

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD

A G E N D A

Work Session, Regular and Executive Session Meeting of the Mayor and Council

Date: February 26, 2024

Open Public Meetings Statement by Mayor Jimenez

Work Session: 6:00 P.M. C.T.O.: Adjourn:

- Discussion on Ordinance No. 2479

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

Pledge of Allegiance

Invocation

Citizens Comment on Agenda:

Correspondence:

ROLL CALL-WORK SESSION		
	PRESENT	ABSENT
Mayor Jimenez		
Kontolios		
Ryu		
Congalton-Hali		
Kim		
Ramundo		
Said		

ROLL CALL-PUBLIC SESSION		
	PRESENT	ABSENT
Mayor Jimenez		
Kontolios		
Ryu		
Congalton-Hali		
Kim		
Ramundo		
Said		

Presentation of Certificates – Cliffside Park/Ridgefield Royal Raiders Pee Wees

As advertised, hearing will be held on Ordinance No. 2478 entitled, “BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING VARIOUS 2024 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, BY AND IN THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD, IN THE COUNTY OF BERGEN, STATE OF NEW JERSEY; APPROPRIATING \$1,166,000 THEREFOR AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF \$1,110,475 BONDS OR NOTES OF THE BOROUGH TO FINANCE PART OF THE COST THEREOF”

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. 2479 entitled, “AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 322-9 ENTITLED ‘CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS’ OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD”

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. 2480 entitled, “AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 375-5 ENTITLED NO PARKING AREAS OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD”

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. 2481 entitled, “AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 375-52 ENTITLED PARKING FOR MOBILITY HANDICAPPED PERSONS OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD”

First Reading of Ordinance

Roll Call

CONSENT AGENDA:

All items listed are considered to be routine and non-controversial by the Borough Council and will be approved by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Council member(s) so request it, in which case the item(s) will be removed from the Consent

Agenda and considered in its normal sequence on the agenda. The one motion signifies the adoption of all resolutions and approval of applications and minutes.

- 103-2024 Councilman Kontolios Hire Part-Time Violations Clerk
- 104-2024 Councilwoman Congalton-Hali Authorize DCA Local Recreation Improvement Grant Application for Willis Park
- 105-2024 Councilman Said Authorize Award of Contract with Nielsen Ford through ESCNJ Co-op
- 106-2024 Councilman Kontolios Limousine License-Garcia
- 107-2024 Councilman Said Stipulation of Settlement-654 Bergen Blvd.
- 108-2024 Councilman Kontolios Appoint Alternate Public Defender
- 109-2024 Councilman Kontolios Shared Service Agreement with Bergen County-Limited Tree Removal Services
- 110-2024 Mayor Jimenez Oppose Affordable Housing Revisions
- 111-2024 Councilwoman Congalton-Hali Appointment to Recreation Commission
- 112-2024 Councilman Said Hire Technical Tax Clerk
- 113-2024 Councilman Said Transfer of Appropriation Reserves

Fire Department Membership:

Ashraf Mansour
702 Bergen Boulevard
Company No. 2

Boot Drive Request:

Ridgefield Fire Department
Saturday, April 27, 2024 and Sunday, April 28, 2024
Company No. 1 - Broad Avenue/Ray Avenue/Route 5
Company No. 2 – Bergen Boulevard and Oakdene Avenue
Company No. 3 – Shaler Boulevard and Edgewater Avenue

Application for Raffles License:

Sts. Vartanantz Armenian Church
461 Bergen Boulevard
Merchandise Raffle
Sunday, June 9, 2024

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

RESOLUTIONS:

114-2024 Councilman Said Warrants

COMMENTS BY MAYOR:

COMMENTS BY COUNCIL:

COMMENTS BY ADMINISTRATOR:

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 February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Kontolios

ORDINANCE NO. 2478

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

“BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING VARIOUS 2024 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, BY AND IN THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD, IN THE COUNTY OF BERGEN, STATE OF NEW JERSEY; APPROPRIATING \$1,166,000 THEREFOR AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF \$1,110,475 BONDS OR NOTES OF THE BOROUGH TO FINANCE PART OF THE COST THEREOF”

introduced on the 12th day of February, 2024, 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
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 12, 2024

Presented by Councilman Kontolios

ORDINANCE NO. 2478

“BOND ORDINANCE PROVIDING VARIOUS 2024 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, BY AND IN THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD, IN THE COUNTY OF BERGEN, STATE OF NEW JERSEY; APPROPRIATING \$1,166,000 THEREFOR AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF \$1,110,475 BONDS OR NOTES OF THE BOROUGH TO FINANCE PART OF THE COST THEREOF”

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

SECTION 1. The improvements or purposes described in Section 3 of this bond ordinance are hereby authorized as general improvements or purposes to be undertaken by the Borough of Ridgefield, in the County of Bergen, State of New Jersey (the “Borough”). For the said improvements or purposes stated in Section 3, there is hereby appropriated the aggregate sum of \$1,166,000, which sum includes \$55,525 as the aggregate amount of down payments for said improvements or purposes as required by the Local Bond Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:2-1 et seq. (the “Local Bond Law”). Said down payments are now available therefor by virtue of appropriations in a previously adopted budget or budgets of the Borough for down payment or for capital improvement purposes.

SECTION 2. For the financing of said improvement or purpose described in Section 3 hereof and to meet the part of said \$1,166,000 appropriation not provided for by application hereunder of said down payment, negotiable bonds of the Borough are hereby authorized to be issued in the principal amount of \$1,110,475 pursuant to the Local Bond Law. In anticipation of the issuance of said bonds and to temporarily finance said improvement or purpose, negotiable notes of the Borough in a principal amount not exceeding \$1,110,475 are hereby authorized to be issued pursuant to and within the limitations prescribed by the Local Bond Law.

SECTION 3. (a) The improvements hereby authorized and purposes for the financing of which said obligations are to be issued include, but are not limited to, the following:

<u>Description</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Authorization</u>	<u>Down Payment</u>	<u>Useful Life</u>
(i) <u>Fire Department</u> – Acquisition Of A Pumper Fire Truck; And	\$816,000	\$777,142	\$38,858	10 years
(ii) <u>Library</u> – Improvements To Public Library Building Including, But Not Limited To, Improvements To And/Or Replacement Of The Roof And Improvements To The Interior Ceilings.	\$350,000	\$333,333	\$16,667	20 years
TOTAL	<u>\$1,166,000</u>	<u>\$1,110,475</u>	<u>\$55,525</u>	

(b) All such improvements or purposes set forth in Section 3(a) shall include, but are not limited to, as applicable, all engineering, architectural and design work, surveying, construction planning, preparation of plans and specifications, permits, bid documents, construction inspection and contract administration, and also shall include all work, materials, equipment, accessories, labor and appurtenances necessary therefor or incidental thereto and all in accordance with the plans and specifications therefor on file in the Office of the Clerk of the Borough and available for public inspection and hereby approved.

(c) The aggregate estimated maximum amount of bonds or notes to be issued for said purposes is \$1,110,475.

(d) The estimated cost of said improvement or purpose is \$1,166,000, the excess thereof over the said estimated maximum amount of bonds or notes to be issued therefor, being the amount of \$55,525, is the down payment for said improvement or purpose.

SECTION 4. In the event the United States of America, the State of New Jersey, and/or the County of Bergen make a contribution or grant in aid to the Borough for the improvements and purposes authorized hereby and the same shall be received by the Borough prior to the issuance of the bonds or notes authorized in Section 2 hereof, then the amount of such bonds or notes to be issued shall be reduced by the amount so received from the United States of America, the State of New Jersey, and/or the County of Bergen. In the event, however, that any amount so contributed or granted by the United States of America, the State of New Jersey, and/or the County of Bergen shall be received by the Borough after the issuance of the bonds or notes authorized in Section 2 hereof, then such funds shall be applied to the payment of the bonds or notes so issued and shall be used for no other purpose. This Section 4 shall not apply, however, with respect to any contribution or grant in aid received by the Borough as a result of using funds from this bond ordinance as “matching local funds” to receive such contribution or grant in aid.

SECTION 5. All bond anticipation notes issued hereunder shall mature at such times as may be determined by the Chief Financial Officer of the Borough, provided that no note shall mature later than one (1) year from its date or otherwise authorized by the Local Bond Law. 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 the notes issued pursuant to this bond 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 in accordance with the provisions 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 purchaser thereof upon receipt of payment of the purchase price and accrued interest thereon from their dates to the date of delivery thereof. The Chief Financial Officer is directed to report in writing to the governing body at the meeting next succeeding the date when any sale or delivery of the notes pursuant to this bond ordinance is made. Such report must include the principal amount, the description, the interest rate, and the maturity schedule of the notes so sold, the price obtained and the name of the purchaser.

SECTION 6. The Capital Budget or Budgets of the Borough are hereby amended to conform with the provisions of this bond ordinance to the extent of any inconsistency herewith. In the event of any such inconsistency, a resolution in the form promulgated by the Local Finance Board showing full detail of the amended Capital Budget or Budgets and capital programs as approved by the Director of the Division of Local Government Services, New Jersey Department of Community Affairs will be on file in the office of the Clerk and will be available for public inspection.

SECTION 7. The following additional matters are hereby determined, declared, recited and stated:

(a) The improvements or purposes described in Section 3 of this bond ordinance are not current expenses and are improvements which the Borough may lawfully undertake 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 said improvements or purposes within the limitations of the Local Bond Law, according to the reasonable life thereof computed from the date of the said bonds authorized by this bond ordinance, is 13.0 years.

(c) The Supplemental Debt Statement required by the Local Bond Law has been duly made and filed in the Office of the Clerk of the Borough and a complete executed duplicate thereof has been filed in the Office of the Director of the Division of Local Government Services, New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, and 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 or notes provided for in this bond ordinance by \$1,110,475 and the said bonds or notes authorized by this bond ordinance will be within all debt limitations prescribed by said Local Bond Law.

(d) An aggregate amount not exceeding \$233,200 for items of expense listed in and permitted under section 20 of the Local Bond Law is included in the estimated cost indicated herein for the purposes or improvements hereinbefore described.

SECTION 8. The full faith and credit of the Borough are hereby pledged to the punctual payment of the principal of and the interest on the bonds or notes authorized by this bond ordinance. The bonds or notes shall be direct, unlimited obligations of the Borough, and the Borough shall be

obligated to levy *ad valorem* taxes upon all the taxable real property within the Borough for the payment of the bonds or notes and the interest thereon without limitation as to rate or amount.

SECTION 9. The Borough hereby declares the intent of the Borough to issue the bonds or bond anticipation notes in the amount authorized in Section 2 of this bond ordinance and to use proceeds to pay or reimburse expenditures for the costs of the purposes described in Section 3 of this bond ordinance. This Section 9 is a declaration of intent within the meaning and for purposes of Treasury Regulations §1.150-2 or any successor provisions of federal income tax law.

SECTION 10. The Borough Chief Financial Officer is hereby authorized to prepare and to update from time to time as necessary a financial disclosure document to be distributed in connection with the sale of obligations of the Borough and to execute such disclosure document on behalf of the Borough. The Borough Chief Financial Officer is further authorized to enter into the appropriate undertaking to provide secondary market disclosure on behalf of the Borough pursuant to Rule 15c2-12 of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Rule") for the benefit of holders and beneficial owners of obligations of the Borough and to amend such undertaking from time to time in connection with any change in law, or interpretation thereof, provided such undertaking is and continues to be, in the opinion of a nationally recognized bond counsel, consistent with the requirements of the Rule. In the event that the Borough fails to comply with its undertaking, the Borough shall not be liable for any monetary damages, and the remedy shall be limited to specific performance of the undertaking.

SECTION 11. The Borough covenants to maintain the exclusion from gross income under section 103(a) of the Code of the interest on all bonds and notes issued under this ordinance.

SECTION 12. This bond ordinance shall take effect twenty (20) days after the first publication thereof after final adoption and approval by the Mayor, as provided by the Local Bond Law.

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 12, 2024

Presented by Councilwoman Congalton-Hali

ORDINANCE NO. 2479

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

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 322-9 ENTITLED ‘CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS’ OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD”

introduced on the 12th day of February, 2024, 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
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 12, 2024

Presented by Councilwoman Congalton-Hali

ORDINANCE NO. 2479

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 322-9 ENTITLED ‘CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS’
OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD”

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

SECTION I: Amendments.

Section 322-9, entitled “Capital Improvements”, of the Code of the Borough of Ridgefield be and same is hereby amended by deleting the wording of the existing subsection B. in its entirety and replacing same with the following:

A "capital improvement" is defined as a service or improvement to property which provides an additional benefit to tenants not previously accorded them, and which changes their housing accommodations in a major way. A capital improvement is not a service or improvement that is required by law or by lease and is not a repair, or a replacement of substantially equal value.

Section 322-9, entitled “Capital Improvements”, of the Code of the Borough of Ridgefield be and same is hereby amended by deleting the wording of the existing subsection C. in its entirety and replacing same with the following:

A landlord seeking a capital improvement surcharge shall petition the Rent Leveling Board for permission to collect same. Such petition must be in the form of an application and filed no later than 12 months following the completion of the work for which the landlord seeks a capital improvement surcharge. Thereafter, the Rent Control Office shall review the application for completeness, and if the Office determines the application complete, the Rent Control Office shall stamp the application as “complete” and shall designate a hearing date for the Board’s consideration of the application. Once a hearing date is designated, the Rent Control Office will provide the landlord with a copy of the stamped completed application and a Notice of Completed Application and Hearing Date. The landlord shall then notify all tenants of the application and the scheduled hearing date by providing the tenants with the Notice of Completed Application and Hearing Date and a copy of the stamped completed application by certified and regular mail at least thirty (30) days prior to the scheduled hearing date. In the event that a scheduled hearing date is postponed, the landlord must provide notice of the rescheduled hearing date at least thirty (30) days prior to the rescheduled date, however, said notice may be provided by regular mail only. After the landlord has finished

providing notice to the tenants, the landlord shall submit a Notice Log to the Rent Control Office confirming said notice has been provided to the tenants no later than five (5) days before the scheduled hearing date.

Section 322-9, entitled “Capital Improvements”, of the Code of the Borough of Ridgefield be and same is hereby amended by deleting the wording of the existing subsection K. in its entirety and replacing same with the following:

A landlord may seek a surcharge after completion of a capital improvement. Notice shall be provided by the landlord, and the tenant shall have opportunity to object, all as set forth above. No greater or lesser consideration shall be given to the applicant by the Board because of the fact that the application is made subsequent to the project’s completion. Any landlord who shall make application for a capital improvement surcharge after accomplishment of the project shall do so at his or her own risk that a surcharge will be granted. In order to be granted a capital improvement surcharge, all work must receive and pass all required governmental inspections. To the extent practicable, government inspections are to be completed within ninety (90) days of completion of all work. Where government inspections must be made to the interior of dwellings, notice is to be provided to each tenant via certified and regular mail that work has been completed and that government inspections are to commence no earlier than ten (10) days from the date of notice. After the government inspections are completed, the landlord must submit an official written confirmation from the government inspector or Borough Construction Official indicating that the completed work has passed all required government inspections. Said written confirmation must be provided to the Rent Leveling Board prior to the hearing.

SECTION II. Ratification and Affirmation.

In all other respects, the terms, conditions and provisions of Sections 322-9 of the Code of the Borough of Ridgefield are ratified and affirmed.

SECTION III. Repealer.

Any article, section, paragraph, subsection, clause, or other provision of the Code of the Borough of Ridgefield inconsistent with the provisions of this ordinance is hereby repealed as to said inconsistencies and conflicts.

SECTION IV. Severability.

If any section, paragraph, subsection, clause, or provision of this ordinance shall be adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such adjudication shall apply only to the section, paragraph, subsection, clause, or provision so adjudged, and the remainder of this ordinance shall be deemed valid and effective.

SECTION V. Retroactive Application.

This ordinance shall apply retroactively to any outstanding Capital Improvement Applications, which have not been adjudicated on the merits by the Rent Leveling Board.

SECTION VI. Effective Date.

This ordinance shall take effect immediately upon final passage and publication according to law.

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 12, 2024

Presented by Councilman Kontolios

ORDINANCE NO. 2480

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

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 375-5 ENTITLED NO PARKING AREAS OF
THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD”

introduced on the 12th day of February, 2024, 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
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 12, 2024

Presented by Councilman Kontolios

ORDINANCE NO. 2480

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 375-5 ENTITLED NO PARKING AREAS OF
THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD”

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

Section I. Section 375-5, Article II be and hereby is amended by adding the following no parking area:

On the northerly side of River Street beginning at a point 259 feet west from the point where said northern curb line of River Street intersects with the western curb line of Grand Avenue, and continuing in a westerly direction along River Street a distance of 20 feet to 279 feet.

Section II. Any article, section, paragraph, subsection, clause, or other provision of the Code of the Borough of Ridgefield inconsistent with the provisions of this ordinance is hereby repealed as to said inconsistencies and conflicts.

Section III: If any section, paragraph, subsection, clause or provision of this ordinance shall be adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such adjudication shall apply only to the section, paragraph, subsection, clause, or provision so adjudged, and the remainder of this ordinance shall be deemed valid and effective.

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

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Kontolios

ORDINANCE NO. 2481

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

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 375-52 ENTITLED PARKING FOR MOBILITY HANDICAPPED PERSONS OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD”

introduced on the 26th day of February, 2024, 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 11th day of March, 2024 at 6:30 PM or as soon thereafter as the matter may be reached at a regular meeting of the Borough Council to be held at the Municipal Complex, 700 Shaler Boulevard 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
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Kontolios

ORDINANCE NO. 2481

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 375-52 ENTITLED PARKING FOR MOBILITY
HANDICAPPED PERSONS OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD”

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. Removing A single handicapped parking space in front of 586 Carpenter Place (on the southerly curblineline of Carpenter Place) beginning at a point 186 feet west of the southwest corner of Martling Place and Carpenter Place and continuing west a distance of 22 feet.

Section II. Any article, section, paragraph, subsection, clause, or other provision of the Code of the Borough of Ridgefield inconsistent with the provisions of this ordinance is hereby repealed as to said inconsistencies and conflicts.

Section III: If any section, paragraph, subsection, clause or provision of this ordinance shall be adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such adjudication shall apply only to the section, paragraph, subsection, clause, or provision so adjudged, and the remainder of this ordinance shall be deemed valid and effective.

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

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Kontolios

RESOLUTION NO. 103-2024

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

KARA YAKO

and

ALEXIS RIVERA

be hired as part-time Violations Clerks for the Municipal Court effective immediately at the rate of \$25.00 per hour.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilwoman Congalton-Hali

RESOLUTION NO. 104-2024

WHEREAS, the Borough of Ridgefield desires to apply for and obtain a grant from the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs under the Local Recreation Improvement Grant Program for approximately \$100,000.00 to carry out a project to complete facility improvements at Willis Park.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,

1. that the Borough of Ridgefield does hereby authorize the application for such a grant; and
2. recognizes and accepts that the Department may offer a lesser or greater amount and therefore, upon receipt of the grant agreement from the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, does further authorize the execution of any such grant agreement; and also, upon receipt of the fully executed agreement from the Department, does further authorize the expenditure of funds pursuant to the terms of the agreement between the Borough of Ridgefield and the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the persons whose names, titles, and signatures appear below are authorized to sign the application, and that they or their successors in said titles are authorized to sign the agreement, and any other documents necessary in connection therewith.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Said

RESOLUTION NO. 105-2024

WHEREAS, under certain circumstances award of contract without public bidding is permitted pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:34-6.2; and

WHEREAS, Nielsen Ford. is an approved vendor under the Educational Services Commission of New Jersey (ESCNJ) CO-OP as approved by the State of New Jersey; and

WHEREAS, the Borough of Ridgefield wishes to enter into an agreement with Nielsen Ford. for the purchase of two (2) 2024 Ford Escape AWD vehicles to be used as inspections vehicles for the Ridgefield Board of Health and Ridgefield Building Department; and

WHEREAS, prior to the award of this contract a Notice of Intention to Award a Contract must be published in the official newspaper;

WHEREAS, the maximum amount of the purchase is \$59,999.74 and funding for this purchase is available through Bond Ordinance 2441, account number 04-2150-55-2441-002 in the amount of \$29,999.87 and the UCC Code Enforcement Penalty Trust, account number 03-3010, as evidenced by the Borough's Chief Financial Officer's certificate attached hereto; now be it

NOW, THERFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that they approve the following:

1. The Borough Clerk is hereby authorized to publish a Notice of Intention to Award Contract to Nielsen Ford pursuant to the ESCNJ CO-OP for the purchase of two (2) 2024 Ford Escape AWD vehicles at a cost of \$59,999.74.
2. Any objections to this award of contract should be directed to the Borough Clerk, 700 Shaler Boulevard, Ridgefield, New Jersey 07657 within ten (10) days of the publication of the Notice of Intention.
3. The contract is awarded to Nielsen Ford contingent upon no objections being received.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Kontolios

RESOLUTION NO. 106-2024

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that a
Limousine License be issued to:

JUAN C. GARCIA

in accordance with Ordinance No. 1558.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Said

RESOLUTION NO. 107-2024

WHEREAS, the Tax Court of New Jersey has approved the settlement stipulation for an adjusted assessment on Block 1308 Lot 13; also known as 654 Bergen Boulevard for the tax year 2023.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that Wolf Vespasiano, LLC - Attorney Trust Account representing 654 Bergen Blvd LLC, be issued a refund in the amount of \$1,984.18 for the year 2023.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chief Financial Officer be and he is hereby authorized to issue a check in the total amount of \$1,984.18 from Account 01-2030-30-4262-001 made payable to: Wolf Vespasiano LLC, Attorney Trust Account and mailed to: 331 Main Street, Chatham, New Jersey 07928.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Kontolios

RESOLUTION NO. 108-2024

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

JOHN SHAHDANIAN

be appointed Alternate Public Defender for the remainder of Calendar Year 2024.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Kontolios

RESOLUTION NO. 109-2024

WHEREAS, the Borough of Ridgefield wishes to enter into a shared service agreement with the County of Bergen to have the County remove trees from County roadways in the Borough when necessary; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interests of the Borough to enter into the agreement with the County in the form annexed hereto;

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

1. The Mayor and Council do hereby approve the attached agreement with the County of Bergen for tree removal on County Roads.
2. The Mayor and Borough Clerk be, and they hereby are, authorized and directed to execute the agreement on behalf of the Borough of Ridgefield when tree removal services are necessary.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Mayor Jimenez

RESOLUTION NO. 110-2024

RESOLUTION OF THE BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD, COUNTY OF BERGEN, OPPOSING ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 4/SENATE BILL NO. 50, WHICH PROPOSES TO OVERHALL THE FAIR HOUSING ACT (“FHA”) IN A WAY THAT IMPOSES UNREALISTIC OBLIGATIONS WITH UNREALISTIC DEADLINES BASED UPON ONEROUS STANDARDS.

Mount Laurel II

WHEREAS, in 1983, the Supreme Court decided a landmark case, commonly referred to as Mount Laurel II; and

WHEREAS, Mount Laurel II and its progeny generated substantial litigation culminating in the enactment of the New Jersey Fair Housing Act in 1985 (“FHA”); and

The Fair Housing Act of 1985

WHEREAS, the Legislature enacted the FHA to restore home rule, to bring the fair share numbers back to reality and to reduce the burdens of Mount Laurel compliance; and

WHEREAS, more specifically, the FHA sought *to restore home rule* by imposing a moratorium on the builder’s remedy and by providing an administrative process that municipalities could voluntarily pursue wherein they would be insulated from developers seeking builder’s remedies to try to compel them to capitulate their zoning demands; and

WHEREAS, the FHA sought *to bring the fair share numbers back to reality* by among other things defining the prospective need as the need “based on development and growth which is reasonably likely to occur” and by calling for the fair share to be adjusted to a number lower than the fair share formula generated if the municipality lacked sufficient land to satisfy the obligation generated by the fair share formula; and

WHEREAS, the FHA sought *to reduce the burdens on municipalities* by prohibiting any requirement for municipalities to expend their own resources to comply; and

The New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing

WHEREAS, the FHA created COAH and conferred “primary jurisdiction” on COAH to administer the FHA and to implement the affordable housing policies of our State; and

WHEREAS, all acknowledge -- even Fair Share Housing Center (“FSHC”) -- that COAH functioned just fine in Rounds 1 and 2; and

WHEREAS, COAH did not adopt valid regulations for Round 3 despite multiple efforts to do so and made no efforts to cure the bottleneck the third time COAH voted 3-3 on Round 3 regulations in October of 2014; and

Mount Laurel IV

WHEREAS, in 2015, the Supreme Court issued a decision, commonly referred to as Mount Laurel IV, in response to a motion to transfer the responsibilities of COAH back to the courts in light of COAH’s failure to adopt valid regulations; and

WHEREAS, in Mount Laurel IV, the Supreme Court returned the task of implementing the doctrine back to the Courts because COAH had failed to do its job and made no effort to cure the roadblock when it voted 3-3 on the third iteration of Round 3 regulations; and

WHEREAS, notwithstanding the foregoing, the Court emphasized that it preferred the administrative remedy created by the FHA to a judicial one and hoped that COAH would be effective so that towns could comply once again through the administrative process created by the FHA; and

WHEREAS, the Court process proved to be far more expensive than the COAH process and was ill-suited for resolving comprehensive planning disputes over affordable housing matters; and

WHEREAS, the Round 3 process was a disaster with judges pressing municipalities to comply before even establishing the obligations with which they must comply; and

WHEREAS, ultimately, on March 8, 2018, after a 41-day trial in Mercer County, Judge Jacobson issued an opinion in which she set forth a fair share methodology; and

WHEREAS, in that trial and in various other instances throughout the state, FSHC took the position that the Statewide obligation should exceed 300,000 to be addressed between 2015 and 2025; and

WHEREAS, municipalities, through Dr. Robert Powell, presented evidence that, in a best case scenario, the State could only absorb less than 40,000 affordable units in a ten year period and thus argued that FSHC’s calculations was not grounded in reality whatsoever; and

WHEREAS, the trial judge, having been constrained by the Supreme Court to use the formula for Round 2 that COAH adopted in 1994, ultimately concluded that the Statewide obligation to be constructed between 2015-2025 was roughly 153,000 units; and

WHEREAS, FSHC reports that it entered 354 settlements in Round 3; and

WHEREAS, many municipalities are reeling under the burden of satisfying their obligations under those settlements entered between 2015 and 2023; and

WHEREAS, many of those Round 3 settlements will result in development during the Round 4 period; and

WHEREAS, consequently, many of the 211,000 COs anticipated in Round 4 will come from ordinances adopted to satisfy a Round 3 obligation, leaving far fewer units that could contribute to an additional Round 4 responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, Round 4 is set to begin on July 1, 2025 and there is no comprehensive analysis on the impacts of the 354 Round 3 settlements and over-zoning described above; and

WHEREAS, indeed, the A4/S50 Bill fails to consider the impact from affordable housing projects that were approved during the Third Round, but are still not yet under construction, as said projects, as well as additional future projects, will impact legitimate public concerns like infrastructure, the environment, schools, traffic, parking and open space; and

WHEREAS, the Round 3 process destroyed the balance achieved by the Fair Housing Act in 1985; and

A-4/S-50

WHEREAS, on December 19, 2023, against the above backdrop, the Housing Committee of the Assembly (a) unveiled the Legislation (A-4) – a detailed 69-page bill that the Chairwoman of the Housing Committee announced had been worked on for a long time; and (b) scheduled the bill for a vote at a hearing scheduled less than 24 hours later; and

WHEREAS, on December 19, 2023, the Administrative Office of the Courts wrote to the Legislature and made clear that it could not structure the bill in the manner set forth in the proposed legislation; and

WHEREAS, notwithstanding the foregoing, on December 20, 2023, the Housing Committee voted the bill out of the Committee and announced that the bill needed to be ready for signing by the Governor before the end of the lame duck session on January 8, 2024; and

WHEREAS, the perception that the Legislature designed the process to adopt the bill before the public had an opportunity to review it and provide meaningful comment was as troubling as it was real; and

WHEREAS, consequently, the Legislature did not ram the bill through in the lame duck session as had been announced; and

WHEREAS, instead, on January 29, 2024, the Housing Committee of the Assembly met to consider a new version of A-4 and voted to release it out of the Committee; and

WHEREAS, on February 8, 2024, as a result of comments, letters and resolutions challenging this new version of A-4, the Appropriations Committee of the Assembly announced a number of changes to the Bill; and

WHEREAS, one witness likened the summary presented to the public at the February 8, 2024 Appropriations meeting to that of an auctioneer; and

WHEREAS, the Appropriations Committee voted the bill out of the Committee at its February 8, 2024 meeting before the public had an opportunity to even see the changes, much less process their significance and comment on them; and

WHEREAS, the bill has been improved marginally as it has evolved from its initial version in December of 2023 to the current version voted out of the Appropriations Committee of the Assembly on February 8, 2024; and

WHEREAS, the Assembly adopted the Bill on February 12, 2024 with the changes rattled off at the February 8, 2024 Appropriations Committee hearing of the Assembly; and

WHEREAS, despite elimination of just some of the gross excesses of the prior version of the bill, the Bill the Committee adopted on February 12, 2024 is still severely flawed; and

WHEREAS, the Bill still creates a judicial entity made up of 3-7 retired Mount Laurel judges called “The Program”, which, unlike COAH, is not comprised of an equal number of municipal and housing representatives, and is not made up of an equal number of Republicans and Democrats, thereby depriving the citizens of our State of the carefully crafted COAH Board that included a diversity of interests and that was the centerpiece of the FHA adopted in 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Bill still does not require the promulgation of affordable housing obligations, or the adoption of substantive regulations, in a way that utilizes an open and transparent process that COAH used and that gave all interested parties an opportunity to comment and receive COAH’s response to their comments; and

WHEREAS, as detailed below, the bill creates a patently unreasonable responsibility on municipalities by imposing an obligation on them to create a realistic opportunity for satisfaction of a fair share that is itself unrealistic; and

WHEREAS, the current version still details the methodology to be used for determining the fair share numbers of municipalities in Round 4 and in subsequent rounds; and

WHEREAS, the current version still presumes that 40 percent of all new households will qualify as low or moderate; and

WHEREAS, the current version still calls for the determination of the prospective need by subtracting the number of households reported in the 2010 Decennial Census from the number of households reported in the 2020 Decennial Census and multiplying that figure by 40 percent; and

WHEREAS, the statewide need number has been calculated to be 84,690 based upon the formula set forth in the bill; and

WHEREAS, the current version of the Bill calls for 84,690 to be adjusted by the number of conversions and demolitions; and

WHEREAS, the statewide fair share would be increased from 84,690 to 96,780, if the same number of demolitions and conversions used by Judge Jacobson in her formula for Round 3 apply in Round 4; and

WHEREAS, an estimate of the obligation for each municipality can be made if we assume that the same percentage of the regional need in Round 3 for each municipality applies in Round 4; and

WHEREAS, the estimates of the fair share obligations the Bill would generate for Round 4 have been widely distributed and all have had the opportunity to review the estimates and offer any corrections; and

WHEREAS, other than an analysis of the allocation factors by an expert for the American Planning Association (Creigh Rahenkamp) who identified problems with the allocation factors, nobody has reviewed and commented on our rough estimates set forth above that were generated in a very short period of time; and

WHEREAS, to the contrary, the Executive Director of Fair Share Housing Center, Inc. testified that he did not have a calculation of the fair share numbers; and

WHEREAS, more importantly, no committee of the Assembly or Senate has identified the fair share obligations municipalities should expect based upon the formula set forth in the bill; and

WHEREAS, the 96,780 fair share number estimated for Round 4 compares to the roughly 211,000 COs issued between 2010 and 2020; and

WHEREAS, the 96,780 fair share number divided by 211,000 COs equals roughly 46 percent (45.867 percent to be more precise); and

WHEREAS, all municipalities should be able to cure any violations of the prohibition against exclusionary zoning with inclusionary zoning; and

WHEREAS, traditional inclusionary zoning ordinances generally require no more than 20 percent of the units to be affordable; and

WHEREAS, it is mathematically impossible to satisfy a 46 percent problem with a 20 percent solution and, therefore, the number generated by the statutory formula is patently excessive; and

WHEREAS, this mathematical error conceptually may have existed at COAH; however, COAH utilized its discretion to reduce the statewide number to roughly 5,000 units per year in Rounds 1-2 (or lower for prospective need in its attempted regulations in 2014); and

WHEREAS, in addition, COAH's Round 2 regulations had flexible standards, Regional Contribution Agreements (RCAs), an achievable bonus structure, waivers and other flexible standards to further mitigate the problem; and

WHEREAS, had COAH not mitigated the problem, it is likely that the regulations would have been challenged by municipalities; and

WHEREAS, as detailed below, the Bill still fails to account for the enormous burdens on municipalities to comply with their Round 3 obligations before imposing very substantial additional burdens on those 354 municipalities for Round 4; and

WHEREAS, a representative of FSHC testified that it has entered into 354 settlements and that it would furnish those settlements to the Housing Committee, which it has failed to do; and

WHEREAS, at least one witness at the Committee hearings have pressed FSHC to advise how much development will take place in Round 4 as a result of municipalities implementing the 354 settlements reached in Round 3; and

WHEREAS, Adam Gordon on behalf of FSHC has indicated he doesn't know the answer to this question and no committee of the Assembly or Senate has even hinted at what the answer might be; and

WHEREAS, the Bill requires municipalities to create a realistic opportunity for satisfaction of a fair share without taking into account how many affordable units can realistically be achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning (where generally one out of every five units must be affordable); and

WHEREAS, efforts have also been made to ascertain how many affordable units could be realistically achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning by urging the Legislature to do a market study since the strength of the housing market will determine the number of market units that can reasonably be anticipated and since there must be a sufficient market for the four market units to generate the one affordable unit under a traditional inclusionary ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature has not furnished a market study in response to the repeated emphasis on the need for one to ascertain how many affordable units could be realistically achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning; and

WHEREAS, as explained below, the bill dilutes the protections to which a municipality is currently entitled; and

WHEREAS, while the Supreme Court established standards to preserve a municipality's immunity in the absence of proof that the municipality is "determined to be constitutionally

noncompliant”, the proposed bill does not require proof that the municipality is “determined to be constitutionally noncompliant” to warrant stripping the municipality of immunity; and

WHEREAS, the Bill subjects municipalities to litigation not only as they seek approval of their Housing Element and Fair Share Plans, but also even after they secure approval of those plans; and

WHEREAS, more specifically, the Bill provides municipalities a “compliance certification” if the municipality secures approval of its affordable housing plan; however, that certification does not prevent an interested party from “alleging that, despite the issuance of compliance certification, a municipality’s fair share obligation, fair share plan, housing element, or ordinances implementing the fair share plan or housing element are in violation of the Mount Laurel doctrine”; and

WHEREAS, the Bill suffers from a myriad of additional flaws; and

WHEREAS, for example, a municipality would have a right to rely on the fair share number that COAH provides under prior laws, under the new bill, a municipality would only have a presumption of validity that the number the DCA provides to the municipality is appropriate and FSHC, a deep pocketed developer or any other interested party could seek to overcome that presumption through litigation; and

WHEREAS, the Bill replaces a straightforward system by which a municipality could secure bonus credits up to a 25 percent cap with a highly complicated system for securing bonuses with many conditions attached to various forms of bonus; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature previously capped the fair share of any municipality down to 1,000 in recognition that any obligation above 1,000 would be “onerous”; the Bill applies the 1,000-unit cap only to a component of the municipality’s fair share -- the prospective need – and authorizes the imposition of an obligation that is onerous; and

WHEREAS, the Bill creates unfair requirements when a municipality secures a Vacant Land Adjustment in that it requires a land-poor municipality to create a realistic opportunity for satisfaction of 25 percent of its unmet need or to “demonstrate why” it is unable to do so; and

WHEREAS, the Bill includes many other provisions and changes to the FHA that are impractical and devoid of any consideration of the burdens created by the statute; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the facts set forth above, a bill that boasts of its effectiveness in reducing costs and litigation will clearly have the exact opposite effect; and

WHEREAS, in addition to all the concerns expressed above, a bill that so radically changes the affordable housing laws of our state still needs considerable work; and

WHEREAS, indeed, as the following facts demonstrate, the Legislature has yet to do the most fundamental due diligence before enacting a statute with such broad ramifications;

1. The Legislature has not and cannot inform the public of the fair share obligations the bill, if enacted, would impose on the public;
2. The Legislature has not and cannot inform the public of the obligations that municipalities will satisfy in Round 4 from the 354 settlements achieved in Round 3 before heaping substantial additional burdens on them for Round 4;
3. The Legislature has not and cannot inform the public of the number of affordable units that can realistically be achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning while imposing obligations on municipalities to create a realistic opportunity for a fair share that far exceeds any number a municipality can realistically achieve through inclusionary zoning; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the pronounced lack of due diligence, the bill will likely force taxes to increase dramatically and will foster serious overdevelopment creating unreasonable burdens on our schools, public services, roads, sewer and water infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature clearly can and should upgrade the affordable housing policies of our State; however, the current Version of A4 is not the answer and the most fundamental diligence can and should be exercised before adopting such a bill.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that for all of the above reasons, the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield, objects to and opposes Assembly Bill No. 4/Senate Bill No. 50, and requests that the bill be tabled, re-written and re-introduced in way that imposes achievable obligations and facilitates the ability of the municipality to satisfy its obligations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Borough Clerk of the Borough of Ridgefield is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution immediately to Governor Phil Murphy, Senate President Nicholas Scutari , Assembly Speaker Craig Coughlin, the sponsors of the Bill in the Senate and in the Assembly, and to the Legislators in the State Assembly and Senate representing our District immediately.

Approved:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Attest:

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

COUNCIL VOTE				
	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilwoman Congalton-Hali

RESOLUTION NO. 111-2024

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

MIN KIM

be appointed to the Recreation Commission for the remainder of Calendar Year 2024.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Said

RESOLUTION NO. 112-2024

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

VINCENT BUONO

be hired as Technical Tax Clerk effective immediately at the monthly salary of \$500.00.

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Said

RESOLUTION NO. 113-2024

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 40A:4-59 provides that if, during the first three months of any fiscal year, the amount of any appropriation reserve for the immediately preceding fiscal year is insufficient to pay the claims authorized or incurred during said preceding year which were chargeable to said appropriation, and there shall be an excess in any appropriation reserves over and above the amount deemed necessary to fulfill its purpose, the governing body may, by resolution adopted by not less than 2/3 vote of the full membership thereof, transfer the amount of such excess to an appropriation reserve or any appropriation in the prior budget deemed to be insufficient to fulfill its purpose or for which no reserve was provided.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ridgefield that the Chief Financial Officer is herewith directed to execute the following transfers in the calendar year 2024 budget appropriation reserves:

<u>CURRENT FUND</u>	<u>FROM</u>	<u>TO</u>
Engineering	12,500.00	
Insurance-Employees Health	11,500.00	
Information Technology		6,400.00
Planning Board O/E		4,000.00
Police O/E		4,000.00
Main Boro Vehicles: Police		2,000.00
Maint Boro Vehicles Garbage		500.00
Steet Lighting O/E		4,000.00
Electric & Gas		2,600.00
Water		500.00

Approved:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Attest:

Linda M. Silvestri, Borough Clerk

COUNCIL VOTE				
	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

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.

Francis J. Elenio,
Chief Financial Officer

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Councilman Said

RESOLUTION NO. 114-2024

BE IT RESOLVED, that warrants totaling **\$2,215,642.43**
be drawn on the following accounts:

CURRENT	\$2,162,960.67
TRUST	\$4,046.17
CAPITAL	\$46,590.50
POOL	\$173.89
DOG LICENSE	\$1.20
COAH	\$1,870.00
TOTAL	\$2,215,642.43

COUNCIL VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

Approved:

Attest:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk

BOROUGH OF RIDGEFIELD
Bergen County, New Jersey

Meeting February 26, 2024

Presented by Mayor Jimenez

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
Kontolios				
Ryu				
Congalton-Hali				
Kim				
Ramundo				
Said				
Mayor Jimenez				

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:

Hugo Jimenez, Mayor

Linda M. Silvestri,
Borough Clerk