

The Council Retreat of the Township Council of the Township of Franklin, County of Somerset, New Jersey was called to order by the Mayor at 2:00 p.m.

Mayor Levine read the following statement: "In accordance with Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975, be advised that adequate notice of this Council Retreat of the Township Council of the Township of Franklin, County of Somerset was made by the posting on the bulletin board at the Municipal Complex and by faxing to the officially designated newspapers, a notice indicating that the Council Retreat would take place at the Community Center at 2:00 p.m. on February 26, 2006. In addition, a copy of this notice is and has been available to the public and is on file in the Office of the Municipal Clerk."

The Township Clerk called the roll:

Present: Deputy Mayor Ashley-Williams, Ms. Danile, Ms. Eberle, Mayor Levine, Mr. McKenzie, Ms. Ritchie, Mr. Vassanella

Absent: Mr. Regan, Mr. Sumter

Also Present: Kenneth W. Daly, Township Manager, Ann Marie McCarthy, Township Clerk, Theodore Chase, Planning Board Chairman, Marc D. Dashield, Chief Finance Officer, Donna M. Vieiro, Assistant Township Manager, Khalilah Stewart, Planner; Thomas Zilinek, Township Engineer/Director of Public Works, Vincent Lupo, Community Development Director.

All present participated in the pledge of allegiance.

Township Master Plan Overview

Presented by Theodore Chase, Planning Board Director

Dr. Chase presented the following report:

"Before going into details of the new Master Plan, I'd like to make some general remarks. Firstly, there are no big changes. Probably the biggest is the Bennetts/Veronica tract for a development including excess affordable housing, and you have heard about that *ad nauseam*. The basic outlines of our Master Plan were set long ago, I think in 1983 with a Democratic Planning Board, and what has happened in subsequent Master Plans has only been a refinement of that basic plan; and as more and more of the town is built up in one way or another, there is less to plan for. If there is time I'll comment on the major tracts, which remain undeveloped and undecided.

Secondly, big changes generally do not happen as a result of the Master Plan. They happen when we are presented with new proposals that were not and could not have been anticipated by the Master Plan, and the Council looks upon them and decides that they are good. The Planning Board is then expected to ratify them, and may express some resentment at being overrun when they don't agree fast enough; Summerfields, a/k/a Canal Walk II, is a case of this. The biggest change in the township in the last decade has been the explosive growth of "adult communities", beginning with Canal Walk and continuing with Somerset Run, Renaissance and Sterling Pointe, and soon Summerfields. A lot of land, M-1, R-40 and A, has been rezoned to accommodate them. The original rezoning for Canal Walk had broad support, and at the same time the M-1 zone was extended. Somerset Run came in as an attractive alternative to 3 million square feet of office space, with accompanying traffic problems, approved by a Planning Board 15 years earlier. The Council then created an overlay zone for adult community development and extended it to cover the whole of the block defined by Cedar Grove Lane, New Brunswick Road, Elizabeth Avenue and Weston Road, and as a result we got Renaissance and Sterling Pointe. Summerfields is an extension of the same concept.

These were good from a tax standpoint – paying property taxes, no children in the schools; but they resulted in a very large affordable housing obligation when COAH adopted its

Phase 3 rules. I don't know whether we could have anticipated this, but even if we had, there was nothing we could enforce before COAH came out with the new rules. Ms. Ritchie could comment on this far better than I.

As a result we have the Fair Housing Plan that has just been approved by you and the Planning Board, which I don't need to review. I will only say that, as Dave Roberts of Schoor DePalma pointed out, you can set the rules for the General Business part of the Bennetts/Veronica tract. For instance, there is a lot of sentiment against a gas station on the Ruffles site, as well as three gas stations at Veronica and Route 27, and I hope you will preclude gas stations in this zone. A bank or a drug store would be more acceptable. I will also say that I'm taking a certain amount of beating in the Environmental Commission for supporting it. And we need to exert ourselves to get improvements to Route 27 from Veronica through Bennetts Lane to happen. I was just talking to Assemblyman Upendra Chivukula yesterday, and he says there is money designated for the Veronica/Route 27 intersection, which could be switched to the Bennetts Lane intersection, which in my opinion is the real problem. If there is some developer's money, this could happen. I'm sure Mr. Daly is working on this.

The Master plan overview of the township finds that residential and commercial uses of land increased substantially from 1999 to 2004, industrial only a little, while vacant land and farmland each decreased by about 10% of the total. Quasi-public and preserved land *increased* by over 10% from 24.9% of the township to 35.4%; this includes preservation of some farmland. The Plan states that there is little remaining developable land in the township that is not either approved for development or preserved; a table suggest that even at fullest use of the land as zoned only 907 more residential units could be constructed. However, the key phrase there is *as zoned* which may occur in the future, just as the 1993 Master Plan did not foresee Canal Walk, Somerset Run, etc.

The suggested zoning changes are minor. In Kingston, it is suggested on a suggestion from the Kingston Joint Committee, to make the O-P zone east of Shaw Drive R-20H with offices permitted, with a limitation of expansion to 10%, to ensure that existing houses aren't replaced by larger office buildings. This area includes several fine old houses, culminating in the Jedediah Higgins built in 1714.

The redevelopment plans for the houses at the end of Old Georgetown Road and the Laurie Rubber and Onka properties in East Millstone have been polished by the Planning Board and will have a hearing shortly.

A late proposal we think is worthy is extension of the M-2 zone east along Hamilton Street from just east of Shirley Street to include the Tabachnick, formerly Narbest, food plant. Some minor rezoning recognizing existing lot sizes on Welsh's Lane in East Millstone is suggested. Lots now R-O-L east and west of the Exxon and Huntington Life Sciences properties are suggested to be zoned Agricultural – the east property is now county-owned, the west is in agricultural use. The Rurka farm on New Brunswick Road just east of Somerset Run should be rezoned R-40 – we would not now want to see a manufacturing use there. At the same time, the S-C-V overlay could be removed from the bit of Pulte-owned property on the north side of New Brunswick Road, since they show no intention of expanding Somerset Run there.

The west side of Elizabeth Avenue north of 287 is a long-standing question, since there are four businesses and four homes there, plus the gas station on the corner with Cedar Avenue. Frank Hasner suggests a NB-R zone that would legitimize both the homes and the businesses. We don't propose changing the C-B zone behind them, since a C-B use could deal with wetlands better than a residential development.

The Plan suggests a possible mixed use infill overlay in the C-B zone on Davidson Avenue, possibly retail on the ground floor and apartments over. This could result in double use of the big parking lots, office workers in the day and residents in the evening. But it remains to be seen whether anyone is interested in doing this.

At the work session on February 22 we discussed the properties Steve Rubin keeps bugging us about and the Janho property. We felt they could be rezoned to R-15, which is no denser than Worlds Fair Drive to the northwest of it, especially if Rubin developed the Janho property too, and maybe even the Jain temple site if they decided to take a profit and build a smaller temple elsewhere.

It is suggested to have a special Institutional Zone for Pillar of Fire, recognizing that they have their own internal master plan with various uses on the “mainland” side of the canal. The same zone could be used for Consolata Fathers, and maybe even for Rutgers Prep, simply allow greater flexibility for these non-profit institutions. However, the land at the southeast corner of Schoolhouse Road and Weston Canal Road, owned by the Pillar of Fire, could be removed from the S-C-V zone; they have no plans for developing it, even in their master plan.

There are a lot of general suggestions, not all of which I’ll cover. We could redefine lot area to exclude or partially exclude wetlands, steep slopes, etc. from lot area, particularly when a “yield map” is drawn up prior to proposing clustering, which sometimes shows house lots that are 80% wetlands. A Conservation Design Ordinance is proposed, to get developers to design development more in accordance with what exists, *before* coming to the Planning Board with a full site plan. Design standards are suggested, for commercial uses along Route 27 and for the RR3, RR5 and A zones, similar to requirements of the Canal Preservation zone. Residential overlays for cluster-developed areas such as Town and Country and Wildflower Ridge area suggested, to recognize what has been developed and not apply A zone setbacks, but not encouraging any further subdivision.

We have somewhat come to grips with landscaping contractors, who are not now a permitted use in any zone. It is suggested to make them conditional uses in the A, RR3, RR5 and CP zones, with lots and standards. We took out R-40 at the work session.

The required parking for non-residential uses could be reduced by using a sliding scale, say 1 space for 1,000 square feet for the first 5,000 square feet and one per 2,500 square feet beyond that, to reduce lot coverage while in some cases allowing a bigger building. “Banking” unneeded space should be encouraged.

The rest of the Plan is largely statements of what exists, but read the Recommendations. Parks and Recreation: a southern community park is needed, perhaps on an interim basis on the Board of Education property on Claremont Road purchased for a future school, but ultimately either on the Catalpa property or on the Dunn property, northwest corner of Suydam Road and South Middlebush Road. This isn’t immediate, but the Recreation Council will press you on it. Lighted playing fields are also suggested, to make them usable for more hours and installation of Field Turf to make the fields usable for more of the year.

The Conservation section makes much of the Stream Corridor Protection Ordinance, but actually it does little, because it allows a buffer of only 50 feet when there is a DEP-mapped wetland along the stream, which is always. This limitation even applies to the steep slope part of the ordinance. The Stony Brook-Millstone Watershed Association has a model stream corridor protection ordinance, which has been adopted by other communities without challenge, and which I’d like to get you to consider.

At several points a Millstone Valley Scenic Byway Plan is mentioned. I think this will be prepared mostly by the County and the State Department of Transportation, with prodding from Jan ten Broeke, but we should help, since one side of the area, from Kingston to East Millstone, is in Franklin.”

Long-term Financial Plan, with focus on tax levy
Presented by Marc D. Dashield, CFO

Mr. Dashield made the following presentation, which was discussed by Council members:

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
IN-CAP							
Liability Insurance	27,961,348	28,939,995	29,952,895	31,001,246	32,086,290	33,209,310	34,371,636
Health Insurance	741,457	793,359	848,894	908,317	971,899	1,039,932	1,112,727
PERS	4,787,617	5,505,760	6,331,623	7,281,367	8,373,572	9,629,608	11,074,049
PFRS	179,600	359,200	429,600	554,600	679,600	804,600	929,600
Capital Downpayments	758,173	1,133,173	1,508,173	1,883,173	2,258,173	2,558,173	2,858,173
Cash Capital	800,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
SCIA Debt Service	1,825,680	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Debt Service	1,257,166	1,276,173	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Debt Service on future capital programs	2,900,201	2,900,201	3,600,201	3,600,201	3,600,201	3,600,201	3,600,201
Reserve for Uncollected Taxes				250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Misc. OUT-CAP	4,652,193	5,002,423	5,268,170	5,566,837	5,844,571	6,136,800	6,443,640
Expenditures w/o Library, Grants	468,742	468,742	468,742	468,742	468,742	468,742	468,742
	46,332,177	46,579,026	49,908,299	53,014,483	56,033,048	59,197,366	62,608,768
Grants	1,245,266.71	1,245,266.71	1,245,266.71	1,245,266.71	1,245,266.71	1,245,266.71	1,245,266.71
Library Expenditures	2,199,372.00	2,617,210.16	2,783,875.16	2,950,540.16	3,117,205.16	3,283,870.16	3,450,535.16
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	49,776,815.71	50,441,502.84	53,937,440.74	57,210,289.77	60,395,520.24	63,726,502.69	67,307,569.95
REVENUES	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Surplus Anticipated	7,568,349	7,684,387	4,469,000	3,760,000	3,760,000	3,760,000	3,760,000
Licenses, fees, permits	684,000	699,000	714,000	729,000	744,000	759,000	774,000
Municipal Court	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Interest on Taxes	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
Investment Earnings	601,763	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Fire Prevention fees	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Cable Franchise fees	52,704	52,700	52,700	52,700	52,700	52,700	52,700
State Aid	6,387,687	6,388,191	6,388,191	6,388,191	6,388,191	6,388,191	6,388,191
Construction Code Fees	2,700,000	2,070,000	2,142,450	2,217,436	2,295,046	2,375,373	2,458,511
Hotel Tax	950,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Receipts from Delinquent Taxes	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
Local Tax for Mun. Purposes	23,498,127	24,728,866	25,955,424	27,242,819	28,594,070	30,012,343	31,500,962
Grants	1,232,867	1,245,267	1,245,267	1,245,267	1,245,267	1,245,267	1,245,267
Interlocal Agreements	305,947	305,947	305,947	305,947	305,947	305,947	305,947
Library Tax	2,199,372	2,617,210	2,783,875	2,950,540	3,117,205	3,283,870	3,450,535
Recurring Revenues	41,662,466	42,757,180	44,237,853	45,781,900	47,392,426	49,072,690	50,826,113
Sale of Liquor Licenses	546,000						
TOTAL REVENUES	49,776,816	50,441,567	48,706,853	49,541,900	51,152,426	52,832,690	54,586,113
REVENUES MINUS EXP.		65	(5,230,587)	(7,668,390)	(9,243,095)	(10,893,813)	(12,718,457)

	FY Levy	CY Levy
1998.2	7,008,328	
1999.1	7,489,308	14,497,635
1999.2	6,881,998	
2000.1	7,673,561	14,371,306
2000.2	7,115,039	14,788,599
2001.1	8,547,790	15,662,828
2001.2	8,206,696	16,754,485
2002.1	8,222,700	16,429,395
2002.2	8,586,827	16,809,527
2003.1	11,769,091	20,355,919
2003.2	10,554,954	22,324,045
2004.1	9,489,043	20,043,997
2004.2	10,013,947	19,502,990
2005.1	12,095,671	22,109,618
2005.2	11,575,432	23,671,102
2006.1	11,922,695	23,498,127
2006.2	12,214,801	24,137,497
2007.1	12,514,064	24,728,866
2007.2	12,820,659	25,334,723
2008.1	13,134,765	25,955,424
2008.2	13,456,567	26,591,331
2009.1	13,786,252	27,242,819
2009.2	14,124,016	27,910,268
2010.1	14,470,054	28,594,070
2010.2	14,824,570	29,294,924
2011.1	15,187,772	30,012,343
2011.2	15,559,873	30,747,645
2012.1	15,941,090	31,500,962

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
SURPLUS							
Beginning fiscal year	18,149,000	13,393,387	9,469,000	8,760,000	8,760,000	8,760,000	8,760,000
Minimum Surplus	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Available Surplus	13,149,000	8,393,387	4,469,000	3,760,000	3,760,000	3,760,000	3,760,000
School taxes to be paid	(600,000)						
Appropriated	(7,915,613)	(7,684,387)	(4,469,000)	(3,760,000)	(3,760,000)	(3,760,000)	(3,760,000)
Regeneration of Surplus							
Hotel	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Investment earnings	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Property taxes	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
MRNA	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
Added/omitted	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Appropriation reserves	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Surplus regenerated	3,760,000	3,760,000	3,760,000	3,760,000	3,760,000	3,760,000	3,760,000
End of year balance	13,393,387	9,469,000	8,760,000	8,760,000	8,760,000	8,760,000	8,760,000

Budget Balancing Strategies	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reduce in-cap rate of increase from 3.5% to 2.5%	(279,613)	(576,004)	(889,933)	(1,222,194)	(1,573,611)	(1,945,045)	
Hold health insurance rate of increase to 5%		(550,576)	(1,211,267)	(1,999,967)	(2,937,323)	(4,047,150)	
Vehicle replacement program: Every other year Skip 2007		(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)			
Skip 2009				(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	
Hold annual capital program , \$1 million		(50,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	
Sell liquor license	250,000						
Increase license & non-construction permit fees	100,000	102,000	104,040	106,121	108,243	110,408	
Move rate of increase in property taxes: 2.45% to 3% per half year	200,298	491,926	815,175	1,172,656	1,567,176	2,001,749	
Decrease minimum fund balance to \$4.5 million	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	
Net changes from strategies	1,329,912	2,420,506	3,720,415	5,400,937	6,886,354	8,404,352	
Additional available surplus from prior year		1,329,976					
Remaining imbalance	1,329,976	(1,480,105)	(3,947,976)	(3,842,157)	(4,007,459)	(4,314,105)	

Council discussed increasing library costs. It was the consensus of Council to explore library funding protocol acceptance standards.

BUSINESS PLANNING FOR THE TOWNSHIP: UPDATE & OVERVIEW

A. Overview on lines of business identified during FY 2006 budget process ***Presented by Donna Vieiro, Assistant Township Manager***

Ms. Vieiro reviewed the external lines of business for the following departments: Assessor; Collector; Community Development; Economic Development; Engineering; Fire Prevention; Health Department; Police Department; Public Works; Purchasing; Recreation & Parks and Violations/Municipal Court. Each department outlined their lines of business with the current effort measurement; outcome measurement; future effort measurement and future outcome measurement. Ms. Vieiro explained that this is a working document and will be continually updated and amended. The Township Council discussed shared services with other agencies and consolidating some departments.

B. Potential lines of business identified at 2005 Retreat Update

1. Public Transportation

Mr. Daly presented the following report on behalf of Khalilah Stewart, Planner who will be working on the following Transit Service Feasibility Study as outlined by Rutgers University:

Scope of Work:

Task 1: Review of Existing Documents and Data

The project team will review recently completed studies and other data sources to determine transit performance and utilization patterns. Potential sources included but may not be limited to: the final report an survey data from the recently completed I-287 Mobility Enhancement Implementation Plan and operations and ridership data from existing transit services already operating in the township. Transit data from the following service providers will be investigated: New Jersey Transit, Suburban Transit, Somerset County Ridewise, and Somerset County (SAH services). Census data and local planning documents and ordinances will be utilized to provide indicators of development densities and land use patterns. No new surveys will be conducted.

In addition to these existing sources, anticipated development trends and demographic patterns will be documented to determine current and potential transit trip generators. These data will form the basis for recommending new or modified transit services within Franklin Township.

Task 2: Assess Township-wide Transit Needs

The project team will conduct an analysis of population and employment densities using data from the 2000 Census and other existing data sources. The analysis will include the creation of GIS maps depicting densities within ¼-mile of existing transit routes and/or major arterial roadways. The map will also show key employment generators within ¼-mile of existing routes and/or major arterial roadways. This type of map is often called a transit walk/zone buffer and provides an indicator of how many people can easily access a bus route (Existing and future services).

Task 3: Conduct Transit Service Feasibility Planning

Utilizing the results of Tasks 1 and 2, the project team will identify potential new or modified transit service routes and operating frequencies to serve travel markets that are currently not served by transit or are underserved. Various service alternatives will be explored (e.g., peak hours only versus full-day service). The project team will develop order-of-magnitude estimates for revenue hours and/or passenger boardings for the service options. Finally, the team will prepare conceptual route maps and schedules, estimate vehicle requirements and identify key new bus stop locations (if any),¹ as needed. This information will be presented in map and spreadsheet format as appropriate.

Task 4: Develop Identity Plan

In order to develop a sense of ownership by the residents and employees within Franklin Township for a new transit service, the project team will develop a conceptual identity plan. This will include developing a proposed name, theme, and logo characteristics for the service, which accentuate the characteristics that describe Franklin Township. Recommendations will also include requirements for necessary signage and amenities at transit stops, and the potential for bike racks on buses.

SCHEDULE:

Task	Month					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Task 1: Review of Existing Documents and Data						
Task 2: Assess Township-wide Transit Needs						
Task 3: Conduct Transit Service Feasibility Planning						
Task 4: Develop Identity Plan						
Deliver Draft and Final Reports					X	X

¹These will be approximate locations. Actual locations will need to be worked out in greater detail in coordination with safety and traffic analyses, which are beyond the scope of this study.

2. Solid Waste – Presented by Thomas Zilinek, Township Engineer

Mr. Zilinek presented the following report:

“Approximate cost for collection is \$8.1 million based on similar municipalities (South Brunswick; East Brunswick; Hamilton; Lawrence; Bloomfield; West Orange to name a few).

This is only for collection
 Breaks down to about \$425.00 per house
 This includes a one time per month bulk collection
 Additional cost of \$125.00 per house for disposal fees

Average cost per house for private collection program will increase the cost to the homeowner between \$50.00 to \$100.00 a year

This increase includes the new service of a once per month bulk collection
 This eliminates the paying for mini dump passes
 This eliminates the need of getting materials to mini dump
 In effect eliminates the need for the mini dump therefore saving tax dollars spent on overtime to operate the mini dump
 Also a quality of life issue by being able to regulate the hours of collection
 Quality of life issue everyone on the street has the same collection day

If decide to pursue the Township managed solid waste collection the following decisions will need to be made:

1. Utility (outside of cap) – Need Ordinance creating solid waste utility
 - a. If utility, commercial collection could be excluded because it is a user fee not a tax.
 - b. If utility, condo, townhouse, apartment could be excluded because it is a user fee not a tax.
2. Fee vs. Bag – uniform rate for all or pay as you go with a yearly recalculation. Bag rate would reward for recycling. People who have less garbage would pay less.
3. Point of Collection – curbside, rear yard, or optional (extra cost for rear yard approximately \$120/yr extra)
4. Frequency – 1 or 2 x per week.
5. Special Waste Collection – Bulky (furniture, rugs), household hazardous, tires, batteries, white goods (appliances), paints, remodeling materials, brush

If decide to not proceed with Township managed solid waste collection then for bulk the following should be discussed:

1. Go with a regional system through Somerset County (located in Bridgewater)
2. Move the mini dump to behind Town Hall
3. Move the mini dump to behind Town Hall and only use for recycling and leaves
4. Go with a Township managed once per month bulk pickup”

3. Housing presented by Vincent Lupo, Community Development Director

Mr. Lupo made the following presentation:

“PROPERTY MAINTENANCE AND HOUSING INSPECTIONS DIVISION

Mission Statement

Improve quality of life issues and address violations of current land use issues through a comprehensive change of occupant inspection and property maintenance ordinance.

Organization

- Division of Department of Community Development
- Two existing employees with years of experience in zoning and property maintenance inspections
- One additional field inspector and one new administrative support person

Issues to be Addressed

- Appropriation of affordable housing grant monies
- Violations to Zoning and Building regulations
- Addressing sub-par property maintenance issues
- Grading and nuisance issues
- Identification numbers on houses to effectuate 911 system
- Water Department would have access to change meters
- Visual inspections for work done without permits
- Illegal conversion of single family to multi-family housing
- Illegal changes of use to industrial and commercial properties
- Health and safety issues that should be referred to other agencies

Methodology

- Respond to complaints
- Target neighborhoods to sweep for corrective measures
- Require a Certificate of Housing Approval for resale and/or re-occupancy of all structures

Benefit to Community

- Health and Safety issues would be addressed by a central division, less duplication of efforts
- Overcrowding issues would be addressed to extent allowed by current laws
- Violations would be addressed by previous owners/tenants vs. citing new owner/tenants for conditions that were not their responsibility

Financial Impact

- Revenues from violations though not measurable would defray cost to administer
- Fees from residential inspections alone should exceed \$140,000.00 annually
- Fees from Commercial and Industrial inspections should exceed \$20,000.00 annually”

B. Steps and Timeline for Township Business Plan – Presented by Kenneth Daly, Township Manager

Mr. Daly made the following presentation:

2005

Spring	Department heads identify lines of business
July	Lines of business and performance measures presented in FY2006 budget submissions. Reviewed by Township Council during budget hearings.
October	Finance Oversight Committee outlines fiscal strategy to budget for stable, predictable property taxes.

2006

February	<p>Township Council Retreat. Within the context of new Master Plan and multiyear fiscal policy options, Township Council reviews and sets directions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - existing lines of business and data currently collected to measure performance (effort, outcome) - potential new lines of business (public transportation, solid waste, housing)
March-April	<p>Department Heads meet with Township Council’s Administration Committee to refine lines of business, related performance measures, and develop priority list of lines of business, both existing and potential, with benchmarks, including not just current fund lines of business, but also capital, water utility, and open space. Setting priorities will include discussion of lines of business that might more appropriately be provided by a unit of government other than the Township, lines of business that might be dropped, and new lines of business. Discussion of performance measures and benchmarks will include feasible frequency of performance reports to Township Council.</p> <p>Finance Oversight Committee refines fiscal policy options and develops guidelines for FY2007 budgets, including current fund, capital, water utility and open space.</p>
May	<p>Administration Committee proposes priorities and benchmarks on lines of business for Township Council to adopt as guidance for Township Manager in preparation of FY2007 budgets, including current fund, capital, water utility, and open space.</p> <p>At same meeting, Finance Oversight Committee proposes fiscal policies for Township Council to adopt to guide the Township Manager in preparation of FY2007 budgets.</p>
July	Township Manager proposes FY2007 budgets, including performance targets for each line of business tied to funding provided in budget.

July-September	Township Council reviews budget proposals and performance benchmarks with departments and finalizes FY2007 budgets.
October	FY2007 budgets adopted.

2007

January	Begin fiscal and performance reports to Township Council at frequency determined during budget process.
February	Annual Township Council Retreat begins new cycle of business and fiscal planning.
July	FY2008 budget proposals include performance measures compared with benchmarks set during FY2007 budget process.”

The Township Council conducted a roundtable on priorities for 2006 to 2010. They discussed coordinating the plans that include the Master Plan, Fiscal Plan and Business Plan.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Upon motion by Ms. Ritchie seconded by Mr. McKenzie, the meeting was opened for public discussion. Said motion carried unanimously upon voice vote.

There being no comments made by the public, Ms. Ritchie moved to close the public discussion. Said motion was seconded by Deputy Mayor Ashley-Williams and carried unanimously upon voice vote.

AGENDA DISCUSSION

A discussion ensued regarding agenda protocol. The discussion included standards of how appointments are placed and stated on the agenda as well as how items are placed on the agenda.

Mr. McKenzie moved that when appointments are listed on the agenda, names of the nominees are not to be stated on the agenda with the exception of appointments that come from certain boards and commissions as recommendations. Said motion was seconded by Deputy Mayor Ashley-Williams and carried unanimously upon voice vote.

After a discussion by Council regarding the placement of items on the agenda, it was the consensus of the Council to follow the following procedures:

1. Any item to be placed on the agenda by a member of Council will submit it to the Township Clerk or Manager 10 days prior to the meeting.
2. If a Council member misses the aforesaid deadline, then the agenda would be amended the night of the meeting.
3. No Council member can remove an item that was placed on the agenda by another Council member.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion by Mr. McKenzie, seconded by Ms. Ritchie, the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m. Said motion carried unanimously upon call of the roll.

Approved:

Date:

Ann Marie McCarthy, Township Clerk