

BOROUGH OF ROOSEVELT
33 N. Rochdale Ave, Roosevelt Borough, NJ 08555

Mayor and Council
Regular Meeting Minutes of April 7, 2025

Mayor Malkin opened the meeting at 7:10pm and read the Open Public Meeting Act statement which stated, Adequate notice of this meeting, as required by Chapter 231, P.L. 1975, has been provided by a public notice on January 6, 2025 which was posted on the Bulletin Board Roosevelt Post Office and in the Borough Hall. The notice was transmitted to The Times and Asbury Park Press.

ROLL CALL

	PRESENT	ABSENT	LATE ARRIVAL
<i>Councilmember Lou Esakoff</i>	✓		
<i>Councilmember Danelle Feigenbaum</i>	✓		
<i>Councilmember Constance Herrstrom</i>	✓		
<i>Councilmember Claudia Luongo</i>	✓		
<i>Councilmember Tina Kaufman-Marut</i>	✓		
<i>Councilmember Ralph Warnick</i>	✓		
<i>Mayor Peggy Malkin</i>	✓		

Also in attendance: Greg Cannon, Esq., Kathleen Hart, Borough Clerk

MAYOR’S REPORT: The Mayor did not give a report and allowed the Borough Attorney, Greg Cannon to speak about Ordinance 25-07, Cannabis Ordinance.

Borough Attorney, Greg Cannon, Esq. spoke about Ordinance 25-07, Cannabis Ordinance and why the town is considering cannabis cultivation. A resident farmer has come and asked about starting a micro cannabis business. Mr. Cannon gives a brief description of a micro cannabis business. The first step is that the Municipality must allow cannabis cultivation and then a business then must apply to the State for a license, similar to a liquor license. To apply for the micro cannabis cultivation license, you must also have a resolution of support from the governing body. Tonight’s ordinance will allow for a micro cannabis business (not more than 2500 sq. feet of leaf canopy). In 2021, the Borough prohibited all cannabis in the town. In order to allow the micro cannabis business in the municipality the Borough must pass a new ordinance allowing cannabis cultivation in the RAG-400 zone. It doesn’t change the size of buildings. Whatever you currently can build in the RAG-400 zone still remains the same. The current permitted uses allowed in the RAG-400 zone are farms for growing of field, vegetable, fruit, tree crops and vineyards; nurseries and greenhouses; single family detached dwellings; Group homes for the developmentally disabled license by the New Jersey Department of Human Services; Houses of worship; Public and private schools; Winery; Sales Room for Winery; Winemaking; Athletic and recreation facilities; Dormitories for private schools. What is being added is Cannabis Cultivators and Medical Cannabis Cultivators. There are no changes to the size of buildings or setbacks only adding the permitted use of Cannabis Cultivators and Medical Cannabis Cultivators and security controls.

M/Malkin asks the Borough Attorney Greg Cannon to explain if we pass this ordinance this evening what are the next steps. The Borough Attorney states that the licensing process which requires fees for the Borough to consider for the business; governing body pass a resolution of support for micro cannabis cultivation license (which would be given to the applicant). Which means that is the only size it can be. A State license is also required to be applied for. It would also have to go before the Planning Board if a structure was being built.

PUBLIC COMMENT: (Agenda items only)

M/Malkin opened the meeting to Public Comment for agenda items only at 7:22pm.

1. Maureen Parrott, 2 Tamara Drive – Asks about Resolution 25-62, which is authorizing ETM to make a revised plan but it doesn't say this Council is approving any guidelines for approving the plan. It is the Council's duty to set forth the parameters of any plan. Municipal Clerk states that Resolution 25-62 will be tabled from the consent agenda; it will be discussed in executive session.
2. Alan Mallach, 15 Pine Drive – Comments that his understanding of the State rules is that a micro business cannot be more than 2500 sq. feet, but a cannabis cultivator is not defined that way. A cannabis cultivator can be any size.
3. Tom Curry, 3 Pine Drive – Questions why are minutes for this year and nothing on the agendas regarding this topic are not online. Municipal Clerk states there are 2 sets of minutes from January on tonight's agenda and this ordinance was on the March 7th agenda as a late addition and only the draft agenda was posted. We are working on getting the minutes up to date and will have the revised agenda posted.
4. Gail Hunton, 19 Homestead Lane – States she was here are at the request of C/Herrstrom and the Amphitheater committee in your early February meeting and we did an explicit presentation about the revised plans.

M/Malkin closed the Public Comment for agenda items at 7:37pm.

CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Letter from the Roosevelt Planning Board regarding consistency with the Borough's Master Plan and Zoning Ordinances for Ordinance 2025-04 and Ordinance 2025-07
2. Letter from Fund for Roosevelt, Inc., dated March 26, 2025, regarding the FDR Memorial Amphitheater Project Contract Amendment #3 for ETM Associates, LLC.

MINUTES:

1. Reorganization and Regular Council Meeting Minutes – January 6, 2025

On a motion by C/Warnick to accept the minutes, with a second offered by C/Kaufman-Marut the minutes were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call:

AYES: C/Esakoff, C/Herrstrom, C/Kaufman-Marut, C/Warnick
 NAYS: None ABSTAIN: C/Feigenbaum, C/Luongo ABSENT: None

2. Regular Meeting Minutes – January 21, 2025

On a motion by C/Warnick to accept the minutes, with a second offered by C/Esakoff the minutes were approved by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call:

AYES: C/Herrstrom, C/Kaufman-Marut, C/Warnick, C/Esakoff
 NAYS: None ABSTAIN: C/Feigenbaum, C/Luongo ABSENT: None

RESOLUTIONS:

Resolution 25-55 Resolution Acknowledging Receipt and Review of Planning Board Consistency Report for Ordinance 2025-04

C/Herrstrom made a motion to adopt the Resolution 25-55, with a second from C/Warnick, by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call:

AYES: C/Herrstrom, C/Luongo, C/Kaufman-Marut, C/Warnick, C/Esakoff, C/Feigenbaum

NAYS: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

Resolution 25-56 Resolution Acknowledging Receipt and Review of Planning Board Consistency Report for Ordinance 2025-07

C/Esakoff made a motion to adopt the Resolution 25-56, with a second from C/Warnick, by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call:

AYES: C/Luongo, C/Kaufman-Marut, C/Warnick, C/Esakoff, C/Feigenbaum, C/Herrstrom,
 NAYS: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

ORDINANCES:

Ordinance 2025-04 An Ordinance Amending the Zoning Ordinances of the Borough of Roosevelt at Article VI: “Supplementary Regulations” to Strengthen the Borough’s Stormwater Management Regulations per the Recommendation of the Borough’s Planning Board

M/Malkin opens the public comment at 7:35pm.

No public comment. Attorney, Greg Cannon states through experience with Michelle Donato, the Borough’s Planning Board Attorney, and with what is going on in Allentown regarding the warehouses, she brought this Ordinance to Roosevelt so we would have a much better chance at fighting a warehouse if it ever happens in Roosevelt.

M/Malkin closes the public comment at 7:38pm.

C/Warnick made a motion to adopt Ordinance 2025-04 on second reading, with a second offered by C/Esakoff.

Roll Call:

AYES: C/Kaufman-Marut, C/Warnick, C/Esakoff, C/Feigenbaum, C/Herrstrom, C/Luongo
 NAYS: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

Second Reading:

Ordinance 2025-07 An Ordinance Amending Chapter 20: “Cannabis” and Chapter Z: “Zoning” of the Borough’s Revised General Ordinances to Permit Cannabis Cultivators within the R-Ag/400 Zone Under the Borough’s Land Use and Development Regulations

M/Malkin opens the public comment at 7:40pm.

1. Alan Mallach, 15 Pine Drive: States the problem is the ordinance is far too broad, under Ag Zoning district in this ordinance you would be able to build one cannabis facility up to 66,000 sq. ft. for every 10 acres of agricultural land. The ordinance would allow the Roosevelt greenbelt to be covered with large warehouse facilities. Roosevelt would then have a large warehouse park. Mr. Mallach urges the Council to amend this ordinance to make it clear that it is limited to micro businesses purposes and limit the number, have tailored set back and height requirements. Attorney, Greg Cannon states that you are advocating for something beyond the cannabis part. Right now someone can build a greenhouse and grow anything of that size and if that’s why the community came out, maybe we are not just talking cannabis, maybe we need to take a look at the whole, maybe we have the Planning Board look at the whole, more than just this. Mr. Mallach agrees and says he would be in support of the RAG Zone. M/Malkin states that would all come later, tonight is just about changing the zone to allow cannabis in the RAG zone. Mr. Mallach states this is an as of right use, not a conditional use and if this ordinance is adopted whatever the intention of the governing body is, if someone comes in the day after with a proposal for a 60,000 sq. foot – the borough would be legally obligated – Attorney Greg Cannon stops him there and says no, not for cannabis, you can’t build as of right for

cannabis. You raised issues beyond what we are talking about here. We have an extra layer of control. Mr. Mallach believes the best course of action by the governing body would be not to adopt the ordinance tonight and amend to make clear that it is limited to micro businesses, and put a cap on the number. M/Malkin responds she is not opposed to that and not a single person on the governing body that want to see warehouses or giant buildings, all of us live here and for a very long time. As the ordinance is written, the farmers have a lot of leeway; but given your concerns, the governing body does not think anyone wants to see that. Many developers were trying to purchase Ms. Battell's farm and she very graciously waited for a farmer to come forward.

2. Kurk Rothfuss, 3 Tamara Drive: Read a letter from Jane Rothfuss that states: The Public Meeting law of New Jersey requires public hearing where citizens can state support for, or express concerns, or ask questions about a proposed ordinance. It DOES NOT require the governing body, in our case the six members who make up the Council and our Mayor who votes only in the case of a tie, to respond. Responses, if appropriate or helpful, are welcome, but takes away valuable time from other citizens who are waiting to participate in the public hearing. While responding is not required, legally, I think it is morally required that the Council members who will be voting to pass, reject, amend, or table this ordinance truly listen to citizens and when a question is posed, to ask themselves "Do I know the answer to the question?" "Is that a scenario I had not considered?" "What more information do I need in order to answer that questions?" If a citizen expresses a value they hold, it is up to Council members, individually and in their own thoughts, to ask "Have I considered other values besides my own?" "Have I weighed competing goods and considered the risks?" "Have I thought about the worst case scenario as well as the best case scenario?" Many of our current Council members are new; maybe this is the first time you have served in such an important volunteer capacity, and your willingness to serve is very appreciated. It's not easy to get up to speed on all of the considerations and legal processes and history involved in the work you are being asked to do to help our town. Please do not be afraid to day, either out loud or to yourself "I don't know the answer to that questions but I will find out". Please do not be afraid to day out loud or to yourself "this seems to be moving very fast. Is there a reason for that? Is it necessary to move this fast? Some of us have been in your shoes in the past and we know it is not easy to question others with more experience who may be pushing you in one direction or another. Just know that you do not have to make a decision tonight and you should not if you hear questions tonight that you, personally, cannot answer or have yet considered. As the former chair of the Planning Board, I would like to point out that nothing in the 2017 Master Plan Reevaluation Report identifies or even mentions a need to expand the allowed uses in the AG-400 zones in the northern farm areas of the Borough. I ask what is the COMPELLING REASON for allowing cannabis cultivation in the northern farm areas? Why is this a desirable thing? How is it consistent with the work the Borough has done, through the years... (and here I am quoting Pg3 of the 2017 Master Plan Reevaluation Report of the Planning Board) "to preserve and/or protect the agricultural areas within the Borough that were major components of the original Jersey Homesteads Master Plan? (reference page 3 of the 2017 Master Plan Reevaluation Report of the Planning Board). Thank you, Jane Rothfuss
3. Jeff Ellentuck, 40 Pine Drive: Objects procedurally as the ordinance was not on the agenda. Questions 20-5.2c2 (Security) issues with the way it is written. Attorney Greg Cannon will review wording. Mr. Ellentuck speaks about the R-AG/400 and the allowable items, there are a list of them none on them can be built on preserved land, cannabis proposal does not distinguish between preserved and non-preserved land. The problem with the way this is written is there are no restrictions on size, location – under this ordinance if someone came in and said they want to build a 50,000 sq. foot facility for processing, growing, storage - they can do it, it does say that can't be a distributor, wholesaler or retailer, I'm not sure what Lawrence Mendies would do with the pot he is growing; he has to be able to sell it? Attorney, Greg Cannon responds the cultivator grows and sells to a wholesaler who then sells to a distributor, and then the people who make the end cannabis product are essentially manufacturers and retail business and then delivery. There are Class 1-6 from the State, this only allows Class 1, cultivation. Mr. Ellentuck states this overrules the fact that we have persevered land. Attorney, Greg Cannon asks if you can put a green house on preserved land and the answer is yes. Mr. Ellentuck brings up preserved land and non-preserved land and what is allowed. However, his biggest concern is the language. If you pass this ordinance, his concerns are: #1 let's pass a resolution that allows marijuana growth and this comes in effect and if we don't allow

- someone to use it we get sued. #2 the ordinance itself is not limited, no size restrictions. Mr. Ellentuck is against adopting this ordinance tonight because it is way too broad.
4. Sharon Waltz, 23 N. Valley Road: Has serious concerns on water usage, chemical runoff, carbon foot print, truck traffic, odor, noise, crime, safety. Protect Roosevelt's identify, it doesn't fit our values.
 5. Mark Aakhus, 37 Farm Lane: States there are a lot of great things about Roosevelt and one thing that makes Roosevelt special is its open space and that is my fundamental concern tonight – protecting that. Mr. Aakhus endorses what Alan Mallach has said, don't adopt and get ducks in a row first. Let's get an ordinance that protects us from massive warehouses being built, no matter what kind of warehouses they are.
 6. Katrina Paleckova, 28 Lake Drive: States to re-examine size and restrictions, emission issues, fuel, electricity, lights, traffic and wildlife.
 7. Ari Krendal, 38 N. Rochdale Ave: Asks are we talking about cannabis or the building that are going to be built? There will be no sales, the person who applied is asking to cultivate a micro business, he owns agricultural land and pays taxes and is asking permission to grow something on preserved land, which is preserved for farm cultivation. The problem here is the culture of what he wants to cultivate falls within a restricted culture, if he wants to grow tomatoes would he have the same problem? The problem seems like no one wants to see a building, regardless it is not close to residential area, it is at the entrance and will probably be somewhere in the back. No one proposed indoor or outdoor growing, someone mentioned industrial and traffic increase. The problem in our town is the water, we all have wetlands, you can't build anything because there is so much water. Cultivating culture – it looks like the residents of the town are not supporting any inter commercial activity. This is for medicinal uses and only helps people. Mr. Krendal asks if this ordinance passes will all the R-AG400 properties be zoned for that? The answer is yes the whole zone.
 8. Mary Tullos, 21 Lake Drive: States no one knew that this was on for second reading, because of word of mouth so many people are here tonight. Issues with cannabis – it's a control substance, lighting, security issues, size of the building, need restrictions, it is now allowed on preserved property, we need to see where all cannabis facilities can go in Roosevelt, there are possibly 6 properties in Roosevelt then that could grow cannabis. The Borough Council should visit a site that is already growing cannabis, look at during the day and night. Can it be grown in the ground? Lawrence Mendies answers yes.
 9. Cody Parker, 2 Elm Court: States you can grow cannabis multiple ways, outside, indoors, he has an agricultural business but is not involved in cannabis, but follows it very closely. The demand is massive – it's all about yields. As broad as it is keep it Micro Business context.
 10. Kim Felong, 6 Pine Drive: Questions the way the ordinance is written, it talks about how it allows the possibility of athletic fields and how they are to be lighted, her property abuts a property that meets the criteria and the possibility of cannabis farming. What is the buffer to surrounding properties? Looks like you are regulating an athletic field more than a cannabis grower.
 11. Bill Felong, 6 Pine Drive: Asks what kind of revenue comes to the town? In this context it is not significant. Where is the water coming from? Lawrence Mendies states it comes from his well.
 12. Tom Curry, 3 Pine Drive: The money issue is only 2%. Friends for Roosevelt helped preserve three farms in town. It is very important to people to have the greenbelt. What Alan Mallach said earlier is all that matters.
 13. Tom Doran, 4 Willow Tree Drive, Millstone: First wants to state that Millstone & Roosevelt are brother/sister towns, same values. He lives adjacent to one of the farms in questions, a lot of people have expressed our concerns, there environmental impacts, some wells have already dried up, concern that neither town has a police force. Has security concerns. Needs a defined ordinance.
 14. Maureen Parrott, 2 Tamara Drive: Agrees with a lot that has been said and is not opposed to any cultivation, but urges you to table this ordinance and in the re-writing of a new ordinance to have community involvement. On the states website all the towns with cultivation licenses are listed – ordinance needs to be much narrower. Ms. Parrott believes in community involvement.
 15. Chrissy Doran, 4 Willow Tree Drive, Millstone: Is impressed with everyone tonight, we are respectful towns. Everyone have legitimate concerns; people want to learn more.
 16. Jeff Ellentuck, 40 Pine Drive: If you are going to have in open fields or plastic cover facility you are still going to be required by the state of New Jersey to have security, fences, lights and cameras. There are three major industry covers and they will tell you that the average size for a facility is

34,000; 50,000 or somewhere between 10,00 and 250,000. This document says that the floor plan, in a building – and believes it is in appropriate.

17. Hope Pressler, 23 Farm Lane: This is a very important conversation and thinks people should send their comments to the Borough Bulletin this way everyone would have a chance to see what everyone has had to say.
18. Ari Krendal, 38 N. Rochdale: Adds that people are against the building and not the cannabis part.
19. Christine DiGiovanni, 9 School Lane: Points out that under current zoning issues with size of building and water. M/Malkin explains how the water bill works. Attorney, Greg Cannon responds that the Farmers use well water, not treated water from the Borough. Ms. DiGiovanni asks to defer the ordinance and also states that her property is right by another property that would qualify for this and asks about truck traffic going right by her driveway, are there going to be restrictions on access points.
20. Beth Battel, 66 Lake Drive: On the winery there have been no new structures. She has no intention of selling her property however, we need to think about current vs future.
21. Ken LeCompte - 2 Eleanor Lane: Asks when we approved the winery did we impose a tax on the sale? The answer is no; we are not authorized to. Mr. LaCompte asks then why did we impose a 2% tax on a farmer who is struggling to make ends meet. Is the council being a little greedy on the 2% cannabis tax?
22. Kirk Rothfuss, 3 Tamara Drive: Hopes the council will slow down on this and not pass tonight. There is a lot concern and misunderstandings about this. There are three preserved farms in town with different level of easements on them. This is a designed town with a residential component, a commercial component and the farms, we are on the national historic register, and the state historic register and there were expectations years ago on both sides for the town applying and preserving our uniqueness, we don't want to hurt the Mendies or any of the other farms, but we do have a right as individual homeowners to be concerned with what the town looks like.

M/Malkin closes the public comment at 9:14pm.

M/Malkin states that no one wants development, big buildings, warehouses. When the Mendies came to us the reason we felt that this was something we should consider is because we are at risk of development, developers to come in and buy land, farms in the RAG-400. They can put up many houses (200-300 house) as long as the designate 20% for affordable housing, it's happening all over. Keeping Roosevelt agricultural and green, we want the Mendies and all the other farmers to stay, and if growing cannabis achieves that goal for them and they can be self-sustaining – that's why the Mayor wants it. Everyone see when they drive down 33, 130, 571 and Princeton Hightstown Road its nothing but massive developments. The Mayor agrees we need to go back and redesign the ordinance. It will keep the farmers self-sustaining and keep Roosevelt green and keep out major development.

M/Malkin re-opens the public hearing at 9:20pm

1. Lawrence Mendies, 65 N. Rochdale Ave.: States he is speaking on behalf of his wife, Heidi. This is a woman owned business, it is her business, her idea and I support her. 13 years ago the Fund for Roosevelt gave us the opportunity and very thankful to them. I would never be interested in big buildings. After Covid we tried opening a road side stand, and it was only busy in the spring. We grow organically, we grow a lot of herbs, things to help you out. Then Hemp came along and Rutgers invited us over in Cream Ridge – and Heidi wanted get into the medicinal cannabis. The Department of Agriculture lost control and CRC came along – they said they were going to make the rules and said no farmland preserved properties can grow it, and now they have changed their position to allow preserved farms to grow cannabis. Heidi continued with the other farms that were no preserved, Mr. Wong's Farm. Nothing was quickly pushed through, we have been working on this since 2022. Tonight Mr. Mendies was hoping for good things, and all I keep hearing is stop the vote, stop the vote, honestly this is what's going on. The three big properties, one thing that you are missing all those farms that are put there are growing soy beans, which require 5 steps – and they spray very heavy. For the past 13 years, Heidi and I have been trying to purify the land. We are being dumped on by herbicides, Mr. Mendies will continue with organic farming – we use no chemicals. If this goes through then Heidi will have the opportunity to do the cannabis. The two

will marry, they go together very well, herb gardens, cannabis, healing ...its medicinal medicine. There will be different ways that she will be able to distribute it. One property on Nurko Road was going to do solar panels, 30 acres of solar panels, which is allowed under farmland preservation. Maybe now with the availability of cannabis there are other options. Thank you for working on this, I hope we can settle this tonight. The preserved farmers should have been the first ones and not the last ones who are able to do this, because we are the ones who sacrificed sub-dividing our properties. Cannabis is now considered an agriculture commodity. In 2 or 3 years everyone will get used to it and when the Federal Government changes it, the safe bank act, then everyone is going to want to do it. Remember the Department of Agriculture is saying this is a crop, farmers should be growing it not the warehouses. We will move forward with cannabis as a sun grown crop, we will follow all CRC rules.

M/Malkin closes public hearing at 9:33pm.

C/Herrstrom made a motion to table Ordinance 2025-07 on second reading, with a second offered by C/Warnick.

Roll Call:

AYES: C/Feigenbaum, C/Kaufman-Marut, C/Luongo, C/Herrstrom, C/Esakoff, C/Warnick
 NAYS: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

Ordinance 2025-07 is tabled.

The Municipal Clerk states that the agenda is going to be amended to remove Resolution 25-62 from the Consent Agenda.

C/Warnick made a motion to amend and remove Resolution 25-62 Resolution Authorizing the Award of a Non-Fair and Open Contract for Professional Landscape Architect Services to ETM Associates, LLC for Improvements to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Amphitheater from the Consent Agenda and discuss in Closed Session; with a second offered by C/Herrstrom.

Roll Call:

AYES: C/Warnick, C/Feigenbaum, C/Herrstrom, C/Luongo, C/Esakoff, C/Kaufman-Marut
 NAYS: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

CONSENT AGENDA RESOLUTIONS:

- Resolution 25-57 Payment of Bills for April 7, 2025
- Resolution 25-58 Resolution Authorizing Roberts Engineering Group, LLC to Survey, Design, Permit, Bid and Construction Administration/Inspection for the Road Replacement Project on Improvements to Lake Drive and Spruce Lane and Lake Drive and South Valley Road
- Resolution 25-59 Awarding Contract for Maintenance of Public Lands in the Borough to Kyle’s Lawn and Landscaping
- Resolution 25-60 Resolution Authorizing 2025 Salaries for Roosevelt Borough Employees
- Resolution 25-61 Resolution Supporting the Roosevelt Environmental Commission to Apply for a 2025 Open Space Stewardship Grant Application
- ~~Resolution 25-62 Resolution Authorizing the Award of a Non-Fair and Open Contract for Professional Landscape Architect Services to ETM Associates, LLC for Improvements to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Amphitheater~~

C/Warnick made a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda Resolution’s 25-57 through 25-61, with a second from C/Herrstrom, by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call:

AYES: C/Esakoff, C/Feigenbaum, C/Herrstrom, C/Luongo, C/Kaufman-Marut, C/Warnick

NAYS: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE CHAIRS:

Administration: No Report at this time.

Community Dev/Code: C/Herrstrom thanks the council, Peggy and Ana for putting out the flyer for the senior citizen group, next meetings, May 6 at Borough Hall, (Health Fair), June 5, (River Lady Paddleboat in Toms River),

Environmental, Health & Safety: C/Feignbaum reports that we will be submitting permits for Stormwater issues.

Public Works: C/Warnick no public works report. Environmental Commission: the town needs permit for Stormwater – Maureen Parrott, Michael Ticktin and Danelle Feigenbaum will work on together. Board of Education: School budget public hearing April 24, 2025. School is making sufficient use of AI and electronic devices.

Finance: No Report at this time.

Utilities: No Report at this time.

REPORTS OF BOROUGH OFFICIALS:

Michael Ticktin, 37 N. Valley Road: Thanks the Council for the resolution supporting the Environmental Commission applying for the Stewardship Grant.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Branch Pick up – May 5, 2025
2. Bulk Trash Pickup – May 5, 2025

PUBLIC COMMENT (Any item)

M/Malkin opens the public comment at 9:56pm.

1. Jeff Ellentuck, 40 Pine Drive: States the tire pick-up with the County is a great program.
2. Ari Krendal, 38 N Rochdale Ave: Asks about test results of the water in town. M/Malkin states that test results are posted on the Borough website.

M/Malkin closes the public comment at 9:59pm.

CLOSED SESSION:

Resolution 25-63 Providing for a Private Executive Meeting that Excludes the Public

C/Warnick offered the following Resolution and moved its adoption, which was second by C/Herrstrom.

The Municipal Clerk reads the resolution into the record:

WHEREAS, the “Open Public Meetings Act” enacted October 21, 1975 permits a public body to exclude the public from meetings or portions thereof wherein matters are to be discussed which are exempted from the requirements of the Act; and

WHEREAS, the said Act requires that prior to the holding of a meeting or portion thereof from which the public shall be excluded, the public body should adopt a Resolution at a public meeting providing for the holding of a private meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Borough Council of the Borough of Roosevelt has determined that a meeting should be held from which the public should be excluded in order to discuss a subject which is exempted under the said Act.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Borough Council, as follows:

- That the next portion of this meeting be held in Private Session.
- That the general nature of the matter(s) to be discussed relate to the matters:
 - a. Items falling Under Attorney/Client Privilege: Discuss North Valley Road Stormwater Easements
 - b. Contracts
- That no official action will be taken at the meeting but Minutes shall be kept and shall be available to the public after official action on the subject matter has been taken.
- It is anticipated the discussion conducted in closed session can be disclosed to the public after no further action is required in the matter.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: C/Esakoff, C/Feigenbaum, C/Herrstrom, C/Luongo, C/Kaufman-Marut, C/Warnick,
NAYS: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

C/Esakoff made a motion, with a second offered by C/Warnick, to adjourn closed session meeting with an All in Favor.

Time In: 10:01pm Time Out: 10:40 p.m.

C/Esakoff made a motion, with a second offered by C/Warnick, to adjourn meeting with an All in Favor.

Time Out: 10:40pm.

The audio tape is available in the Clerk's Office at Borough Hall.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathleen Hart, Borough Clerk

Adopted Date: May 19, 2025