, the bill was not rammed through in the lame duck session and on January 16, 2024, the Legislature released a new version of the bill, Assembly Bill No. 4/Senate Bill No. 50 (hereinafter the "A4/S50" or "the Bill"); and

WHEREAS, A4/S50 Bill seeks to abolish the Council on Affordable Housing ("COAH") and purports to reform municipal responsibilities concerning the provision of affordable housing and

WHEREAS, the Bill would purportedly reduce litigation and municipal expenses; and

WHEREAS, A4/S50 details the methodology to be used for determining the fair share numbers of municipalities in Round 4 and in subsequent rounds; and

WHEREAS, the Bill is premised on the proposition that 40 percent of all households qualify as low or moderate; and

WHEREAS, A4/S50 calls for the determination of the prospective need by subtracting the number of households reported in the 2010 Decennial Census from the number of households reported in the 2020 Decennial Census and multiplying that figure by 40 percent; and

WHEREAS, we calculate that number to be 84,690;

WHEREAS, A4/S50 calls for that number to be adjusted by the number of conversions and demolitions; and

WHEREAS, the statewide fair share would be increased from 84,690 to 96,780, if we assume the same number of demolitions and conversions used by Judge Jacobson in her formula for Round 3; and

WHEREAS, the 96,780 fair share compares to the roughly 211,000 COs issued between 2010 and 2020; and

WHEREAS, the 96,780 fair number divided by 211,000 COs equals roughly 46 percent (45.867 percent to be more precise); and

WHEREAS, all municipalities should be able to cure any violations of the prohibition against exclusionary zoning with inclusionary zoning; and

WHEREAS, traditional inclusionary zoning ordinances generally require no more than 20 percent of the units to be affordable; and

WHEREAS, it is mathematically impossible to satisfy a 46 percent problem with a 20 percent solution and, therefore, the number generated by the statutory formula is patently excessive; and

WHEREAS, while this mathematical error conceptually may have existed at COAH, COAH utilized its discretion to reduce the statewide number to roughly 5,000 units per year in Rounds 1-2 (or lower for prospective need in its attempted regulations in 2014); and

WHEREAS, in addition, COAH's Round 2 regulations had flexible standards, Regional Contribution Agreements (RCAs), an achievable bonus structure, waivers and other flexible standards to further mitigate the problem; and

WHEREAS, had COAH not mitigated the problem, it is likely that the regulations would have been challenged by municipalities; and

WHEREAS, A4/S50 also, systemically, calcifies the Court process and indeed makes critical changes which severely prejudice municipal interests and undercut the incentive to comply voluntarily; and

WHEREAS, in stark contrast to current laws that preserve a municipality's immunity in the absence of proof that the municipality is "determined to be constitutionally noncompliant", A4/S50 creates multiple opportunities to strip municipalities of immunity and expose them to litigation; and

WHEREAS A4/S50 subjects municipalities to litigation not only as they seek approval of their Housing Element and Fair Share Plans, but also even after they secure approval of those plans; and

WHEREAS, more specifically, while A4/S50 provides municipalities a "compliance certification" if the municipality secures approval of its affordable housing plan, that certification only protects municipalities from builder's remedy lawsuits-not from exclusionary zoning lawsuits by FSHC or anyone else who is not seeking a builder's remedy; and

WHEREAS, in stark contrast to the goal of A4/S50 to reduce litigation, A4/S50 dramatically proliferates litigation by providing many opportunities to sue the subject municipality and through other means; and

WHEREAS, even if a municipality, via the adoption of a resolution, accepts the Fourth Round affordable housing obligation numbers that will be promulgated by the Department of Community Affairs (the "DCA") under the A4/S50 Bill, there is still a risk that the affordable housing obligation numbers will increase during the subsequent process required by the bill, as both housing advocates like FSHC and developers can subsequently challenge the fair share number the municipality accepts; and

WHEREAS, the A4/S50 Bill creates a judicial entity made up of 3-7 retired Mount Laurel judges called "The Program", which, unlike COAH, is not comprised of an equal number of municipal and housing representatives, and is not made up of an equal number of Republicans and Democrats, thereby depriving the citizens of our State of the carefully crafted COAH Board that included a diversity of interests and that was the centerpiece of the FHA adopted in 1985; and

WHEREAS, the A4/S50 Bill does not require the promulgation of affordable housing obligations, or the adoption of substantive regulations, in a way that utilizes an open and transparent process that COAH used and that gave all interested parties an opportunity to comment and receive COAH's response to their comments; and

WHEREAS, the A4/S50 Bill reduces, and in some cases completely eliminates affordable housing bonus credits, and creates an overcomplicated and difficult process to obtain the bonus credits that are still available under the bill; and

WHEREAS, the initial version of the A4/S50 Bill allowed for municipalities to utilize age -restricted affordable units to satisfy up to thirty-three percent (33%) of its Fourth Round obligation in recognition that roughly 33 percent of the demand for affordable housing came from this age group; however, the current version of A4/S50 unfairly and unceremoniously reduced the cap on age-restricted housing down to twenty-five (25%); and

WHEREAS, the Legislature previously capped the fair share of any municipality down to 1,000 in recognition that any obligation above 1,000 would be "onerous"; A4/S50 applies the 1,000-unit cap only to a component of the municipality's fair share -- the prospective need -- and authorizes the imposition of an obligation that is onerous; and

WHEREAS, the A4/S50 Bill creates unfair requirements and ambiguity when it comes to the Vacant Land Adjustment process, which could lead to municipalities that lack sufficient vacant land being required to produce more affordable housing units than is practical; and

WHEREAS, the A4/S50 Bill includes many other provisions and changes to the FHA that are impractical and devoid of any consideration of the burdens created by the statute; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Legislative Services (OLS) has not evaluated the formula required by the A4/S50 Bill for calculating a municipality's Fourth Round or Prospective Need Obligation for its magnitude or reasonableness; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that for all of the above reasons, the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Montvale, objects to and opposes Assembly Bill No. 4/Senate Bill No. 50, and requests

that the bill be tabled, re-written and re-introduced in way that imposes achievable obligations and facilitates the ability of the municipality to satisfy its obligations.

A certified copy of this resolution shall be sent to the Legislators in the State Assembly and Senate representing our District.

Introduced by: Councilmember Lane; seconded by Councilmember Roche - a roll call was taken – all ayes

Borough attorney explained this is a model resolution that has been circulated among towns in Bergen County to oppose legislation in Trenton regarding affordable housing. The new legislation seeks to make a bad situation worse. Round 4 will create a new authority to decide fair share numbers for each municipality, it will empower fair share housing. The borough administrator stated that the borough should be prepared for what comes next as it seems that the bill will adopted.

61-2024 Authorize Change Order No. 2 - 2023 Road Improvement Program - DLS Contracting, Inc.

WHEREAS, the Borough of Montvale awarded a contract via Resolution No.178-2023 to DLS Contracting, Inc. 36 Montesano Road, Fairfield, New Jersey 07004 for the 2023 Road Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, the original contract amount including Alternates A, B, C and D was \$709,416.67; and

WHEREAS, the Borough Engineer, in a letter dated January 31, 2024, which is attached to the original of this resolution has been monitoring the project and recommends in full detail the proposed Change Order #2 as a decrease in the amount of (\$132,518.83); and

Contract Amount

Base:	\$488,152.02
Alternate "A":	\$ 36,850.00
Alternate "B":	\$ 26,055.50
Alternate "C":	\$ 57,936.65
Alternate "D":	\$100,422.50
Change Order #1	\$113,117.75
<u>Change Order #2</u>	<u>(\$132,518.83)</u>
Adjusted Total:	\$690,015.59

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Governing Body of the Borough of Montvale authorize Change Order #2 in the amount of a decrease (\$132,518.83); and

WHEREAS, the Chief Financial Officer of the Borough has certified that funds have been appropriated and are available for this purpose, a copy of said certification attached to the original copy of this Resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Montvale that the above reference change order #2 is hereby approved:

Introduced by: Councilmember Lane; seconded by Councilmember Roche - a roll call was taken – all ayes

BILLS: Administrator read the Bill Report.

Motion to pay bills by Councilmember Lane; seconded by Councilmember Roche - all ayes

REPORT OF REVENUE: Administrator read the Report of Revenue - January

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Council President Roche

Summer Camp registration will begin, Monday, March 4. Camp counselors' applications are now available and are due by March 1st.

Chamber of Commerce

Had their kickoff event at KPMG, very well attended. Street Fair will be on June 9th from 10-5

Councilmember Cudequest

Seniors

Have a busy February a lot of events planned; 5 new members have joined.

Library

Valentine Day cello concert will be held on February 10th at 12:00; Feb 15 will be a lecture on how to stay safe; Feb 17 will be a celebration of the Chinese New Year; displays will be set up for Black History month.

Councilmember Lane

Fire Dept

20 calls, 2 drills, 3 work details and 1 work meeting; regarding the house fire, 2 minor injuries, good neighbors who helped; the department is in need of volunteers; this year will be the 100 year anniversary, they will be having fundraisers throughout the year to help with the celebration, check their facebook page for more information.

Finance

Met with all the departments and are now putting the budget all together to see where we are at.

Councilmember Koelling

Police

Monthly report included in original minutes;

Hometown Heros -Veterans

Applications are now available for Veteran banners, the borough will do 50 this year, the goal is to have them up by Memorial Day.

Planning Board

A few use permits were approved; wanted to mention in regards to the assisted living and senior facilities and ambulance service are really straining our ambulance service. We need to have further discussions regarding that.

Councilmember Russo-Vogelsang

Economic Development Committee

Starting to prepare for the next roundtable and reaching out to the new businesses that opened in the last 12 months.

Local BOE

The schools will be engaging in strategic planning. The school has scheduled 2 community meetings on March 18 at 7pm at Fieldstone and April 15 at 7pm at Memorial.

From Dr. Petersen:

Strategic planning is a critical process that allows us to align our vision, mission and resources to best services all students. Your voice matters, and we want our plan to reflect the values and goals of everyone in our community. We want to hear your aspirations for our students and schools. Your feedback will directly inform the strategic priorities and actions in our plan.

New Board Member, Dominic DiSalvo was sworn in on January 8th

Mayor Ghassali

Mentioned about the house fire and Mayor Ghassali spoke with the neighbor who went into the house to get the elderly neighbor out of the house safely. He will nominate her for Congressman Gotthiemer's Hometown Hero Award. Went to the Chamber of Commerce event at KPMG and had the opportunity to meet the new Managing Director of KPMG. KPMG had 2500 employees pre-covid here in Montvale, they downsized to 1600 and only 600 are in person. They are trying to get more employees to be in person.

ENGINEER'S REPORT:

Andrew Hipolit

Report/Update

2024 Road Improvement Program

The proposed roads are Maureen Court, Ellsworth Terrace, White Oak Court, Hering Road, donnybrook Road, Crestview Terrace, Cypress Peak Lane, Burdick Road, Wildwood Court, Hollow Wood Lane

Valley View Pump Station

Smoke testing did not find anything; there is 13,000 feet of pipe that runs into the pump station; recommendation will be to video the pipes

ATTORNEY REPORT:

David Lafferty, Esq.

Report/Update

DePiero Farm went before the Planning Board and it will be continued at their next meeting; the borough is ready to close on the property. Update with Veolia purchasing 127 Summit, a closing is scheduled for March. Chestnut Ridge, NY planning board next date possibly in April or May.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT:

Joe Voytus

Report/Update

Huff Pond tree removal had to be done for safety issues, an arborist stated the trunks were 75% hollow. Looking into other options for shade in the area. Attended the Historic Preservation Committee meeting in regards to the designation of the Octagon House. Encourage the public to attend a meeting the recall of historic information going back 50, 60, 70 years is really remarkable

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

a. EV Charging Stations

Looking to take advantage of O&R incentives regarding charging stations. The location would be across from the police station in the employee parking lot. Spoke with the Police Chief and he is ok with the location. It would be a 5-year agreement with Livingston who will install the stations that would collect revenue from those parking spaces. After the 5 years, we would then renegotiate a new agreement.

A motion by Councilmember Lane to approve; seconded by Councilmember Cudequest – all ayes

COMMUNICATION CORRESPONDENCE:

None

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC:

HEARING OF CITIZENS WHO WISH TO ADDRESS THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL:

Upon recognition by the Mayor, the person shall proceed to the floor and give his/her name and address in an audible tone of voice for the records. Unless further time is granted by the Council, he/she shall limit his/her statement to five (5) minutes. Statements shall be addressed to the Council as a body and not to any member thereof. No person, other than the person having the floor, shall be permitted to enter into any discussion, without recognition by the Mayor.

*Motion to open meeting to the public by Councilmember Cudequest; seconded by Councilmember Roche
- all ayes*

Cathy Schmidt, 9 Blue Sky Lane

Thank you for considering the ordinance regarding pet sales

Carolee Adams

Wanted an update regarding the benches by senior center; Mentioned some employees from KPMG have a group of Veterans, is it possible to expand banners to them.

*Motion to close meeting to the public by Councilmember Lane; seconded by Councilmember Roche
- all ayes*

MEETING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC:

ADJOURNMENT:

*Motion to adjourn Public Meeting by Councilmember Lane; seconded by Councilmember Cudequest
- all ayes*

Meeting was adjourned at 8:37pm

Regular Workshop Meeting of the Mayor & Council to be held at 7:30pm on February 27, 2024

Respectfully submitted, Frances Scordo, Municipal Clerk