September 29, 2010

Joint Consolidation/ Shared Services Study Commission of Princeton Borough and Princeton Township Minutes of the Regular Meeting Wednesday, Sept. 29, 2010 5:30 pm Municipal Complex, Conference Room A 400 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, NJ

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 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 September 23, 2010 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, Metro, Miller, Goerner, Lilienthal, Simon, Small, Goldfarb, McCarthy, Pascale, Brushchi

Absent: Lahnston, Trotman

September 29, 2010

3. Approval of Minutes- 9/22/10

Revision on page 5 and revision on page 4.

Motion made to approve minutes.

All in favor.

4. Comments from Audience

None at this time.

5. Review of Best and Final Offers

Goldfarb strongly favors CGR.

Mayor Miller explains that both firms are highly qualified but there's a major different in CGR's understanding of the project methodology. Goerner agrees.

Small adds that CGR gave great example of community outreach.

Metro agrees with others and adds that in CGR's final offer, they make clear their ability and willingness to use outside consultants.

Simon explains that the presentation and final offer by CGR show they're very responsive to the needs of the Commission.

Golden explains that the attention to the presentation and the high degree of professionalism set apart CGR.

Lilienthal expresses stronger support for CGR than SCA. He explains that SCA has a depth of understanding as to how municipalities run however CGR has a breadth of knowledge in different areas.

Haynes asks of Pascale if CGR's willingness to bring in outside consultants for the police study makes him more comfortable with CGR. He explains that yes it does. Bruschi is comfortable with CGR.

September 29, 2010

McCarthy discusses his viewing of the Chester website and CGR's work there and believes that CGR's work is definitely what this Commission is looking for.

Haynes says that SCA didn't come together, especially in regards to the public relations aspect of this process.

Mayor Miller explains that having both shared services and consolidation in this study makes it a far more difficult study than years previous and that community support and engagement will be very important and that CGR provides a better community involvement proposal than SCA.

Goldfarb asks if negotiating on the price is still an option.

Metro answers that it is unlikely consultants will change much considering they submitted their best and final offers and that the prices are fair.

6. Contract Award (Subject to Governing Body Funding)

Haynes makes a request for motion to award contract, subject to availability of funds, to CGR.

Motion made by Golden. Seconded by Simon. *Unanimous vote in favor of granting CGR contract.*

7. Commission Budget

Bruschi provides summary of proposed Commission budget. Attached.

Metro asks where the contingency estimate is from. Bruschi answers it is the contingency for clerical, legal, etc.

Simon suggests adding the contingencies into one.

Bruschi explains that budget must be revised to add \$1,000 to the consultant fee because there wasn't any reduction in the consultant fee. Consultant fee is \$76,000.

Haynes asks if there are any comments from the governing body representatives.

September 29, 2010

Goldfarb and Goerner will create a time for a meeting for governing bodies to discuss the splitting of remaining costs.

Simon asks if anyone has compared the Princeton budget to other Commissions.

McCarthy explains that he has and that the other communities have been a lot smaller and have had less costs. In regards to other budget items, the budget is right on target.

Bruschi explains that the Commission doesn't have to stick to these budget lines and they have the power to do as they choose. However, the budget is conservative enough but will not restrain the Commission.

Lilienthal asks if the budgets McCarthy viewed were the initial or final budgets. McCarthy answers that the budgets did not change much.

Commission members discuss how the consultants will be paid and McCarthy suggests talking to the Chester Commission to see how they paid CGR.

Motion made by Lilienthal to accept budget. Seconded by Small. All vote in favor of proposed budget.

Golden asks if subcommittees should meet prior to the 10/27/10 meeting. Fellow Commission members answer yes.

Small asks of Pascale if terms and conditions can be put on website. Pascale answers that the final contract will be put up online.

Additional Comments from Audience

Kate Warren asks if subcommittee meetings are public meetings. Haynes explains that subcommittee meetings are only advisory and that reports will be reported at Commission meetings. Simon adds that Commission will give Warren information on

September 29, 2010

community issues subcommittee. Mayor Miller will give Warren the information for the municipal consolidation subcommittee.

Additional Commission Comments

Notice to proceed will need to be given to CGR prior to 10/27/10 meeting.

Simon explains that he will need to coordinate with CGR for the 10/27/10 meeting.

Haynes asks Pascale if he will serve as the main point of contact for CGR.

Mayor Miller suggests that Chairperson Lahnston be the point of contact for technical matters and that Pascale be the point of contact regarding contractual matters.

8. Adjournment

Motion is made for adjournment by Mayor Miller and motion is seconded by Golden.

Roll Call Unanimous Aye

Meeting is adjourned at 7:00 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shabnam Salih, Study Commission Secretary

Approved: October 27, 2010

September 29, 2010

BUDGET CONSOLIDATION COMMISSION

Category	Salary	Other Expense	Total
Consulting		76,000	76,000
Clerical Support (12 months @ 500/month)		6,000	6,000
Legal (40 hrs)		7,000	7,000
Printing (2 pieces)		7,200	7,200
Postage (2 mailings)		5,040	5,040
Advertising-Legal		8,100	8,100
Contingency		10,934	10,934
TOTAL		120,274	120,274

Notes:

Consulting will be for the final contract price.

Change in scope--provide an amount equal to10% of contract amount for either additional services from this consultant or for the costs associated with the hiring of some additional as yet determined consultant services.

Clerical support for meeting coverage, correspondence, minutes and miscellaneous clerical duties. First month was slightly in excess of \$500.

Legal is 40 hours at \$175 per hour for any legal questions that may arise dealing with form of governments or other necessary legal research. Thought was that this would be through either Borough or Township Attorney

Advertising is for any legal or other print advertising either required or desired.

Printing is an estimate to produce 2 pieces of literature in sufficient quantities for mailing to each residence within the Borough and Township

Postage is for two mailing residential properties in both the Borough and the Township. Overall contingency equals 10% of all items excluding consulting contract and associated consultant contingency.