

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD

A G E N D A

Executive Session and Regular Meeting of the Mayor and Council

Date: August 18, 2014

Open Public Meetings Statement by
Mayor Suarez

Public Session to Adjourn to C.T.O.:
Executive Session: Adjourn:

Mayor Suarez – Adjournment into closed Executive
Session in accordance with the “Open Public Meetings Act”

Executive Session: 6:30 P.M. C.T.O.:
Adjourn:

Public Session: 7:30 P.M. C.T.O.:
Adjourn:

Pledge of Allegiance

Citizens Comment on Agenda:

Correspondence:

ROLL CALL-PUBLIC SESSION

	Adj. to Ex.		Public	
	Pres.	Abs.	Pres.	Abs.
Mayor Suarez				
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				

ROLL CALL-EXEC. SESSION

	PRESENT	ABSENT
	Mayor Suarez	
Castelli		
Acosta		
Penabad		
Shim		
Todd		
Vincentz		

As advertised, hearing will be held on Ordinance No. 2259 entitled, “A CAPITAL ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$36,000 FOR ASPHALT OVERLAY ON PORTIONS OF 12 BOROUGH STREETS BY THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD AND TO APPROPRIATE \$36,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND”

Entertain motion to declare the time for the public hearing to be declared open

Public Hearing

Entertain motion to declare the time for the public hearing to be declared closed

Final Reading of Ordinance

Roll Call

As advertised, hearing will be held on Ordinance No. 2260 entitled, "A CAPITAL ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$88,000 FOR RIDGEFIELD NATURE CENTER FENCE IMPROVEMENTS BY THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD AND TO APPROPRIATE \$44,000 FROM A BERGEN COUNTY OPEN SPACE GRANT AND \$44,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND"

Entertain motion to declare the time for the public hearing to be declared open

Public Hearing

Entertain motion to declare the time for the public hearing to be declared closed

Final Reading of Ordinance

Roll Call

Introduction of Ordinance No. 2261 entitled, "AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 375-52 DESIGNATING HANDICAPPED PARKING SPACES"

First Reading of Ordinance

Roll Call

Introduction of Ordinance No. 2262 entitled, "AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 190 OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD ENTITLED FIRE PREVENTION CODE"

First Reading of Ordinance

Roll Call

Introduction of Ordinance No. 2263 entitled, "BOND ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS IN AND FOR THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD, IN THE COUNTY OF BERGEN, NEW JERSEY, APPROPRIATING \$726,000 THEREFORE AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF \$689,700 BONDS OR NOTES TO FINANCE PART OF THE COST THEREOF"

First Reading of Ordinance

Roll Call

PROPOSED CONSENT AGENDA:

205-2014	Councilman Acosta	Audit Recommendation
206-2014	Councilman Acosta	Extend Due Date for Payment of 3 rd Qtr. 2014 Property Taxes
207-2014	Councilman Acosta	Direct the Undertaking of a Continuing Disclosure Review and Authorize Participation in the Continuing Disclosure Cooperation Initiative of the Division of Enforcement of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
208-2014	Councilman Acosta	Redemption of Tax Title Lien #11-02
209-2014	Councilman Acosta	Redemption of Tax Title Lien #13-05
210-2014	Councilman Acosta	Municipal Charge – Block 1103, Lot 6
211-2014	Councilman Acosta	Approve Contract for National Water Main Cleaning Company-Cleaning and Televising Sanitary Sewer Main Edgewater Avenue
212-2014	Councilman Acosta	Cancel Unexpended Balances – General Capital Fund
213-2014	Councilman Acosta	Cancel Remaining Balance Against Grant Receivable Balances and Appropriation Reserve Balances
214-2014	Councilman Acosta	Appointment of Special Police Officers
215-2014	Councilman Castelli	Reject Bids – Viewing Platform, Concession Stand and ADA Toilets at the Meadowlands Park
216-2014	Councilman Acosta	Authorize to Re-advertise - Fiscal Year 2014 Concrete Sidewalk Replacement Program

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

RESOLUTIONS:

217-2014	Councilman Acosta	Warrants
----------	-------------------	----------

COMMENTS BY MAYOR:

Coin Toss Request:

RMHS Football
August 30, 2014 – 9:00 am-3:00 pm

Recreation Football/Cheerleading
September 13, 2014 – 9:00 am-3:00 pm

American Legion
September 20, 2014 – 9:00 am-3:00 pm
Rain Date: September 27, 2014

Ridgefield Music Parents
October 11, 2014 – 9:00 am-3:00 pm

Raffles License Application:

Sts. Vartanantz Armenian Apostolic Church
50/50
461 Bergen Boulevard
February 15, 2015 – 1:00 pm

COMMENTS BY COUNCILMEN:

COMMENTS BY CITIZENS: (All speakers are limited to five minutes maximum per meeting)

Agenda subject to change as a result of matters not known at time of printing with the consent of the Mayor and Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Mayor Suarez

BE IT RESOLVED, that the regular public meeting be adjourned, and that the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield shall meet in a closed Executive Session following a five minute recess at the termination of this meeting. The purpose of the Executive Session shall be to discuss the following matters:

- _____ Personnel matters in various departments of the Borough.
- _____ Pending and Potential Litigation
- _____ Tax Court Litigation.
- _____ Potential real estate transactions in which the Borough may engage.

COUNCIL VOTE				
	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that as soon as practicable discussion concerning

- _____ Personnel matters
- _____ Potential real estate transactions shall be disclosed to the public.
- _____ And that discussions with the Borough Attorney concerning litigation shall be disclosed when said litigation is terminated.

Adjournment to Closed Session. The Mayor and Council reserve the right to reconvene into Public Session, if necessary, to take action on Closed Session items.

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

ORDINANCE NO. 2259

BE IT ORDAINED by the Borough Council of the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that an Ordinance entitled

“A CAPITAL ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$36,000 FOR ASPHALT OVERLAY ON PORTIONS OF 12 BOROUGH STREETS BY THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD AND TO APPROPRIATE \$36,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND”

introduced on the 14th day of July, 2014, do now pass a final reading and be adopted, and that the Borough Clerk be and she is authorized and directed to publish once, the aforesaid title, together with a notice of the date of its passage on final reading and approval thereof in The Record, a newspaper circulating in the Borough of Ridgefield.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting July 14, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

ORDINANCE NO. 2259

“A CAPITAL ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$36,000 FOR ASPHALT OVERLAY ON PORTIONS OF 12 BOROUGH STREETS BY THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD AND TO APPROPRIATE \$36,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND”

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOROUGH COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD, IN THE COUNTY OF BERGEN AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY (not less than two-thirds of all members thereof affirmatively concurring) AS FOLLOWS:

Section1. The Borough of Ridgefield, in the County of Bergen, New Jersey, authorizes Asphalt Overlay on portions of 12 Borough Streets to be funded from the source specified in Section 2 of the Ordinance.

Section2. The amount of \$36,000 is hereby appropriated for the purposes stated in Section 1 of the Ordinance and which amount was funded from the Capital Improvement Fund in the amount of \$36,000.

Section3. In connection with the purpose and the amount authorized in Sections 1 and 2 hereof, the Borough determines the purpose described in Section 1 hereof is not a Current Expense and is an improvement which the Borough of Ridgefield may lawfully make as a general improvement.

Section4. All ordinances or parts of ordinances which are inconsistent with the terms of this Ordinance be and the same are hereby repealed to the extent of their inconsistency.

Section5. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon due passage and publication according to law.

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Castelli

ORDINANCE NO. 2260

BE IT ORDAINED by the Borough Council of the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that an Ordinance entitled

“A CAPITAL ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$88,000 FOR RIDGEFIELD NATURE CENTER FENCE IMPROVEMENTS BY THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD AND TO APPROPRIATE \$44,000 FROM A BERGEN COUNTY OPEN SPACE GRANT AND \$44,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND”

introduced on the 14th day of July, 2014, do now pass a final reading and be adopted, and that the Borough Clerk be and she is authorized and directed to publish once, the aforesaid title, together with a notice of the date of its passage on final reading and approval thereof in The Record, a newspaper circulating in the Borough of Ridgefield.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting July 14, 2014

Presented by Councilman Castelli

ORDINANCE NO. 2260

“A CAPITAL ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$88,000 FOR RIDGEFIELD NATURE CENTER FENCE IMPROVEMENTS BY THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD AND TO APPROPRIATE \$44,000 FROM A BERGEN COUNTY OPEN SPACE GRANT AND \$44,000 FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND”

BE IT ORDAINED, by the Governing Body of the Borough of Ridgefield in the County of Bergen, New Jersey (not less than two-thirds of all members thereof affirmatively concurring) as follows:

SECTION 1. The improvement described in Section 2 of this Ordinance is hereby respectively authorized as a general improvement to be made by the Borough of Ridgefield, New Jersey, for the said improvements or purposes stated in Section 2, there are hereby appropriated the sum of money therein stated as the appropriation made for said improvement or purpose, said sum being inclusive of all appropriations herefore made thereof and amounting in the aggregate to \$44,000 from a Bergen County Open Space Grant and \$44,000 which is now available in the Capital Improvement Fund.

SECTION 2. The Borough of Ridgefield, in the County of Bergen, State of New Jersey, is hereby authorized to provide for the following:

Ridgefield Nature Center Fence Improvements including all labor, material costs and appurtenances necessary and related thereto	<u>\$88,000</u>
---	-----------------

SECTION 3. It is hereby determined and stated:

(a) That said purpose is not a current expense. That the same is an improvement which the municipality may lawfully make and that no part of the cost of said improvement has been or shall be specifically be assessed on properties specifically benefited.

It is not necessary to finance said appropriation by the issuance of obligations by the Borough of Ridgefield pursuant to the Local Bond Law of the State of New Jersey, for the reason that monies sufficient to cover the appropriation thereof shall be available from a Bergen County Open Space Grant in the amount of \$44,000 and from the Capital Improvement Fund in the amount of \$44,000.

SECTION 4. The Capital Budget of the Borough of Ridgefield is hereby amended or established to conform with the provisions of this Ordinance to the extent of any inconsistency herewith. The resolution in the form promulgated by the Local Finance Board showing all detail of the amended or temporary Capital Budget and capital program as approved by the Director of the Division of Local Government Services, is on file with the Clerk and is available for public inspection.

SECTION 5. The sum of \$88,000 is hereby appropriated for the aforementioned purpose.

SECTION 6. It is hereby determined and stated that no supplemental debt statement is required to be made and signed in connection with said appropriation, since the gross debt of the municipality, as defined under the Local Bond Law, is not increased by this Ordinance and no obligations in the matter of notes or bonds are authorized by this Ordinance.

SECTION 7. This Ordinance shall take effect after publication thereof and final passage as required by law.

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

ORDINANCE NO. 2261

BE IT ORDAINED by the Borough Council of the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that an Ordinance entitled

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 375-52 DESIGNATING HANDICAPPED PARKING SPACES”

introduced on the 18th day of August, 2014 do now pass a first reading and that said Ordinance be further considered for final passage at a regular meeting to be held on the 8th day of September, 2014 at 7:30 P.M. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be reached at the regular meeting of the Borough Council in the Community Center, 725 Slocum Avenue, in the Borough of Ridgefield, and that at such time and place, all persons interested be given an opportunity to be heard concerning the same, that the Borough Clerk be and she is hereby authorized and directed to publish in The Record, a newspaper circulating in the Borough of Ridgefield said Ordinance according to law, with a notice of its introduction and passage on first reading, and of the time and place when and where said Ordinance will be further considered for final passage.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

ORDINANCE NO. 2261

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 375-52 DESIGNATING
HANDICAPPED PARKING SPACES”

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield as follows:

Section I:

Section 375-52 of the Code of the Borough of Ridgefield, entitled “Designated Areas” subpart B, be and hereby is amended by the following:

1. Adding a designated handicapped space adjacent to 405 Chestnut Street (on the western side of Chestnut Street) beginning at a point 55 feet south of the southwest corner of Chestnut Street and Hamilton Avenue proceeding north a distance of 22 feet..

Section II: In all other respects, the terms, conditions and provisions of Section 375-52 of the Code of the Borough of Ridgefield are hereby ratified and affirmed.

Section III: All ordinances or parts of ordinances inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Section IV: This ordinance shall take effect immediately upon passage and publication according to law.

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Castelli

ORDINANCE NO. 2262

BE IT ORDAINED by the Borough Council of the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that an Ordinance entitled

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 190 OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD ENTITLED FIRE PREVENTION CODE”

introduced on the 18th day of August, 2014 do now pass a first reading and that said Ordinance be further considered for final passage at a regular meeting to be held on the 8th day of September, 2014 at 7:30 P.M. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be reached at the regular meeting of the Borough Council in the Community Center, 725 Slocum Avenue, in the Borough of Ridgefield, and that at such time and place, all persons interested be given an opportunity to be heard concerning the same, that the Borough Clerk be and she is hereby authorized and directed to publish in The Record, a newspaper circulating in the Borough of Ridgefield said Ordinance according to law, with a notice of its introduction and passage on first reading, and of the time and place when and where said Ordinance will be further considered for final passage.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Castelli

ORDINANCE NO. 2262

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 190 OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF
RIDGEFIELD ENTITLED FIRE PREVENTION CODE”

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield as follows:

Section I:

Section 190-20 of the Code of the Borough of Ridgefield, forming a part of Chapter 190, Fire Prevention Code, be and hereby is amended by adding to the existing language of Section 190-20 a new subpart C to read as follows:

C. A fire official who has successfully completed a full five (5) year term may, by resolution of the Mayor and Council, be given tenure of office on condition, however, that the fire official must continue to maintain all appropriate licenses and certifications. After receiving tenure, the fire official may only be removed from office for cause.

Section II. Repealer.

All ordinances or parts of ordinances inconsistent or in conflict with this Ordinance are hereby repealed as to said inconsistencies and conflicts.

Section III. Severability.

If any section, part of any section, or clause or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the remaining provisions of this Ordinance, and each section and subsection thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more of the subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases may be declared unconstitutional or invalid.

Section IV. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon passage and publication according to law.

Section V: All ordinances or parts of ordinances inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

ORDINANCE NO. 2263

BE IT ORDAINED by the Borough Council of the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that an Ordinance entitled

“BOND ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS IN AND FOR THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD, IN THE COUNTY OF BERGEN, NEW JERSEY, APPROPRIATING \$726,000 THEREFORE AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF \$689,700 BONDS OR NOTES TO FINANCE PART OF THE COST THEREOF”

introduced on the 18th day of August, 2014 do now pass a first reading and that said Ordinance be further considered for final passage at a regular meeting to be held on the 8th day of September, 2014 at 7:30 P.M. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be reached at the regular meeting of the Borough Council in the Community Center, 725 Slocum Avenue, in the Borough of Ridgefield, and that at such time and place, all persons interested be given an opportunity to be heard concerning the same, that the Borough Clerk be and she is hereby authorized and directed to publish in The Record, a newspaper circulating in the Borough of Ridgefield said Ordinance according to law, with a notice of its introduction and passage on first reading, and of the time and place when and where said Ordinance will be further considered for final passage.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

ORDINANCE NO. 2263

“BOND ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS IN AND FOR THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD, IN THE COUNTY OF BERGEN, NEW JERSEY, APPROPRIATING \$726,000 THEREFORE AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF \$689,700 BONDS OR NOTES TO FINANCE PART OF THE COST THEREOF”

BE IT ORDAINED, BY THE BOROUGH COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD, IN THE COUNTY OF BERGEN, NEW JERSEY (not less than two-thirds of all members thereof affirmatively concurring) AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1:

The improvements described in Section 3 of this bond ordinance (the “Improvements”) are hereby authorized to be undertaken by the Borough of Ridgefield, New Jersey (the “Borough”) as general improvements. For the said Improvements there is hereby appropriated the amount of \$726,000, such sum includes the sum of \$36,300 as the down payment (the “Down Payment”) required by the Local Bond Law of the State of New Jersey, constituting Chapter 2 of Title 40A of the New Jersey Statutes, as amended and supplemented (the “Local Bond Law”). The Down Payment is now available by virtue of provision in one or more previously adopted budgets for down payments or capital improvement purposes.

SECTION 2:

In order to finance the additional cost of the Improvements not covered by application of the Down Payment, negotiable bonds of the Borough are hereby authorized to be issued in the principal amount of \$689,700 pursuant to the provisions of the Local Bond Law (the “Bonds”). In anticipation of the issuance of the Bonds and to temporarily finance said improvements or purposes, negotiable bond anticipation notes of the Borough are hereby authorized to be issued in the principal amount not exceeding \$689,700 pursuant to the provisions of the Local Bond Law (the “Bond Anticipation Notes” or “Notes”).

SECTION 3:

(a) The Improvements authorized and the purposes for which obligations are to be issued, the estimated cost of each Improvement and the appropriation therefor, the estimated maximum amount of bonds or notes to be issued for each Improvement and the period of usefulness of each Improvement are as follows:

<u>Improvements</u>	<u>Appropriation and Estimated Cost</u>	<u>Estimated Maximum Amount of Bonds or Notes</u>	<u>Period of Usefulness</u>
(1) Acquisition of various vehicles, including, but not limited to a street sweeper, sewer/jetter cleaner, 4 wheel drive sport utility vehicle, and pickup truck with plow, including all work and materials necessary therefor or incidental thereto.	\$641,000	\$608,950	13.73 Years
(2) Border Streets roadway improvements, including but not limited to a portion of Lafayette Avenue and Nelson Avenue, including milling and resurfacing, including all work and materials necessary therefore or incidental thereto.	50,000	47,500	10 Years
(3) Acquisition of various equipment, including a paint striping machine and the re-keying of all Borough buildings, including all work and materials necessary therefor or incidental thereto..	35,000	33,250	15 Years
TOTAL	\$726,000	\$689,700	

(b) The estimated maximum amount of Bonds or Notes to be issued for the purpose of financing a portion of the cost of the Improvements is \$689,700.

(c) The estimated cost of the Improvements is \$726,000 which amount represents the initial appropriation made by the Borough.

SECTION 4:

All Bond Anticipation Notes issued hereunder shall mature at such times as may be determined by the chief financial officer of the Borough (the "Chief Financial Officer"); provided that no Note shall mature later than one year from its date. The Notes shall bear interest at such rate or rates and be in such form as may be determined by the Chief Financial Officer. The Chief Financial Officer shall determine all matters in connection with Notes issued pursuant to this ordinance, and the signature of the Chief Financial Officer upon the Notes shall be conclusive evidence as to all such determinations. All Notes issued hereunder may be renewed from time to time subject to the provisions of Section 8(a) of the Local Bond Law. The Chief Financial Officer is hereby authorized to sell part or all of the Notes from time to time at public or private sale and to deliver them to the purchasers thereof upon receipt of payment of

the purchase price plus accrued interest from their dates to the date of delivery thereof. The Chief Financial Officer is directed to report in writing to the Borough Council of the Borough at the meeting next succeeding the date when any sale or delivery of the Notes pursuant to this ordinance is made. Such report must include the amount, the description, the interest rate and the maturity schedule of the Notes sold, the price obtained and the name of the purchaser.

SECTION 5:

The capital budget of the Borough is hereby amended to conform with the provisions of this ordinance to the extent of any inconsistency herewith. The resolution in the form promulgated by the Local Finance Board showing full detail of the amended capital budget and capital program as approved by the Director, Division of Local Government Services, Department of Community Affairs, State of New Jersey is on file with the Borough Clerk and is available for public inspection.

SECTION 6:

The following additional matters are hereby determined, declared, recited and stated:

(a) The Improvements described in Section 3 of this bond ordinance are not current expenses, and are capital improvements or properties that the Borough may lawfully make or acquire as general improvements, and no part of the cost thereof has been or shall be specially assessed on property specially benefited thereby.

(b) The average period of usefulness of the Improvements, within the limitations of the Local Bond Law, taking into consideration the respective amounts of all obligations authorized for the several purposes, according to the reasonable life thereof computed from the date of the Bonds authorized by this bond ordinance, is 13.53 years.

(c) The Supplemental Debt Statement required by the Local Bond Law has been duly prepared and filed in the office of the Borough Clerk and a complete executed duplicate thereof has been filed in the office of the Director, Division of Local Government Services, Department of Community Affairs, State of New Jersey. Such statement shows that the gross debt of the Borough, as defined in the Local Bond Law, is increased by the authorization of the Bonds and Notes provided in this bond ordinance by \$689,700 and the obligations authorized herein will be within all debt limitations prescribed by the Local Bond Law.

(d) An aggregate amount not exceeding \$50,000 for items of expense listed in and permitted under Section 20 of the Local Bond Law is included in the estimated cost of the Improvements, as indicated herein.

SECTION 7:

Any funds received from time to time by the Borough as contributions in aid of financing the purposes described in Section 3 of this Ordinance shall be used for financing said Improvements by application thereof either to direct payment of the cost of said Improvements or to the payment or reduction of the authorization of the obligations of the Borough authorized therefor by this Bond Ordinance. Any such funds received may, and all such funds so received

which are not required for direct payment of the cost of said Improvements shall, be held and applied by the Borough as funds applicable only to the payment of obligations of the Borough authorized by this Bond Ordinance.

SECTION 8:

The full faith and credit of the Borough are hereby pledged to the punctual payment of the principal of and interest on the obligations authorized by this bond ordinance. The obligations shall be direct, unlimited obligations of the Borough, and the Borough shall be obligated to levy ad valorem taxes upon all the taxable property within the Borough for the payment of the obligations and the interest thereon without limitation of rate or amount.

SECTION 9:

This Bond Ordinance constitutes a declaration of official intent under Treasury Regulation Section 1.150-2. The Borough reasonably expects to pay expenditures with respect to the Improvements prior to the date that Borough incurs debt obligations under this Bond Ordinance. The Borough reasonably expects to reimburse such expenditures with the proceeds of debt to be incurred by the Borough under this Bond Ordinance. The maximum principal amount of debt expected to be issued for payment of the costs of the Improvements is \$689,700.

SECTION 10:

This bond ordinance shall take effect 20 days after the first publication thereof after final adoption, as provided by the Local Bond Law.

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 205-2014

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 40A:5-4 requires the governing body of every local unit to have made an annual audit of its books, accounts and financial transactions; and

WHEREAS, the Annual Report of Audit for the calendar year ending December 31, 2013 has been filed by a Registered Municipal Accountant with the Municipal Clerk as per the requirements of N.J.S.A. 40A:5-6, and a copy has been received by each member of the governing body; and

WHEREAS, the Local Finance Board of the State of New Jersey is authorized to prescribe reports pertaining to the local fiscal affairs, as per R.S. 52:27BB-34, and

WHEREAS, the Local Finance Board has promulgated a regulation requiring that the governing body of each municipality shall by resolution certify to the Local Finance Board of the State of New Jersey that all members of the governing body have reviewed, as a minimum, the sections of the annual audit entitled:

General Comments
Recommendations

and

WHEREAS, the members of the governing body have personally reviewed as a minimum the Annual Report of Audit, and specifically the sections of the Annual Audit entitled:

General Comments
Recommendations

as evidenced by the group affidavit form of the governing body, and

WHEREAS, such resolution of certification shall be adopted by the Governing Body no later than forty-five days after the receipt of the annual audit, as per the regulations of the Local Finance Board, and

WHEREAS, all members of the governing body have received and have familiarized themselves with, at least, the minimum requirements of the Local Finance Board of the State of New Jersey, as stated aforesaid and have subscribed to the affidavit, as provided by the Local Finance Board; and

WHEREAS, failure to comply with the promulgations of the Local Finance Board of the State of New Jersey may subject the members of the local governing body to the penalty provisions of R.S. 52:27BB-52 – to wit:

R.S. 52:27BB-52-“A local officer or member of a local governing body who, after a date fixed for compliance fails or refuses to obey an order of the Director of Local Government Services, under the provisions of this Article, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, may be fined not more than One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00) or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both, in addition shall forfeit his office.”

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the governing body of the Borough of Ridgefield hereby states that it has complied with the promulgation of the Local Finance Board of the State of New Jersey dated July 30, 1968 and does hereby submit a certified copy of this resolution and the required affidavit to said Board to show evidence of said compliance.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

 Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

 Linda M. Silvestri,
 Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

GROUP AFFIDAVIT FORM
RESOLUTION NO. 205-2014

STATE OF NEW JERSEY)
) SS.:
COUNTY OF BERGEN)

We, members of the governing body of the Borough of Ridgefield, County of Bergen, of full age, being duly sworn according to law, upon our oath depose and say:

1. We are duly elected members of the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield.
2. In the performance of our duties, and pursuant to the Local Finance Board Regulation, we have familiarized ourselves with the contents of the Annual Municipal Audit filed with the Clerk pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:5-6 for the calendar year 2013.
3. We certify that we have personally reviewed and are familiar with, as a minimum, the sections of the Annual Report of Audit entitled:

GENERAL COMMENTS
RECOMMENDATIONS

(L.S.)
Anthony R. Suarez

(L.S.)
Russell Castelli

(L.S.)
Javier Acosta

(L.S.)
Ray Penabad

(L.S.)
Dennis Shim

(L.S.)
Angus Todd

(L.S.)
Warren Vincentz

Sworn to and subscribed before me this
_____ day of _____, 2014

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 206-2014

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 54:4-67 permits the Mayor and Council of each municipality to fix the rate of interest to be charged for the nonpayment of taxes on or before the date when they would become delinquent; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield set forth said interest rate by Resolution 39-2014 at their January 6, 2014 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Borough of Ridgefield was unable to mail its 3rd Quarter 2014 property tax bills on or before June 14th as required by N.J.S.A. 54:4-66 due to the failure on the part of the Bergen County Board of Taxation to certify the 2014 municipal tax rate and apportionment of taxes; and

WHEREAS, this delay will result in the late mailing of the 3rd Quarter 2014 tax bills to Borough property owners;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield, County of Bergen, State of New Jersey, that the interest rate for the nonpayment of 3rd Quarter 2014 property taxes shall be fixed at zero (0%) percent until September 4, 2014.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if payment of the 3rd Quarter 2014 property tax is not made on or before September 4, 2014, the time period set forth above, then the interest rate for nonpayment of the 3rd Quarter 2014 property tax shall revert back to the original interest rate established in Resolution 39-2014 and shall be charged from the statutory payment date for 3rd Quarter property taxes of August 1, 2014.

Approved:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Attest:

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 207-2014

WHEREAS, the Borough of Ridgefield (the "Governmental Entity") has entered into continuing disclosure agreement(s) in connection with certain of its prior bond and/or note issuance(s) (the "Prior Issuances"), agreeing to file certain financial information and operating data and/or certain enumerated event notices with the former nationally recognized securities information repositories or the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (the "MSRB") pursuant to the provisions of Rule 15c2-12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Rule"); and

WHEREAS, the Governmental Entity has made certain representations regarding its continuing disclosures in bond and note offering documents in connection with its Prior Issuances; and

WHEREAS, in response to widespread concerns that many municipal issuers have not been complying with their obligations to file continuing disclosure documents under the Rule, and furthermore have made false representations concerning compliance in bond and note offering documents, the Division of Enforcement (the "Division") of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") has set forth its Municipalities Continuing Disclosure Cooperation Initiative (the "MCDC Initiative"), attached hereto as Exhibit A. whereby the Commission will recommend favorable settlement terms to municipal issuers involved in the offer or sale of municipal securities, as well as underwriters of such offerings, if they self-report to the Division possible violations involving materially inaccurate statements in bond and note offering documents relating to prior compliance with continuing disclosure obligations pursuant to the Rule; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Local Finance Notice 2014-9, attached hereto as Exhibit B, the Director of the Local Finance Board, Division of Local Government Services of the Department of Community Affairs of the State of New Jersey, has recommended the undertaking of a Review (as hereinafter defined) by all municipal issuers and participation in the MCDC Initiative, where appropriate, as determined by the facts of each Review (the "LFB Recommendation");

NOW, THEREFORE, IN CONNECTION WITH THE LFB RECOMMENDATION, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD, as follows:

Section 1. The Government Entity, through its Chief Financial Officer or through the engagement of a third-party disclosure dissemination agent, is hereby directed to conduct a continuing disclosure review of its prior continuing disclosure undertakings (the "Review"). And

the Governmental Entity hereby ratifies any such previously conducted Review. Such Review shall include, but is not limited to, a historical review of the Governmental Entity’s continuing disclosure obligations and filings in connection with its Prior Issuances that are presently outstanding and which are no longer outstanding but, as of the date five years prior to the date of submission of the Questionnaire (as hereinafter defined), were outstanding; and the undertaking, at any time, of any applicable remedial filings with the MSRB deemed necessary for compliance with its continuing disclosure obligations.

Section 2. The Governmental Entity, through its Chief Financial Officer, is hereby authorized to participate in the MCDC Initiative, if in the discretion of the Chief Financial Officer after consultation with Governmental Entity officials, it is determined that the Governmental Entity may have made materially inaccurate statements in its bond and note offering documents relating to prior compliance with continuing disclosure obligations pursuant to the Rule in connection with its Prior Issuances issued during the period beginning five years prior to the date of submission of the Questionnaire.

Section 3. The Chief Financial Officer of the Governmental Entity is hereby authorized to execute and deliver any and all documents and instruments, including the Municipalities Continuing Disclosure Cooperative Initiative Questionnaire for Self-Reporting Entities contained in the MCDC Initiative (the “Questionnaire”), and to do and cause to be done any and all acts and things necessary or proper for participating in the MCDC Initiative and all related transactions, including the Review, contemplated by this resolution.

Section 4. All resolutions or proceedings, or parts thereof, in conflict with the provisions of this resolution are to the extent of such conflict hereby repealed.

Section 5. This resolution shall become effective in accordance with applicable law.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

EXHIBIT A

#2112165 v1
105312-53691



U.S. Securities and
Exchange Commission

Municipalities Continuing Disclosure Cooperation Initiative

Division of Enforcement

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

I. Introduction

The Municipalities Continuing Disclosure Cooperation Initiative (the "MCDC Initiative") is intended to address potentially widespread violations of the federal securities laws by municipal issuers and underwriters of municipal securities in connection with certain representations about continuing disclosures in bond offering documents.

As described below, under the MCDC Initiative, the Division of Enforcement (the "Division") of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") will recommend favorable settlement terms to issuers and obligated persons involved in the offer or sale of municipal securities (collectively, "issuers") as well as underwriters of such offerings if they self-report to the Division possible violations involving materially inaccurate statements relating to prior compliance with the continuing disclosure obligations specified in Rule 15c2-12 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act").¹

II. Background

Rule 15c2-12 generally prohibits any underwriter from purchasing or selling municipal securities unless the issuer has committed to providing continuing disclosure regarding the security and issuer, including information about its financial condition and operating data.² Rule 15c2-12 also generally requires that any final official statement prepared in connection with a primary offering of municipal securities contain a description of any instances in the previous five years in which the issuer failed to comply, in all material respects, with any previous commitment to provide such continuing disclosure.

The Commission may file enforcement actions under either Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (the "Securities Act"), and/or Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act against issuers for inaccurately stating in final official statements that they have substantially complied with their prior continuing disclosure obligations. In such instances, underwriters for these bond offerings may also have violated the anti-fraud provisions to the extent they failed to exercise adequate due diligence in determining whether issuers have complied with such obligations, and as a result, failed to form a reasonable basis for believing the truthfulness of a key representation in the issuer's official statement. For instance, on July 29, 2013, the Commission charged a school district in Indiana and its underwriter with falsely stating to bond investors that the school district had been properly providing annual financial information and notices required as part of its prior bond offerings.³ Without admitting or denying the Commission's findings, the school district and underwriter each consented to, among other things, an order to cease and desist from committing or causing any violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5. The underwriter also agreed to pay disgorgement and prejudgment interest of \$279,446 as well as a penalty of \$300,000.

The Commission has in the past emphasized that the likelihood that an issuer will abide by its continuing disclosure obligations is critical to any evaluation of its covenants. An underwriter's obligation to have a reasonable basis to believe that the key representations in a final official statement are true and accurate extends to an issuer's representations concerning past compliance with disclosure obligations. Indeed, this provision of Rule 15c2-12 was specifically intended to serve as an incentive for issuers to comply with their undertakings to provide disclosures in the secondary market for municipal securities, and also assists underwriters and others in assessing the reliability of the issuer's disclosure representations. Moreover, the Commission has in the past stated that it believes that it is doubtful that an underwriter could form a reasonable basis for relying on the accuracy or completeness of an issuer's ongoing disclosure representations without the underwriter affirmatively inquiring as to that filing history, and the underwriter may not rely solely on a written certification from an issuer that it has provided all filings or notices.⁴

Based on available information, and as highlighted in the Commission's August 2012 Municipal Market Report, there is significant concern that many issuers have not been complying with their obligation to file continuing disclosure documents and that federal securities law violations involving false statements concerning such compliance may be widespread.

III. The MCDC Initiative

A. Who Should Consider Self-Reporting to the Division?

Issuers who may have made materially inaccurate statements in a final official statement regarding their prior compliance with their continuing obligations as described in Rule 15c2-12 should consider self-reporting to the Division to take advantage of the MCDC Initiative.

Underwriters of offerings in which the final official statement contains materially inaccurate statements regarding an issuer's prior compliance with continuing disclosure obligations should also consider self-reporting under the MCDC Initiative. Such underwriters may include the lead underwriter in an underwriting syndicate of such offerings or the sole underwriter in such offerings, and includes both competitive and negotiated underwritings.

Issuers or underwriters that have already been contacted by the Division as of the date of this announcement regarding possible inaccurate statements as to past compliance with continuing disclosure obligations, but against whom no enforcement action has yet been taken, may be eligible for the MCDC Initiative and should contact the Enforcement staff to discuss eligibility.

B. When and What Must Issuers and Underwriters Self Report?

To be eligible for the MCDC Initiative, an issuer or underwriter must self-report by accurately completing the attached questionnaire and submitting it within the six month period beginning March 10, 2014 and ending at 12:00 a.m. EST on September 10, 2014. Information required by the questionnaire includes:

- Identification and contact information of the self-reporting entity;
- Information regarding the municipal securities offerings containing the potentially inaccurate statements;
- Identities of the lead underwriter, municipal advisor, bond counsel, underwriter's counsel and disclosure counsel, if any, and the primary contact person at each entity, for each such offering;
- Any facts that the self-reporting entity would like to provide to assist the staff in understanding the circumstances that may have led to the potentially inaccurate statement(s); and
- A statement that the self-reporting entity intends to consent to the applicable settlement terms under the MCDC Initiative.

Submissions may be made by email to MCDCsubmissions@sec.gov, by fax to (301) 847-4713 or by mail to MCDC Initiative, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Boston Regional Office, 33 Arch Street, Boston, MA 02110.

C. Standardized Settlement Terms the Division Will Recommend

To the extent an entity meets the requirements of the MCDC Initiative and the Division decides to recommend enforcement action against the entity ("eligible issuer" or "eligible underwriter"), the Division will recommend that the Commission accept a settlement which includes the terms described below.⁵

1. Types of Proceedings and Nature of Charges

For eligible issuers, the Division will recommend that the Commission accept a settlement pursuant to which the issuer consents to the institution of a cease and desist proceeding under Section 8A of the Securities Act for violation(s) of Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act.⁶ The Division will recommend a settlement in which the issuer neither admits nor denies the findings of the Commission.

For eligible underwriters, the Division will recommend that the Commission accept a settlement pursuant to which the underwriter consents to the institution of a cease and desist proceeding under Section 8A of the Securities Act and administrative proceedings under Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act for violation(s) of Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act. The Division will recommend a settlement in which the underwriter neither admits nor denies the findings of the Commission.

2. Undertakings

For eligible issuers, the settlement to be recommended by the Division must include undertakings by the issuers. Specifically, as part of the settlement, the issuer must undertake to:

- establish appropriate policies and procedures and training regarding continuing disclosure obligations within 180 days of the institution of the proceedings;
- comply with existing continuing disclosure undertakings, including updating past delinquent filings within 180 days of the institution of the proceedings;
- cooperate with any subsequent investigation by the Division regarding the false statement(s), including the roles of individuals and/or other parties involved;
- disclose in a clear and conspicuous fashion the settlement terms in any final official statement for an offering by the issuer within five years of the date of institution of the proceedings; and
- provide the Commission staff with a compliance certification regarding the applicable undertakings by the issuer on the one year anniversary of the date of institution of the proceedings.

For eligible underwriters, the settlement to be recommended by the Division must include undertakings by the underwriters. Specifically, as part of the settlement, the underwriter must undertake to:

- retain an independent consultant, not unacceptable to the Commission staff, to conduct a compliance review and, within 180 days of the institution of proceedings, provide recommendations to the underwriter regarding the underwriter's municipal underwriting due diligence process and procedures;
- within 90 days of the independent consultant's recommendations, take reasonable steps to enact such recommendations; provided that the underwriter make seek approval from the Commission staff to not adopt recommendations that the underwriter can demonstrate to be unduly burdensome;
- cooperate with any subsequent investigation by the Division regarding the false statement(s), including the roles of individuals and/or other parties involved; and

- provide the Commission staff with a compliance certifications regarding the applicable undertakings by the Underwriter on the one year anniversary of the date of institution of the proceedings.

3. Civil Penalties

For eligible issuers, the Division will recommend that the Commission accept a settlement in which there is no payment of any civil penalty by the issuer.

For eligible underwriters, the Division will recommend that the Commission accept a settlement in which the underwriter consents to an order requiring payment of a civil penalty as described below:

- For offerings of \$30 million or less, the underwriter will be required to pay a civil penalty of \$20,000 per offering containing a materially false statement;
- For offerings of more than \$30 million, the underwriter will be required to pay a civil penalty of \$60,000 per offering containing a materially false statement;
- However, no underwriter will be required to pay more than \$500,000 total in civil penalties under the MCDC Initiative.

D. No Assurances Offered with Respect to Individual Liability

The MCDC Initiative covers only eligible issuers and underwriters. The Division provides no assurance that individuals associated with those entities, such as municipal officials and employees of underwriting firms, will be offered similar terms if they have engaged in violations of the federal securities laws. The Division may recommend enforcement action against such individuals and may seek remedies beyond those available through the MCDC Initiative. Assessing whether to recommend enforcement action against an individual for violations of the federal securities laws necessarily involves a case-by-case assessment of specific facts and circumstances, including evidence regarding the level of intent and other factors such as cooperation by the individual.

E. No Assurances for Entities That Do Not Take Advantage of MCDC Initiative

For issuers and underwriters that would be eligible for the terms of the MCDC initiative but that do not self-report pursuant to the terms of the MCDC Initiative, the Division offers no assurances that it will recommend the above terms in any subsequent enforcement recommendation. As noted above, assessing whether to recommend enforcement action necessarily involves a case-by-case assessment of specific facts and circumstances, but entities are cautioned that enforcement actions outside of the MCDC Initiative could result in the Division or the Commission seeking remedies beyond those described in the Initiative. For issuers, the Division will likely recommend and seek financial sanctions. For underwriters, the Division will likely recommend and seek financial sanctions in amounts greater than those available pursuant to the MCDC Initiative.

Questions regarding the MCDC Initiative may be directed to MCDCInquiries@sec.gov.

¹Recommendations by the Division to the Commission are subject to approval by the Commission.

²The issuers' agreement to make such disclosures is memorialized in a written undertaking frequently called a Continuing Disclosure Agreement. The Continuing Disclosure Agreement requires that issuer to file annual financial information and notices of certain material events with the Electronic Municipal Market Access, or EMMA, an electronic information repository system maintained by the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (MSRB), which is accessible to all investors on the internet.

³In the Matter of West Clark Community Schools, AP File No. 3-15391 (July 29, 2013); In the Matter of City Securities Corporation and Randy G. Ruhl, AP File No. 3-15390 (July 29, 2013).

⁴See "Municipal Securities Disclosure," Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34961 (November 10, 1994), 59 FR 59590, *supra* notes 50-54 (November 17, 1994). See also "Amendments to Municipal Securities Disclosure," Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34-62184A (May 26, 2010), 75 FR 331100, *supra* n. 348-362 (June 10, 2010).

⁵The standardized settlement terms of the MCDC Initiative are only applicable to inaccurate statements concerning compliance with continuing disclosure obligations. The MCDC Initiative and the standardized settlement terms are not applicable to other material misstatements in final official statements or related communications or other misconduct. Any other potential misconduct is subject to investigation and separate enforcement action, if appropriate. If enforcement action is taken, entities may be subject to additional remedies for that misconduct, including additional financial sanctions.

⁶Violations of Section 17(a)(2) require a finding of negligent conduct.

Modified: March 10, 2014



**U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT**

**MUNICIPALITIES CONTINUING DISCLOSURE COOPERATION INITIATIVE
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SELF-REPORTING ENTITIES**

NOTE: The information being requested in this Questionnaire is subject to the Commission's routine uses. A list of those uses is contained in SEC Form 1662, which also contains other important information.

1. Please provide the official name of the entity that is self-reporting ("Self-Reporting Entity") pursuant to the MCDC Initiative along with contact information for the Self-Reporting Entity:
 - Individual Contact Name:
 - Individual Contact Title:
 - Individual Contact telephone:
 - Individual Contact Fax number:
 - Individual Contact email address:

 - Full Legal Name of Self-Reporting Entity:
 - Mailing Address (number and street):
 - Mailing Address (city):
 - Mailing Address (state): Select a state...
 - Mailing Address (zip):

2. Please identify the municipal bond offering(s) (including name of Issuer and/or Obligor, date of offering and CUSIP number) with Official Statements that may contain a materially inaccurate certification on compliance regarding prior continuing disclosure obligations (for each additional offering, attach an additional sheet or separate schedule):
 - State: Select a state...
 - Full Name of Issuing Entity:
 - Full Legal Name of Obligor (if any):
 - Full Name of Security Issue:
 - Initial Principal Amount of Bond Issuance:
 - Date of Offering:
 - Date of final Official Statement (format MMDDYYYY):
 - Nine Character CUSIP number of last maturity:

3. Please describe the role of the Self-Reporting Entity in connection with the municipal bond offerings identified in Item 2 above (select Issuer, Obligor or Underwriter):

- Issuer
- Obligor
- Underwriter

4. Please identify the lead underwriter, municipal advisor, bond counsel, underwriter's counsel and disclosure counsel, if any, and the primary contact person at each entity, for each offering identified in Item 2 above (attach additional sheets if necessary):

Senior Managing Underwriting Firm:

Primary Individual Contact at Underwriter:

Financial Advisor:

Primary Individual Contact at Financial Advisor:

Bond Counsel Firm:

Primary Individual Contact at Bond Counsel:

Law Firm Serving as Underwriter's Counsel:

Primary Individual Contact at Underwriter's Counsel:

Law Firm Serving as Disclosure Counsel:

Primary Individual Contact at Disclosure Counsel:

5. Please include any facts that the Self-Reporting Entity would like to provide to assist the staff of the Division of Enforcement in understanding the circumstances that may have led to the potentially inaccurate statements (attach additional sheets if necessary):

On behalf of (Name of Self-Reporting Entity)
I hereby certify that the Self-Reporting Entity intends to consent to the applicable
settlement terms under the MCDC Initiative.

By: _____

Name of Duly Authorized Signer:

Title:

EXHIBIT B

#2111165 v1
105312-53691

LFN 2014-9

July 23, 2014

Local Finance Notice

Chris Christie Governor Kim Guadagno Lt. Governor Richard E. Constable, III Commissioner Thomas H. Neff Director

Contact Information

Director's Office
 V. 609.292.6613
 F. 609.292.9073

Local Government Research
 V. 609.292.6110
 F. 609.292.9073

Financial Regulation and Assistance
 V. 609.292.4806
 F. 609.984.7388

Local Finance Board
 V. 609.292.0479
 F. 609.633.6243

Local Management Services
 V. 609.292.7842
 F. 609.633.6243

Authority Regulation
 V. 609.984.0132
 F. 609.984.7388

Mail and Delivery
 101 South Broad St.
 PO Box 803
 Trenton, New Jersey
 08625-0803
Web:
www.nj.gov/divisions/dca/dlgs
E-mail: dlgs@dca.state.nj.us

Distribution
 Chief Financial Officers
 Municipal Clerks
 Freeholder Board Clerks
 Authority Officials
 Auditors

**Secondary Bond Market
 Continuing Disclosure Commitments**

This Notice is intended to give fair warning to local government officials, including Certified Municipal Finance Officers and comparable staff of authorities and other local governments, that there will be consequences for failing to have identified past noncompliance (where applicable) with continuing financial disclosure requirements related to outstanding bonds and other securities and determining by September 10, 2014 whether to take advantage of a compliance initiative offered by the Securities Exchange Commission's (SEC). While this notice is important for all local governments that have outstanding bonds, bond anticipation notes, and other securities, it is critically important where local governments anticipate a need to access financial markets in the near future - as with the need to "roll over" Bond Anticipation Notes or to issue bonds.

Continuing disclosure requirements are indirectly required pursuant to federal law. The CFO, or another local official, was generally required in one or more documents authorizing the issuance of debt (commonly called "Continuing Disclosure Agreements") to annually, or more frequently, publicly disclose certain information. Consequences of failing to live up to requirements will likely include future difficulty accessing credit markets. Consequences could include, among other things: (1) enforcement actions being brought by the SEC that will result in more severe penalties otherwise available pursuant to "the SEC's "Municipalities Continuing Disclosure Cooperation Initiative" (see below for discussion); (2) denial or deferral of applications made to the Local Finance Board or Director of the Division for various approvals; (3) actions against State licensures in the event of fraudulent attestations of compliance; and/or (4) decreased scores on future "Best Practices Questionnaires" (which will contain questions as to past compliance) that could trigger a withholding of a portion of State Aid.

It is important that you read this notice in its entirety and consult your public finance professionals so you understand your continuing disclosure obligations and what must be done to achieve compliance.

Local government access to capital is critical for advancing needed local infrastructure projects and meeting local cash flow needs. As a condition of providing access to capital in the form of debt, the financial community - at the time of buying debt and while debt remains outstanding - expects to be kept abreast of key financial information that could impact the value of securities in the secondary market. Legally, local governments have an obligation to provide certain information. They are obligated under federal law to issue certain information at the time of issuing new debt, and they are frequently contractually obligated to continue providing certain information while their debt remains outstanding.

Recently, the SEC and the financial community have focused attention on what is alleged to be a widespread failure of local government issuers across the nation to meet their continuing disclosure obligations. They maintain that local government issuers of debt frequently fail to meet their continuing disclosure obligations and misrepresent (sometimes innocently or inadvertently and other times fraudulently) their past compliance when issuing new debt.

Earlier this year, the SEC adopted a program to encourage local government issuers to self-identify past noncompliance and improve timely continuing disclosure in the future. Their program, known as the "Municipalities Continuing Disclosure Cooperation Initiative" essentially establishes lesser enforcement actions provided local government issuers (and others) self-identify past noncompliance and agree to a plan designed to prevent future noncompliance. You can read more about this program by visiting: <http://www.sec.gov/divisions/enforce/municipalities-continuing-disclosure-cooperation-initiative.shtml>). It is strongly recommended that local government officials proactively take steps to self-identify their own levels of compliance with Continuing Disclosure Agreements if they have outstanding debt and consult their public finance officials during this process to, among other things, determine if it is advisable to participate in the SEC's program.

The private marketplace is also taking steps to improve disclosure by more closely reviewing past compliance and, as appropriate, refraining from underwriting or buying new debt unless compliance has been achieved. It is critically important that local governments anticipating a need to access financial markets conduct a self-assessment of past continuing disclosure compliance and correct deficiencies. Failure to do so could bar, or delay, access to capital markets.

As part of your self-assessment, it is recommended that you first identify your continuing disclosure contractual obligations with respect to past issuances of debt while it remained (or remains) outstanding. These obligations generally include filing audits, budgets, and certain operating data with various depositories.

Continuing Disclosure Agreements generally specify what information must be filed and where it must be filed. It is critically important that each local government understand the commitments it has made and live up to them. However, the Division recommends, as a best practice, that local governments with continuing disclosure requirements file the following information through the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board's Electronic Municipal Marketplace Access (EMMA) website (www.emma.msrb.org) in addition to any information they had previously agreed to provide:

- a) As soon as available: The issuer's Annual Financial Statement -- or a variation thereof where an Annual Financial Statement is not statutorily required; and
- b) As soon as available: The Issuer's Audited Financial Statements; and
- c) As soon as available: The Issuer's adopted budgets; and
- d) Within 180 days of the end of the fiscal year: Annual Operating Data, consisting of:
 - (i) Debt Statistics
 - (ii) Property Tax Information and tax statistics where the issuer relies on property tax collections as a major source of revenue;
 - Net Assessed Valuation
 - Real Property Classifications
 - Ratio of Assessed Valuation to True Value
 - Percentage of Collection
 - Delinquent Tax and Tax Title Lien Information
 - Property Acquired By Tax Title Lien Liquidation
 - Tax Rates
 - Tax Levies
 - Largest Taxpayers
 - (iii) Other major revenue data and statistics where the issuer relies on revenues other than property tax collections;
 - Sewer and water billings;
 - Parking rents and collections;
 - Etc.
 - (iv) Capital Budget
 - (v) New Construction Permits
- e) Within 10 business days of the occurrence of any material events consisting of the following:
 - (i) Principal and interest payment delinquencies;
 - (ii) Non-payment related defaults, if material;
 - (iii) Unscheduled draws on debt service reserves reflecting financial difficulties;
 - (iv) Unscheduled draws on credit enhancements reflecting financial difficulties;
 - (v) Substitution of credit or liquidity providers, or their failure to perform;
 - (vi) Adverse tax opinions, the issuance by the Internal Revenue Service of proposed or final determinations of taxability, Notices of Proposed Issue (IRS Form 5701-TEB) or other material notices or determinations with respect to the tax status of the security, or other material events affecting the tax status of the security;
 - (vii) Modifications to rights of security holders, if material;
 - (viii) Bond calls, if material, and tender offers;
 - (ix) Defeasances;
 - (x) Release, substitution, or sale of property securing repayment of the Securities, if material;
 - (xi) Rating changes;

- (xii) Bankruptcy, insolvency, receivership or similar event of the obligated person;
 - (xiii) The consummation of a merger, consolidation, or acquisition involving an obligated person or the sale of all or substantially all of the assets of the obligated person, other than in the ordinary course of business, the entry into a definitive agreement to undertake such an action or the termination of a definitive agreement relating to any such actions, other than pursuant to its terms, if material; and
 - (xiv) Appointment of a successor or additional trustee or the change of name of a trustee, if material.
- f) Any and all additional or other information or documents required by the specific continuing disclosure obligations of such Issuer, for any particular series of Securities outstanding.

You should also ensure that past official statements -- or similar documents issued with respect to new issuances of debt -- have accurately reported your past compliance with continuing disclosure requirements.

While not required, the Chief Financial Officer is encouraged to seek the assistance of an experienced professional to assist or undertake such self-assessment.

As a final matter, the Division will be drafting a proposed Local Finance Notice -- or other appropriate action -- to require: (1) CFOs to attest as part of budget submissions to the Division that appropriate steps are being taken to ensure compliance with continuing disclosure requirements; and (2) auditors to treat non-compliance with continuing disclosure requirements as an instance of non-compliance with prevailing laws, statutes, regulations, contracts and agreements that is required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*.

Approved: Thomas H. Neff, Director

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 208-2014

WHEREAS, the Law Office of Ambrosio and Tomczak has deposited a check in the amount of \$49,454.68 into the Suspense Account for the redemption and subsequent taxes of Tax Lien # 11-02, Block 707 Lot 2, further known as 735 Stewart Street, sold to Stonefield Investment Fund 1, LLC and whereas \$12,100.00 was previously deposited into the Trust Account for the premium at the time of the tax sale;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that the Chief Financial Officer be and he is hereby authorized to issue and sign a check in the amount of \$49,454.68 from the Suspense Account and a check for \$12,100.00 from the Trust Account.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the check in the amount of \$49,454.68 be drawn on the Borough of Ridgefield Suspense account and the check for \$12,100.00 be drawn on the Borough of Ridgefield Trust account and be made payable to Stonefield Investment Fund 1, LLC and mailed to 21 Robert Pitt Drive #202, Monsey, NY 10952.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 209-2014

WHEREAS, Nuco Title Insurance Agency has deposited a check in the amount of \$20,630.99 into the Suspense Account for the redemption and subsequent taxes of Tax Lien # 13-05, Block 3204 Lot 8, further known as 380 Bernard Place, sold to Stonefield Investment Fund 11, LLC and whereas \$17,800.00 was previously deposited into the Trust Account for the premium at the time of the tax sale;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that the Chief Financial Officer be and he is hereby authorized to issue and sign a check in the amount of \$20,630.99 from the Suspense Account and a check for \$17,800.00 from the Trust Account.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the check in the amount of \$20,630.99 be drawn on the Borough of Ridgefield Suspense account and the check for \$17,800.00 be drawn on the Borough of Ridgefield Trust account and be made payable to Stonefield Investment Fund 11, LLC and mailed to 21 Robert Pitt Drive #202, Monsey, NY 10952.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 210-2014

WHEREAS, the Borough of Ridgefield received numerous complaints in regard to the disrepair and/or abandonment of certain properties; and

WHEREAS, the aforesated facts were confirmed upon inspection by the Property Maintenance Department; and

WHEREAS, Property Maintenance notified the owners that the properties needed to be cleaned up and maintained and the owners did not respond; and

WHEREAS, in order to preserve the health, safety and welfare of the adjacent neighbors and all municipal residents the Borough of Ridgefield hired vendors for emergency cleanup of said properties; and

WHEREAS, the owners of these properties were given ample time to respond and pay the clean up fees and have not done so;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and Council directs Tax Collector Frank Berardo to place Municipal Charges upon the said property for the clean-up costs incurred by the Borough of Ridgefield according to the following schedule:

1010 Elm Avenue Block 1103 Lot 6 \$250.00

Approved:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Attest:

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

COUNCIL VOTE				
	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 211-2014

WHEREAS, there is a need in the Borough of Ridgefield for the cleaning and televising of the sanitary sewer main along Edgewater Avenue from Bergen Boulevard to Oak Street; and

WHEREAS, the Borough previously solicited quotations from contractors; and

WHEREAS, the Borough has received only one proposal from National Water Main Cleaning Company of 875 Summer Avenue, Newark, New Jersey; and

WHEREAS, the amount of the proposal, \$6,668.50, is well below the bid threshold; and

WHEREAS, the bid is determined to be reasonable by the Borough Engineer; and

WHEREAS, the Borough previously awarded this bid and now wishes to authorize the Mayor and Borough Clerk to sign a form of contract with National Water Main Cleaning Company; and

WHEREAS, the Borough wishes to award said contract to National Water Main Cleaning Company in the form as annexed hereto;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that the Mayor and Borough Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to execute the attached form of contract subject to certification of the availability of funds, and compliance by the vendor with all applicable pay-to-play legislation.

Approved:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Attest:

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 212-2014

WHEREAS, there appears open of record unexpended balances on certain ordinance appropriations in the General Capital Fund; and

WHEREAS, the capital projects have been completed or are no longer active:

NOW, THEREFOE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield, County of Bergen, New Jersey, that the following funded ordinance appropriation balances in the General Capital Fund be cancelled, reducing notes outstanding and deferred charges unfunded.

<u>Ord. No.</u>	<u>Improvement Description</u>	<u>Funded</u>
2108	Synthetic Turf Replacement	\$ 53,014
2116	Purchase of Quint Fire Truck	19,671
		<u>\$ 72,685</u>

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 213-2014

WHEREAS, certain Grant Receivable balance remains uncollected for projects which have been completed; and

WHEREAS, it has been determined that the Borough has received all the funds eligible to be received and desires to cancel the remaining balance against grant receivable balances and appropriation reserve balances:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that the following balances be cancelled of record as follows:

<u>Grant Description</u>	<u>Grant Receivable Balance</u>	<u>Appropriation Reserve Balance</u>
NJ Meadowlands Grant COAH	\$11,336	\$11,336

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 214-2014

BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that

MARGARET WIKTOROWSKI
YOUNG CHUL CHO
FREDI NOLASCO
DIGNA MENDEZ
SALVATORE SGHERZA
ANDREW FARELLI
WILFREDO MEDINA

be appointed as Special Police Officers at the hourly rate of \$13.00 effective September 2, 2014.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Castelli

RESOLUTION NO. 215-2014

WHEREAS, the Borough of Ridgefield previously advertised for bids for the construction of a Viewing Platform, Concession Stand and ADA Toilets at the Meadowlands Park; and

WHEREAS, bids were received and opened on July 8, 2014; and

WHEREAS, all bids received have been determined by the Borough Engineer to not be reasonable as to price based on the cost estimates prepared by the Borough Engineer prior to advertising for bids; and

WHEREAS, all bids exceeded the amount of allocated funds; and

WHEREAS, this was the second consecutive occasion where all bids exceeded the reasonable price based on the cost estimates prepared by the Borough Engineer; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council now wish to negotiate a contract as permitted, and in accordance with the terms and conditions of, N.J.S.A. 40A:11-5(3);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield as follows:

1. Pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 40A:11-13.2, the Mayor and Council determines and does hereby reject all bids received at the July 8, 2014 public bid opening for the project for the Construction of a Viewing Platform, Concession Stand and ADA Toilets at the Meadowlands Park as all bids exceed the reasonable price based on the cost estimates prepared by the Borough Engineer prior to advertising for said bids.

2. As this is the second occasion where all bids received have exceeded the reasonable price based on the cost estimates prepared by the Borough Engineer, the Mayor and Council has determined that it wishes to avail itself of the opportunity to attempt to negotiate a contract as provided by the provisions of N.J.S.A. 40A:11-5(3). Accordingly, appropriate Borough Officials be and hereby are authorized and directed to attempt to negotiate a contact pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 40A:11-5(3).

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 216-2014

WHEREAS, the Borough of Ridgefield previously advertised for invitation for bids for the Fiscal Year 2014 Concrete Sidewalk Replacement Program; and

WHEREAS, bids were to be received on or before Tuesday, July 22, 2014; and

WHEREAS, no bids were received pursuant to the advertisement for bids;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that invitation for bids for the Fiscal Year 2014 Concrete Sidewalk Replacement Program be re-advertised, and that the Borough Engineer shall prepare the necessary specifications for same.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Borough Clerk and hereby is authorized to advertise for said invitation for bids.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri
Borough Clerk

The undersigned, being the Chief Financial Officer of the Borough of Ridgefield, County of Bergen, New Jersey, and the person charged with the responsibility of maintaining financial records of said Borough in accordance with N.J.S.A. 40:4-57 and the rules of the Local Finance Board of the State of New Jersey adopted thereunder, does hereby certify that there are adequate funds available for the payment of the attached list of invoices, duly adopted by said Borough, and which said list indicates the specific line item of said budget to which expenditures shall be charged.

Frank Berardo,
Chief Financial Officer

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting August 18, 2014

Presented by Councilman Acosta

RESOLUTION NO. 217-2014

BE IT RESOLVED, that warrants totaling \$5,271,450.74
be drawn on the following accounts:

CURRENT	\$5,018,944.25
TRUST	\$124,073.55
CAPITAL	\$51,255.89
POOL	\$72,598.18
DOG LICENSE	\$2,401.33
UNEMPLOYMENT FUND	\$2,177.54
TOTAL	\$5,271,450.74

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Castelli				
Acosta				
Penabad				
Shim				
Todd				
Vincentz				
Mayor Suarez				

Approved:

Attest:

Anthony R. Suarez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk