

Joint Consolidation/ Shared Services Study Commission of Princeton Borough and Princeton Township

May 17, 2011

Joint Consolidation/ Shared Services Study Commission of Princeton Borough and Princeton Township

Minutes of the Regular Meeting

Tuesday, May 17, 2011 7 pm

**Municipal Complex, Conference Room A
400 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, NJ**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 pm, with Ms. Shabnam Salih reading the Open Public Meetings Act Statement:

The following is an accurate statement concerning the providing of notice of this meeting and said statement shall be entered in the minutes of this meeting.

Notice of this meeting as required by sections 4a, 3d, 13 and 14 of the Open Public Meetings Act has been provided to the public in the form of the written notice attached hereto.

On May 6, 2011 at 2:00 p.m., said notice was posted in the official bulletin board, transmitted to the Princeton Packet, the Trenton Times, the Town Topics, filed with the Township Clerk and posted on the Princeton Borough and Princeton Township websites.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Golden, Haynes, Goerner, Lilienthal, Lahnston, Trotman, McCarthy, Miller, Simon, Goldfarb and Small

Absent: Metro

Additional Attendees: John Fry, Eugene McCarthy, Bob Bruschi, Jim Pascale and Joe Stefko (via phone)

3. REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES FROM APRIL 27, 2011

May 17, 2011

It is noted that emailed revisions will be added to the minutes.

Motion is made by Miller to approve the 4/27/11 minutes.

Motion is seconded by Simon.

All vote in favor.

4. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Chairperson Lahnston revises the agenda and moves up the comments portion of the evening.

Phyllis Teitelbaum hands out a worksheet , which has her analysis of the estimated savings of consolidation. She states that the savings will be inequitable between the Township and the Borough and that this will be a result of consolidation rather than shred services. She also stresses that there will be inequitable political representation as a result of consolidation and asks that the commission consider only shared services, not consolidation.

Mayor Goerner asks where she received the estimated savings figures from since only the Finance subcommittee had seen those figures.

Goldfarb answers that he was in contact with Teitelbaum.

Chairperson Lahnston asks that the figures shared by Teitelbaum not be reported because those figures have changed since the meeting and are no longer correct.

5. UPDATE ON COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MEETINGS – CAROL GOLDEN

Golden shares that the subcommittee held neighborhood gatherings on May 2nd, 4th, 10th and 16th. Many from the public expressed the same concerns and issues

May 17, 2011

that have been on the radar of the Commission. There will be additional neighborhood gatherings June 7th, 9th and 16th, which will be held all throughout the town. There are also many people interested in hosting future neighborhood gatherings.

Lahnston explains that in the interest of time Golden was asked to be brief and will provide a more thorough update at the meeting on the 25th.

Miller asks Golden for an updated worksheet on the themes of concern that Golden had previously compiled. She agreed.

**6. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM POLICE SUBCOMMITTEE –
RYAN LILIENTHAL**

a. COMMISSION DISCUSS AND VOTE ON:

i. POLICE CONSOLIDATION

Lilienthal thanks Metro, in his absence, for his expertise and guidance.

In relating the recommendation of the Police Subcommittee with regard to a fully consolidated municipality, Lilienthal references CGR's May 11, 2011 Powerpoint presentation, page 53. As reflected on Powerpoint page 53, the subcommittee recommends a goal of 51 officers within 3 years time or before and a consolidated dispatch, court service, jail and violations bureau. The model begins with headcount neutral (60 officers) on Day 1 of consolidation, decreases to 54 then within 3 years or less will decrease to 51 sworn officers.

He explains that the current level of services will be maintained and other services will be enhanced or added. There will be no cuts in services.

There is discussion about the phase-in process, particularly with regard to the development of a traffic/safe neighborhood unit.

Joint Consolidation/ Shared Services Study Commission of Princeton Borough and Princeton Township

May 17, 2011

Mayor Trotman explains that in the restructuring process, management can move around officers accordingly to make sure all services are appropriately staffed.

Goldfarb asks what consideration was given to avoid layoffs.

McCarthy explains that the focus was on attrition rather than layoffs.

Goldfarb also asks why in other departments cuts are made in the short term and why cuts are over a longer period of time in police.

Lilienthal explains that it is important to maintain a level of service and safety for the public and that he does not believe other departments would be as dramatically impacted by cuts, as the police department would be.

Mayor Trotman explains that there may be more early retirements or retirements in the police department as a result of consolidation or shared services than there may be in other departments.

Simon asks for more information regarding the early retirement packages as discussed by DCA.

McCarthy explains that it has to be a part of the transitional planning and costs.

Simon asks what will happen in the case that the police chief does not want to reduce staff.

Representatives from the governing bodies explain that it is ultimately the governing body that makes the decision and execute the recommendations.

May 17, 2011

Vote for Consolidation of Police Departments

All Vote in Favor

ii. POLICE AS A SHARED SERVICE

In relating the recommendation of the Police Subcommittee with regard to merging the Township and Borough police services in the context of separate municipalities, Lilienthal references CGR's May 11, 2011 Powerpoint presentation, page 54. The Police Subcommittee recommends that the municipalities share police services, even in the absence of full consolidation. As reflected on Powerpoint page 54, the subcommittee recommends the same staffing model recommended for a fully consolidated municipality; as well as sharing dispatch, jail, courts and violations bureau.

The committee, however, is not making a recommendation with regard to a governance structure. Lilienthal points out that both the Township and Borough police chiefs underscore the importance of establishing a single line of authority to which the police chief reports; and not creating a structure in which the chief reports to two "masters." Lilienthal notes that the subcommittee evaluated the Joint Meeting structure, as well as other options that would provide a single line of authority, but the subcommittee did not reach a specific recommendation in this area. The committee notes that it is unclear at this time which governance approach is best. The governing bodies will be tasked to provide a legal analysis of the Joint Meeting Statutes, which could be used to create a joint Authority; and to explore alternative governance structures, if needed.

Simon asks for examples where municipalities contract out for police services.

Fry lists several NJ municipalities.

Joint Consolidation/ Shared Services Study Commission of Princeton Borough and Princeton Township

May 17, 2011

There is discussion as to whether police as a consolidated service and police as a shared service will both be on the referendum. Goldfarb and Mayor Goerner express their different understandings of whether both or one of the questions will appear on the referendum. Goldfarb states that both should be on the referendum and Goerner believes that both should not.

Simon makes a motion to adopt the recommendation of the subcommittee for the police shared services model in the case consolidation does not receive approval, given that the governing bodies work together to determine the details.

Mayor Goerner seconds the motion.

Mayor Trotman explains that a more detailed recommendation on police as a shared service did not come from the subcommittee due to a multitude of unanswered questions such as cost sharing, governing body structure for police, etc.

Simon withdraws his motion.

Small suggests adding a statement to the recommendation on cost sharing for police as a shared service.

Mayor Trotman makes the motion to accept the recommended police model, as reflected in CGR's May 11, 2011 Powerpoint presentation, page 54 – including, 51 officers in 3 years or less, with the added statement that the governing bodies will need to determine how to approach cost-sharing between the municipalities.

Golden seconds this motion.

May 17, 2011

Goldfarb explains that he needs more definitive details on the shared service structure.

Vote:

Seven in favor.

Two against: Simon and Goldfarb

Motion Carries

- 7. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE -- VALERIE HAYNES**
 - a. COMMISSION DISCUSS AND VOTE ON:**
 - i. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS CONSOLIDATION**

Haynes explains that the subcommittee recommends Model 4, thea cross departmental, integrated model, as described at the previous meetings.

The subcommittee has had further discussion with the Recreation department and the department management has expressed strong reservations to having the maintenance staff from recreation merged with the DPW. Given these concerns, the subcommittee is now reconsidering whether to include the Rec. department in the consolidated Public Works Department.

Mayor Goerner asks if the concerns of the Rec. Dept. can be mitigated and what the specific concerns of the department are.

Haynes refers to the model four organization chart and explains the department perceives a long chain of command in the structure of the recommended consolidated department. Recreation is concerned that park maintenance will have a lower priority in a consolidated department and therefore recreation activities

Joint Consolidation/ Shared Services Study Commission of Princeton Borough and Princeton Township

May 17, 2011

and program will suffer. Recreation now has the ability to respond quickly as needs arise, and fears this responsiveness will be lost.

Goldfarb, Miller and Goerner express their beliefs that yielding to one department will not set a good precedent.

Golden explains that Ben Stentz had good points and that the Rec. department has a strong relationship with the public and a lot of people may vote against consolidation if they fear they could lose the Rec. services they are accustomed to.

Lahnston explains that the issues of concern can be dealt with by good management.

Mayor Goerner suggests possibly phasing in the Rec. Dept.

Golden explains it is not wise to force the department into consolidation especially if it is likely to be unpopular with the public.

Haynes makes a motion to recommend the original recommendation, which is an integrated model of the following departments: engineering, public works, PSOC, and the recreation maintenance crew.

Goldfarb seconds the motion.

Simon explains his belief that consolidated will in no way hurt the Rec. Department.

Miller explains that with consolidation the Rec. Dept. will no longer be an autonomous body.

May 17, 2011

Mayor Goerner adds that under consolidation the Rec. Dept will still have the Rec board but will not have the management powers they are accustomed to.

Lahnston adds an amendment to the motion that the Rec./maintenance dept will be phased in over a 2-year period. The motion does not carry.

Pascale and Bruschi are asked of their opinions by Lilianthal.

Bruschi explains that the Rec. Dept. can certainly transition into a consolidated dept. and it would be easier to do so in the beginning than to phase it in later.

Pascale explains that the Rec. Dept. has very specialized services but could be put under a consolidated department. He adds that under consolidation they would no longer be a joint service and would have a board but a different administrative structure.

On the motion: 8 Vote in favor

1 against (Golden)

Motion Carries

ii. FACILITIES

Haynes explains the new facilities needed for River Road.

Goldfarb asks for estimated costs in case consolidation does not happen. He also asks if the subcommittee looked into operational advantages and disadvantages to the River Road facility.

Haynes responds that the subcommittee did in fact do so in their deliberations..

May 17, 2011

Lahnston suggests the facilities recommendations along with the cost estimates -- that were prepared by the DPW Superintendents along with the Engineering Department and the PSOC Engineer -- go in the report narrative.

Because these recommendations are simply advice to a future governing body (or bodies), it was agreed that no vote was necessary.

iii. EQUIPMENT

Both towns have capital plans. The subcommittee had no recommendation for changes in the equipment inventory. However, construction of a cold storage facility in the future will help prolong the life of equipment.

iv. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AS A SHARED SERVICE

The subcommittee is recommending against Public Works as a shared service. The synergy of combining Engineering, DPW, SOC and recreation maintenance can not be achieved as a shared service, as the Engineering departments would not be merged. Given that, the quantifiable savings is less. Further, it would be difficult to structure the administration of the DPW as a shared service - the benefit of the potential savings do not warrant the work of creating a new administrative structure. The subcommittee recommends, however, that if we continue as two separate towns, the communities continue the cooperative relationship that currently exists between the two departments, and be open to ways to expand cooperative efforts in the future.

Motion made by Lahnston not to recommend Public Works as a shared service.

Golden seconds the motion.

All vote in favor.

May 17, 2011

**8. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MUNICIPAL CONSOLIDATION
SUBCOMMITTEE – BERNIE MILLER**

Miller states that the subcommittee recommends the name of Princeton for a consolidated community.

Motion is made by Goerner to recommend the name of Princeton.

Motion is seconded by Golden.

All vote in favor.

In regards to Advisory Planning Districts the subcommittee recommends that under consolidation in the transitional year, the governing bodies of the two municipalities develop a framework for the implementation of APD in the consolidated municipality.

Motion is made by Miller to accept the recommendation on APDs.

Motion is seconded by Simon.

All vote in favor.

Mayor Goerner will share a legal memo he received on APDs.

Miller makes the following recommendations which are the same as presented on May 11, 2011 at the public meeting.

**ADMINISTRATOR Option 2: Reduce 1 administrator, no new staff
(savings of \$205,756)**

**CLERK Option 3: Retain only one clerk and deputy clerk + full current support staff
(savings of \$198,892)**

**FINANCE/TAX COLLECTOR Option 3: Retain only one CFO and assistant CFO + full current support staff
(savings of \$217,496)**

May 17, 2011

ENGINEERING Option 2: Reduce duplicate engineer, downgrade duplicate assistant engineer

(savings of \$177,468)

COURT Option 3: Eliminate duplicate administrator title instead of p/t deputy administrator position

(savings of \$79,140)

CONSTRUCTION Option 1: Retain full staff #, downgrade duplicate construction official and technical assistant titles

(savings of \$43,609)

AFFORDABLE HOUSING *Single full-time coordinator, supplemented by contracted services for marketing and qualifications*

(savings N/A)

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT Option 1: Designate single Director of Emergency Management

(savings N/A)

FIRE INSPECTION *No formal staffing recommendation; Program should continue to be designed such that fees cover costs (savings N/A)*

TAX ASSESSMENT Option 2: Reduce by one p/t assistant assessor title

(savings of \$17,642)

ZONING/HPO *Transition to one zoning/HPO official and deputy, enabling duplicate positions to return to primary responsibilities in other departments*

(savings N/A)

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY Option 1: Retain one f/t Director of IT

(savings N/A)

Miller makes a motion accept all above recommendations.

Golden seconds the motion.

All vote in favor.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE –

May 17, 2011

CHAD GOERNER AND PAT SIMON

a. SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED SAVINGS -- GOERNER

Mayor Goerner passes out a report entitled “Summary of Residential Tax and Non-tax impacts from Consolidation” in draft form.

Mayor Goerner goes through the report and summarizes key savings. He also discusses the equalization ratio.

Stefko via phone further explains some of the savings.

McCarthy adds that DCA and CGR are currently discussing minor differences in numbers. He adds that should consolidation occur, and normal reassessment schedules continue then there will be no need for equalization.

Goldfarb expresses concern over the Borough and Township savings listed. He explains that a savings number for Borough residents may be perceived as reoccurring when it is a one-time savings. He suggests changing the bottom line on the savings chart to show only the savings due to consolidation and not the secondary impacts.

Mayor Goerner explains that the entire analysis is a “snapshot” in time of the financial impact of consolidation and related adjustments.

Haynes asks how the public may obtain their own tax savings.

McCarthy and Stefko will look into a calculation.

Miller emphasizes that the public must be made aware that these numbers are all estimates.

May 17, 2011

Simon notes that the library tax is missing.

McCarthy answers that it has a very small impact due to consolidation.

Simon adds that the sewer savings need to be taken out of impact cost savings. Simon suggests additional revisions to the draft savings chart. These changes are taken by the finance subcommittee and the finance subcommittee will make the necessary changes. An additional meeting of the subcommittee has been scheduled for May 23, 2011 to discuss information not finalized or covered at this meeting.

10. REVIEW OF POPULATION MAP/DATA – CHAD GOERNER

Due to the late hour this presentation was deferred to a later date.

11. REVIEW OF COMMISSION TASKS AND SCHEDULE --

Lahnston called the commission's attention to the addendum to the milestone schedule and the related responsibilities. The members of the Commission were asked to relay any issues of concern to Chairperson Lahnston.

12. NEW BUSINESS

None

13. ADJOURNMENT

Motion made to adjourn by Goerner.

Seconded by Lilienthal.

All vote in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

*Joint Consolidation/ Shared Services Study Commission of Princeton Borough and
Princeton Township*

May 17, 2011

Respectfully Submitted,

Shabnam Salih, Study Commission Secretary

Approved: May 25, 2011