

**Joint Consolidation/ Shared Services Study Commission
of Princeton Borough and
Princeton Township
Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Wednesday, December 22, 2010
7:00 p.m. Municipal Complex, Community Room
400 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, NJ**

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 pm, with Ms. Rogers 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 November 29, 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, Lahnston, Simon, Goldfarb, McCarthy, Trotman, Pascale, Bruschi

Absent: Lilienthal and Small

There were 5 members of the public present.

3. Review and Approval of Minutes of November 17, 2010:

A motion was made by Trotman and seconded by Goerner and the Commission voted unanimously to approve the Minutes of November 17, 2010.

4. Review of Baseline Report – Led by CGR

The Commission discussed the inclusion of a glossary into the report. Chairman Lahnston noted that some people may interpret the terms differently and he felt this would be a help to form a

clear and consistent understanding of the terms used throughout the report. Stefko went over some of the terms in the glossary with the Commission and noted that he can add to the list if anyone felt that there should be other definitions included. The members discussed including, but not limited to the following items; Distinguishing how the Borough and Township budgets differ, Equalized Real Property Valuations, Calls for Service Data, Uniform Crime Reporting Data, separate glossaries for Court – Police – Public Works and Affordable Housing. It was also suggested that there be one glossary with subsections for ease to the person reviewing the report.

Chairman Lahnston suggested that if anyone has any other suggestions, they get them to CGR ASAP.

Chairman Lahnston asked if anyone had substantial comments on the report that could not be emailed to CGR. He said after the comments are discussed, he would then like to discuss the next steps the Commission should take on this report.

Comments by the Commission included, but are not limited to the following; clarifying which census data is being used, pages 6-12 do not add up to the total in the summary; stats on the Police numbers (possibly breaking out the Princeton University number separately – it was decided that the Police subcommittee would look into this); page 13 clarifying whether or not the numbers are double counted (Borough and Twp) and separating the numbers out; page 21 with regards to staffing – add a sentence that refers the reader to the departmental summaries; page 25 shows the Borough numbers for Buildings & Grounds and it should refer the reader to the Township Public Works summaries showing that this item is out sourced; page 26 regarding Affordable Housing should refer the reader to the departmental summary; perhaps adding a list of the data that is included in the report and directing the reader on where to find each item.

a) Discussion of next steps:

Chairman Lahnston and Commission discussed the urgency of everyone getting their comments back to CGR as soon as possible. It was decided that all comments would be given to CGR no later than January 3, 2011. CGR would make the appropriate changes and get the document back to the Commission by the 6th or 7th, the Commission would review and approve the document electronically so that the report can be posted on the website no later than January 10th in order to give the public ample time to review it before the January 26, 2011 public meeting. A suggestion was made by Goerner to include a “user’s guide” explaining what the document is and what it will be used for. He then volunteered to write this piece.

5. Public Comment:

Marvin Reed asked when he would be able to view the document. Chairman Lahnston said the document would become public when it is posted on the website. It is still in draft form and he would want the public to be able to view the final draft to avoid misconceptions and provide version control. It was brought to the Commissions attention that members of the press (in the room) had copies of the draft document. Chairman Lahnston asked that those copies be returned as it is not yet a public document. There was a discussion on whether or not it was considered a public record. It was ultimately decided that Pascale would consult with the Township Attorney and get a legal opinion on this. In the meantime, the press returned their copies of the draft report.

Kip Cherry mentioned that the executive summary or user's guide should be included in the document as it will be very helpful.

Stefko noted that when the document is available online, the public can view the document and provide feedback prior to the meeting on January 26, 2011.

6. Reports from the Subcommittee Chairs:

- a) **Finance:** Goerner reported that a meeting was held on December 16th, 2010 and they made some changes to the baseline report and also discussed the possibility of the glossary. He said the next meeting will focus on formulating an analysis. He said the next meeting is scheduled for January 13th, 2011 at 3:30 p.m.
- b) **Police:** Metro discussed Call for Service and Uniform Crime Data and how it should be integrated into the report. He also said the subcommittee would like to see if there is a difference in policing philosophies in the Borough and Township, they would like to see a list of assets for each police department and more information on the technology end of each department. He said they have scheduled a site visit with the two departments on January 20, 2010 to tour the facilities and interview the command leaders.
- c) **Public Works:** Haynes reported that the subcommittee has met twice and they are planning site visits with each Public Works facility on January 20, 2011. She said they will be meeting with the Supervisory staff of each department. She also noted that the next subcommittee meeting will be held on January 21, 2011 at her house. She said the subcommittee decided to meet on the 3rd Friday of each month.

d) Community Engagement: Golden said the subcommittee is trying to reach out to the PTO's and has received the backing from School Superintendent Judy Wilson. She said they met with Bob Durkee and Kristin Appelget of the University and they are happy to help as much as they can but will remain neutral in their thinking and stay on the sidelines. She said the general consensus is for the Commission to stay up-to-date on the University's plans for the Arts and Transit Neighborhood as that could change views on municipal consolidation. She said they have scheduled some meetings – January 18th, 2011 with the Merchants Assoc.; January 26, 2011 with the Princeton Senior Resource Center; and March 26th, 2011 with Princeton Future. She noted that they will be getting some exposure to the Witherspoon neighborhood and they will be reaching out to the Institute for Advanced Study, **Tenacre** and other entities in the area.

Trotman suggested that they also reach out to the Clergy Assoc.

Chairman Lahnston noted that the subcommittee also met with Princeton University regarding a public survey that they would like to do.

Simon noted that the Princeton Survey Research Center at Princeton University has volunteered to facilitate the survey *pro-bono* on behalf of the Commission. He discussed the credentials of Dr. Ed Freeland who would be spearheading this project. He said the SRC is bound by a certain standard of ethics much like that of a doctor or an attorney. He said the main reason for the survey is not to take a vote of all residents as to who is in favor/opposed to consolidation, but more to understand the issues that are of greatest concern to the public. He said SRC has a pre-tested survey that could be used to formulate a survey for the Commission. He noted that the goal is to reach out to 1,000 people in each municipality (Borough and Township) with hopes of getting a return of 300-400 in each town; a letter will be mailed to the residents and the survey will be web-based with the option to complete online, over the phone or to come into the SRC to complete it; it will be in both English and Spanish (the letter and survey) in order to reach a wide range of people.

Chairman Lahnston noted that because of timing the Commission would need to make a decision at this meeting on whether or not to proceed with the survey.

Goerner said after hearing everything Simon has said, he feels that due diligence has been done and he feels comfortable with the SRC facilitating the survey.

Golden asked what would be done with the results of the survey.

Simon noted that the intent is to assess how people view issues that the Commission will be working on.

Chairman Lahnston also noted that the results will inform the Commission on the sensitivities in the community.

Mayor Miller voiced his concern about the perception from the public because the University will be facilitating this. He said he is concerned that it will open the door for the public to say that the University bought the results of the survey and that the Commissions work may be at risk because of it. After an in-depth discussion the Commission voted on whether or not to proceed.

A motion was made by Simon and seconded by Golden and the Commission. There were 6 yes votes, 2 opposed votes and 1 abstention – there was insufficient affirmative votes from the Township side to carry the motion.

Simon said he would look into other options for the survey, but, time is of the essence and he does not know if there is enough time to get someone onboard with this.

- e) Municipal Consolidation: Mayor Miller stated that the subcommittee has not met yet and that they do not plan to meet until after the public meeting.
- f) The process of reporting minutes of meetings to CRG: Stefko asked that any previously approved subcommittee minutes be sent to him so they can be uploaded to the website. He also requested that within a week of the adoption of minutes, that they are sent to him so they can be placed on the website in a timely manner.

Mayor Miller left the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

7. Review of calendar of events for the next 3 months:

Chairman Lahnston went over the calendar:

Next Commission Meeting is January 19, 2011

Public Meeting is January 26, 2011 at 7:30 at the John Witherspoon School

February Commission meeting is scheduled for February 23, 2011 however CGR cannot attend that meeting. **It was decided that the February meeting will be held on February 16, 2011.**

Princeton Future Meeting on March 26, 2011 at the Library in the Community Room. Chairman Lahnston requested that the Commission members plan to attend so that table groups can be supported by the Commission members.

Mr. Goerner left the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

The Commission again held a brief discussion on the draft baseline report and whether or not it was considered at public document at this point of the process. It was decided that the report would not be given to the public until there was a legal decision from the Township Attorney.

8. Adjournment:

A motion was made Golden and seconded by Trotman and the Commission voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Debra Rogers, Acting Secretary

Date Approved: 1/19/11