

REGULAR MEETING – November 19, 2007

The Chairman calls the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

TURN ON RECORDER

The Chairman reads the statement on “Open Public Meetings Law”.

In accordance with the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act, State of New Jersey, adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by the inclusion of the date, time and place in a Notice forwarded to The Star Ledger, the Home News Tribune and the Clerk of each of the eleven member municipalities on February 6, 2007 and again on November 14, 2007.

If any member of this body believes that this meeting is being held in violation of the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act, please state your objection and the reasons for same at this time.

.... Hearing no objections, we shall proceed with our regularly scheduled meeting.

The Chairman requests that everyone stand to salute the Flag.

Roll Call

<u>Pres.</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Town Rep.</u>	<u>Pres.</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Name</u>
_____	_____	Clark	_____	_____	M. Brinker, Interim Exec. Dir.
_____	_____	Cranford	_____	_____	R. Materna, Secretary-Treasurer
_____	_____	Garwood	_____	_____	J. Grimes, Office Administrator
_____	_____	Kenilworth	_____	_____	B. Hak, Counsel
_____	_____	Mountainside	_____	_____	J. Wancho, Consulting Engineer
_____	_____	Rahway			
_____	_____	Roselle Park			
_____	_____	Scotch Plains			
_____	_____	Springfield			
_____	_____	Westfield			
_____	_____	Woodbridge			

Approval of Minutes

Chairman: The minutes of the Regular meeting held October 18, 2007, are not finished and therefore will be not be acted on this evening.

Communications

The following letter addressed to Mr. Brinker was received November 7, 2007 from Richard F. Guerrero, VP of Car-Tech Auction, Inc.:

On November 2, 2007 at approximately 2:00 AM a fire occurred on our property. If it were not for your employee, Greg Evelyn, the fire could have been catastrophic. Because of his quick thinking and response our damage was limited.

On behalf of all of us at Car-Tech Auction, Inc., please convey to Greg our great appreciation and gratitude.

The following letter and resolution dated October 24, 2007, were received from Barbara Riepe, Township Clerk for the Township of Scotch Plains:

Enclosed please find a certified copy of a resolution adopted last evening by the Township Council of the Township of Scotch Plains regarding opposition to the solicitation of proposals for professional services to explore privatization of the operation of the RVSA.

Resolution #162-07

RESOLUTION STATING OPPOSITION TO THE SOLICITATION OF PROPOSALS FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES TO EXPLORE PRIVATIZATION OF THE OPERATION OF THE RAHWAY VALLEY SEWERAGE AUTHORITY.

Whereas, the Township of Scotch Plains is one of the 11 member municipalities of the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority (RVSA) a regional sewerage authority created and operating pursuant to the New Jersey Sewerage Authorities Law, N.J.S.A. 40:14A-1 et. seq.; and

WHEREAS, RVSA operates sewage treatment facilities constructed, maintained and operated with funds received from the taxpayers of the member municipalities, which facilities have cost hundreds of millions of dollars to construct and which are undergoing extensive capital projects intended to upgrade and make more efficient the operation of those facilities, the costs of which capital projects exceed \$175 million; and

WHEREAS, RVSA's annual operating costs are in excess of \$18 million, which costs are paid primarily by the member municipalities; and

WHEREAS, RVSA is responsible for the handling and treatment of the sanitary sewage for its 11 member municipalities in a cost efficient and environmentally sound manner; and

WHEREAS, as a member municipality whose taxpayers have paid and continue to pay significant amounts of money to the construction and operation of RVSA, the Township of Scotch Plains is concerned that RVSA be operated in a sound and cost-efficient manner; and

WHEREAS, over the past several years, various consultants for RVSA and some members of RVSA have suggested or recommended that RVSA consider entering into a privatization contract for part or all of its operations; and

WHEREAS, the Township of Scotch Plains and other members have expressed concerns regarding whether such privatization would actually result in better or more cost effective operation of RVSA; and

WHEREAS, despite such concerns raised by the Township of Scotch Plains and other members, RVSA determined to undertake an investigation of privatization of a portion of its

operations and retained various consultants to make recommendations to RVSA as to the appropriateness of moving forward to take actions to solicit request for qualifications for a privatization contract; and

WHEREAS, in response to concerns voiced by the Township of Scotch Plains and other members, RVSA determined to conduct a Mayors Forum to present to the Mayors and other representatives of the member municipalities the reasons why RVSA had decided to move forward to take actions to solicit requests for qualifications for a privatization contract; and

WHEREAS, on November 30, 2006, the RVSA held such a Mayors' Forum, at which it presented statements from the various consultants it had retained who had recommended to RVSA that it move forward with such privatization; and

WHEREAS, during this Mayors Forum, based on questions asked, concerns raised and information presented, RVSA's own consultants, including Steve Kellogg, Senior Vice President of CDM, agreed that it was premature to consider whether privatization might be a sound and cost effective measure for RVSA, and agreed that the appropriate course was to await completion of the significant capital projects being undertaken at the RVSA facility, including the Comprehensive Strategic Plan (CSP) contracts, the Major Upgrades contracts, and the Cogeneration/Sludge Drying Facility contract and a sufficient time after such completion to be able to undertake an informed evaluation of how the RVSA facility was operating; and

WHEREAS, the Township of Scotch Plains and various other member municipalities welcomed these recommendations as a much sounder approach to the question of whether some form of privatization of RVSA's operations or facilities might be sound and/or cost effective; and

WHEREAS, despite the recommendations of its own consultants in November 2006, and despite the fact that the capital projects referred to at the November 30 Mayors' Forum have not all be completed and in operation, RVSA placed on its October 18, 2007 agenda a motion to solicit proposals for the services of (1) Special Counsel, (2) Special Engineer, and (3) Special Financial Advisor, to perform certain work related to the preparation of a Request for Qualifications on a privatization contract; and

WHEREAS, to solicit such proposals and to move forward with the process contemplated thereby will be a time consuming and costly process, and should not be considered, let alone undertaken, until the capital projects referred to at the November 30 Mayors' Forum have all been completed and in operation for a sufficient time to enable an informed evaluation of how the RVSA facility was operating; and

WHEREAS as recognized by RVSA previously, no such actions should be taken by RVSA toward possible privatization without first informing the Mayors and other municipal representatives of the basis for such action, and seeking the input of these important parties; and

WHEREAS, despite the above, at their October 18, 2007 meeting, in a six to five vote, RVSA passed the Resolution or motion to solicit proposals for the services of (1) Special Counsel; (2) Special Engineer and (3) Special Financial Advisor to perform certain work related to the preparation of the request for qualifications for a privatization contract.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and Township Council of the Township of Scotch Plains hereby affirmatively and emphatically state the position that it is inappropriate and premature for RVSA to solicit proposals for the services of 1) Special Counsel, 2) Special Engineer and/or 3) Special Financial Advisor to perform any work related to the preparation of a Request For Qualifications on a privatization contract or to take any other actions to move forward with the process contemplated thereby, and as previously recognized by RVSA's own consultants and represented to the public at the November 30 2006 Mayors Forum, no further consideration should be given to the actions taken toward possible privatization until the capital projects referred to at the November 30 Mayors Forum have all been completed and in operation for a sufficient time to enable an informed evaluation of how the RVSA facility was operating; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority, the Governing Body of each member municipality of the RVSA, The Newark Star Ledger, The Record Press, The Scotch Plains Times, Senator Nicholas Scutari, Assemblyman Jerry Green, Assemblywoman Linda Stender, Senator Thomas Kean, Assemblyman Jon Bramnick, Assemblyman Eric Munoz, Senator Joseph Vitale, Assemblyman Joseph Vas and Assemblyman John S. Wisniewski.

The following letter and resolution dated October 26, 2007, were received from Tara Rowley, RMC, Municipal Clerk for the Township of Cranford:

Enclosed is a certified copy of Resolution #2007-315 adopted by the Township Committee of the Township of Cranford at a meeting held October 23, 2007 opposing Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority's solicitation of proposals for professional services related to a potential privatization contract.

Resolution #2007-315

WHEREAS, the Township of Cranford is one of the eleven member municipalities of the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority (RVSA), a regional sewerage authority created and operated by the New Jersey Sewerage Authorities Law, N.J.S.A. 40:14A-1 et. seq.; and

WHEREAS, RVSA is responsible for the conveyance and treatment of the sanitary sewerage for its eleven member municipalities in a cost-efficient and environmentally sound manner, operating from sewerage treatment facilities constructed, maintained, and operated with funds from the taxpayers of the member municipalities; and

WHEREAS, such facilities have cost hundreds of millions of dollars to construct and are presently undergoing extensive capital improvements intended to upgrade and make the operation of those facilities more efficient, the costs of which capital projects is expected to exceed \$250 million; and

WHEREAS, RVSA's annual operating costs are approximately \$15 million; upgrades are \$250 million; and these costs are shouldered and paid by the member municipalities; and

WHEREAS, over the past several years, various consultants for RVSA and some members of RVSA have suggested or recommended that RVSA consider entering into a public/private partnership or a privatization contract; and

WHEREAS, some member municipalities, councils, and mayors have expressed serious concerns regarding whether such privatization would actually result in a better or more cost effective operation of RVSA, recognizing that substantial evidence exists that privatization in some cases increases costs and/or diminishes resident service; and

WHEREAS, in 2006, despite such concerns raised by some member municipalities, RVSA determined to undertake an investigation of privatization of a portion of its operations and retained various consultants to make recommendations to RVSA as to the appropriateness of moving forward to take actions to solicit Requests for Qualifications (RFQ) for a privatization contract; and

WHEREAS, in response to concerns voiced by member municipalities, RVSA decided to conduct a Mayors Forum to present to the Mayors and other representatives of the member municipalities the pros and cons of privatization and the reasons why RVSA was considering moving forward to take actions to solicit RFQ's for a privatization contract; and

WHEREAS, on November 30, 2006, RVSA held such a Mayors Forum, at which time it presented statements from various consultants it had retained who could present the pros and cons of such privatization efforts; and

WHEREAS, during this Mayors Forum, based on questions asked, concerns raised, and information presented, RVSA's own consultants, including Steve Kellog, Senior Vice President, CDM, agreed that it was premature to consider whether privatization might be a sound and cost-effective measure for RVSA, and agreed that the appropriate course was to await completion of the significant capital projects being undertaken at the RVSA facility, including the Comprehensive Strategic Plan (CSP) contracts, the Major Upgrades contracts, and the Cogeneration/Sludge Drying Facility contract and a sufficient time after such completion to be able to undertake an informed evaluation of how the RVSA facility was operating; and

WHEREAS, various municipalities welcomed these recommendations as a much sounder approach to the question of whether some form of privatization of RVSA's operations or facilities might be sound and/or cost effective; and

WHEREAS, despite the recommendations of its own consultants in November 2006, and despite the fact that the capital projects referred to at the November 30 Mayors Forum have not all been completed and in operation, and despite strong concerns and objections raised by member municipalities, at its October 18, 2007 meeting, RVSA passed a resolution

“ . . . to authorize the publication of Requests For Proposals on its official website from legal service professionals, engineering professionals and financial consultants in connection with all activities associated with the Authority’s efforts to explore public/private partnership for the operation of all of its facilities. The Authority Interim Executive Director, Secretary/Treasurer and all of the Authority’s other officials, employees and professionals are authorized and directed to execute those documents and perform those tasks that will affect the purposes of this Resolution.”

WHEREAS, to solicit such proposals and to move forward with the process contemplated thereby will be a time consuming and costly process, and should not be considered, let alone undertaken, until capital projects referred to at the November 30 Mayors Forum have all been completed and in operation for a sufficient time to enable an informed evaluation of how the RVSA facility was operating; and

WHEREAS, as recognized by RVSA previously, no such actions should be taken by RVSA toward possible privatization without first informing the Mayors and governing bodies of all RVSA member municipalities of the basis for such actions, and seeking the input of these important parties; and

WHEREAS, a number of member municipalities voiced strong opposition against moving forward with any privatization effort, including the preparation of Request for Proposals (RFP), and, in particular, Cranford requested dialogue with their RVSA representative before such RVSA voting took place, and whereby that dialogue did not occur; and

WHEREAS, such action by RVSA sets off a process with a goal that has not yet been appropriately sanctioned and in fact could ultimately incur substantial costs, yet undetermined at this time, to the constituent communities, with current reports indicating procurement costs up to and perhaps exceeding \$500K, before any contract is executed, with related legal fees for 2006 alone exceeding \$63K; and

WHEREAS, reports indicate a number of communities, large and small, near and far, have rejected privatization in favor of public control, yet executive summaries regarding related studies and decisions, as well as the input of those overseeing such efforts, were not considered in RVSA’s decision making process, despite requests that such information should be considered and discussed before voting for the aforementioned RFP; and

WHEREAS, privatization of any given entity has pros and cons that require careful consideration, with downsides including a lack of transparency and a lack of access to important documents, as well as ultimate goals of turning a profit for private interests, as opposed to optimal, cost-effective public service; and

WHEREAS, due diligence has not had an adequate chance in this case to best serve the interests of residents.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Township of Cranford hereby emphatically states its opposition to the inappropriate and premature action by the RVSA to adopt a resolution

“ . . . to authorize the publication of Requests For Proposals on its official website from legal service professionals, engineering professionals and financial consultants in connection with all activities associated with the Authority’s efforts to explore public/private partnership for the operation of all of its facilities. The Authority Interim Executive Director, Secretary/Treasurer and all of the Authority’s other officials, employees and professionals are authorized and directed to execute those documents and perform those tasks that will affect the purposes of this Resolution.”

or to take any other related actions to move forward with that process at this time. As previously recognized by RVSA’s own consultants, and represented to the public at the November 30, 2006 Mayors Forum, no further consideration should be given to or actions taken towards possible privatization until the capital projects referred to at the November 30 Mayors’ Forum have all been completed and in operation for a sufficient time (defined previously as one year) to enable an informed evaluation of how the RVSA facility is operating; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Township Committee desires that our RVSA representative rescind his affirmative vote for RFP and instead cast an opposing vote to privatization efforts as, at this time, we do not see such RFP to be in the best interest of the residents we collectively represent, and recognize that such move forward at this time could in fact be to their detriment, while incurring potentially unnecessary and substantial costs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that related action regarding RFP for privatization should not be taken until due diligence is allowed to run its course as indicated above; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the RVSA, each of its member municipalities governing bodies, and to the newspapers that regularly cover the business of this Township Committee, as well as the newspapers that cover RVSA meetings.

The following letter and resolution dated November 9, 2007, were received from Donna L. Corrigan, Deputy Borough Clerk for the Borough of Roselle Park:

Attached please find a copy of Resolution #232-07, opposing the solicitation of proposals for professional services to explore privatization of the operation of the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority, which was adopted at the meeting of the Mayor and Council held on November 8, 2007.

Resolution #232-07

Whereas, the Borough of Roselle Park is one of the 11 member municipalities of the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority (RVSA) a regional sewerage authority created and operating pursuant to the New Jersey Sewerage Authorities Law, N.J.S.A. 40:14A-1 et. seq.; and

WHEREAS, RVSA operates sewage treatment facilities constructed, maintained and operated with funds received from the taxpayers of the member municipalities, which facilities have cost hundreds of millions of dollars to construct and which are undergoing extensive capital projects intended to upgrade and make more efficient the operation of those facilities, the costs of which capital projects exceed \$175 million; and

WHEREAS, RVSA's annual operating costs are in excess of \$18 million, which costs are paid primarily by the member municipalities; and

WHEREAS, RVSA is responsible for the handling and treatment of the sanitary sewage for its 11 member municipalities in a cost-efficient and environmentally sound manner; and

WHEREAS, as a member municipality whose taxpayers have paid and continue to pay significant amounts of money to the construction and operation of RVSA, the Borough of Roselle Park is concerned that RVSA be operated in a sound and cost-efficient manner; and

WHEREAS, over the past several years, various consultants for RVSA and some members of RVSA have suggested or recommended that RVSA consider entering into a privatization contract for part or all of its operations; and

WHEREAS, the Borough of Roselle Park and other members have expressed concerns regarding whether such privatization would actually result in better or more cost effective operation of RVSA; and

WHEREAS, despite such concerns raised by the Borough of Roselle Park and other members, RVSA determined to undertake an investigation of privatization of a portion of its operations and retained various consultants to make recommendations to RVSA as to the appropriateness of moving forward to take actions to solicit request for qualifications for a privatization contract; and

WHEREAS, in response to concerns voiced by the Borough of Roselle Park and other members, RVSA determined to conduct a Mayors Forum to present to the Mayors and other representatives of the member municipalities the reasons why RVSA had decided to move forward to take actions to solicit requests for qualifications for a privatization contract; and

WHEREAS, on November 30, 2006, the RVSA held such a Mayors' Forum, at which it presented statements from the various consultants it had retained who had recommended to RVSA that it move forward with such privatization; and

WHEREAS, during this Mayors Forum, based on questions asked, concerns raised and information presented, RVSA's own consultants, including Steve Kellogg, Senior Vice President of CDM, agreed that it was premature to consider whether privatization might be a sound and cost effective measure for RVSA, and agreed that the appropriate course was to await completion of the significant capital projects being undertaken at the RVSA facility, including the Comprehensive Strategic Plan (CSP) contracts, the Major Upgrades contracts, and the Cogeneration/Sludge Drying Facility contract and a sufficient time after such

completion to be able to undertake an informed evaluation of how the RVSA facility was operating; and

WHEREAS, the Borough of Roselle Park and various other member municipalities welcomed these recommendations as a much sounder approach to the question of whether some form of privatization of RVSA's operations or facilities might be sound and/or cost effective; and

WHEREAS, despite the recommendations of its own consultants in November 2006, and despite the fact that the capital projects referred to at the November 30 Mayors' Forum have not all be completed and in operation, RVSA placed on its October 18, 2007 agenda a motion to solicit proposals for the services of (1) Special Counsel, (2) Special Engineer, and (3) Special Financial Advisor, to perform certain work related to the preparation of a Request for Qualifications on a privatization contract; and

WHEREAS, to solicit such proposals and to move forward with the process contemplated thereby will be a time consuming and costly process, and should not be considered, let alone undertaken, until the capital projects referred to at the November 30 Mayors' Forum have all been completed and in operation for a sufficient time to enable an informed evaluation of how the RVSA facility was operating; and

WHEREAS as recognized by RVSA previously, no such actions should be taken by RVSA toward possible privatization without first informing the Mayors and other municipal representatives of the basis for such action, and seeking the input of these important parties; and

WHEREAS, despite the above, at their October 18, 2007 meeting, in a six to five vote, RVSA passed the Resolution or motion to solicit proposals for the services of (1) Special Counsel; (2) Special Engineer and (3) Special Financial Advisor to perform certain work related to the preparation of the request for qualifications for a privatization contract.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Roselle Park hereby affirmatively and emphatically state the position that it is inappropriate and premature for RVSA to solicit proposals for the services of (1) Special Counsel, (2) Special Engineer and/or (3) Special Financial Advisor to perform any work related to the preparation of a Request For Qualifications on a privatization contract or to take any other actions to move forward with the process contemplated thereby. As previously recognized by RVSA's own consultants and represented to the public at the November 30 2006 Mayors Forum, no further consideration should be given to the actions taken toward possible privatization until the capital projects referred to at the November 30 Mayors Forum have all been completed and in operation for a sufficient time to enable an informed evaluation of how the RVSA facility was operating; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority, the Governing Body of each member municipality of the RVSA, The Newark Star Ledger, The Union Leader, The Home News & Tribune, Senator Thomas Kean, Assemblyman Eric Munoz, Assemblyman Jon Bramnick, Senator Nicholas

Scutari, Assemblyman Jerry Green, Assemblywoman Linda Stender, Senator Joseph Vitale, Assemblyman Joseph Vas, Assemblyman John S. Wisniewski, Senator Raymond Lesniak, Assemblyman Neil Cohen and Assemblyman Joseph Cryan.

Report of Treasurer

The Treasurer's Reports for the month of September 2007 have been distributed to the Commissioners for review and will be spread on the Minutes. So ordered.

Report of Interim Executive Director

Report of Consulting Engineer

Report of Counsel

Committee Reports

Chairman: Are there reports from any of the following Committees:

Engineering Committee (C. Clark Landale, Chair)

An Engineering Committee Meeting was held on November 8, 2007, at which time several items were discussed. Items which require action are on the agenda under New Business.

Finance Committee (Charles Lombardo, Chair)

A Finance Committee Meeting was held earlier this evening at which time the Bills and Claims were reviewed and action is on the agenda under Bills and Claims.

Personnel Committee (Joan Papen, Chair)

Sludge Management Committee (Frank Mazzarella, Chair)

Legal Committee (Joan Papen, Chair)

A Legal Committee Meeting was held earlier this evening at which time proposals received on Contract #0813 were discussed. Action is on the agenda under New Business.

Public Relations Committee (Rosalie Berger, Chair)

A Public Relations Committee Meeting was held earlier this evening at which time proposals received on Contract #0812 were discussed. Action is on the agenda under New Business.

Insurance Review Committee (Allen Chin, Chair)

Unfinished Business

New Business

Mr. Papen to offer three resolutions and one motion

1. #07-63 (Action to Rescind #07-62)

Motion:
 Second:
 Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye: _____
 Those opposed to the motion say Nay: _____

2. #07-64 (Amend PSA - #0512 – Hall & Assoc. \$16,000.00)

Motion:
 Second:
 Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye: _____
 Those opposed to the motion say Nay: _____

3. #07-65 (PSA - #0813 – Hall & Assoc. \$70,000.00)

Motion:
 Second:
 Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye: _____
 Those opposed to the motion say Nay: _____

4. Motion approving the purchase of 60 \$30.00 Holiday Gift Certificates from Supermarkets General, one to be given to each employee from the Commissioners.

Motion:
 Second:
 Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye:_____

Those opposed to the motion say Nay:_____

Mrs. Berger to offer one resolution.

- 1. #07-66 (PSA #0812 - The Spi Group \$10,540.00)

Motion:

Second:

Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye:_____

Those opposed to the motion say Nay:_____

Mr. Landale to offer four motions.

- 1. Motion to reject both bids received on Contract #0817 – Equipment Rental & Sewer Line Inspection Services, as the low bid was found to have non-waivable deficiencies, and to re-solicit bids for other options, as recommended by the Engineering Committee.

Motion:

Second:

Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye:_____

Those opposed to the motion say Nay:_____

- 2. Motion to reject both bids received on Contract #0819 – Bulk Lubricating Oil, as the low bid was found to have non-waivable deficiencies, and to re-solicit bids, as recommended by the Engineering Committee.

Motion:

Second:

Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye:_____

Those opposed to the motion say Nay:_____

- 3. Motion to award Contract #0821 – Furnish and Deliver Emulsion Polymer to the low bidder, Polydyne, Inc. of Riceboro, GA, for the portion of the bid on the Dewatering Facility only, contingent upon Polydyne, Inc. passing the necessary performance tests, in an amount

of \$0.90/lb., total estimated amount of \$259,200.00, as recommended by the Engineering Committee.

Motion:
Second:
Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye: _____
Those opposed to the motion say Nay: _____

- 4. Motion to award Contract #0822 – Furnish and Deliver Sodium Hypochlorite to the low bidder, JCI Jones Chemicals, Inc. of Warwick, NY in an amount of \$0.87/gal., total estimated amount of \$435,000.00, as recommended by the Engineering Committee.

Motion:
Second:
Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye: _____
Those opposed to the motion say Nay: _____

Mr. Pelissier to offer one resolution.

- 1. #07-67 (TWA - Rahway)

Motion:
Second:
Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye: _____
Those opposed to the motion say Nay: _____

Mr. Luban to offer one resolution.

- 1. #07-68 (TWA - Woodbridge)

Motion:
Second:
Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye: _____
Those opposed to the motion say Nay: _____

Bills and Claims

Motion that the following bills and claims previously audited by the Finance Committee be ordered paid.

- Motion:
- Second:
- Discussion:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye: _____

Those opposed to the motion say Nay: _____

Open the floor to the Public for questions or comments

Closed Session (Only If Necessary) (TURN OFF RECORDER)

Chairman: Do I hear a motion to close the meeting for discussion of pending and/or anticipated legal matters, based on Attorney Client privilege.

- Motion:
- Second:
- Discussion:
- Time:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye: _____

Those opposed to the motion say Nay: _____

Chairman: Do I hear a motion to return to the regular order of business. *(TURN ON RECORDER)*

- Motion:
- Second:
- Discussion:
- Time:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye: _____

Those opposed to the motion say Nay: _____

Return to Regular Order of Business

Adjournment

If there is no further business, do I hear a motion that this meeting be adjourned?

Motion:

Second:

Discussion:

Time:

Those in favor of the motion say Aye: _____

Those opposed to the motion say Nay: _____

TURN OFF RECORDER

/jg