

MINUTES OF THE HARDYSTON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON MARCH 18, 2008

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Armstrong at 7:00 P.M. with the opening statement that the meeting had been duly advertised and met all the requirements of the Sunshine Law.

Also present were: Deputy Mayor Kievit, Councilwoman Hamilton, Councilman Ross, Councilman Lasinski, Manager Marianne Smith and Clerk Jane Bakalarczyk

SALUTE THE FLAG:

CONSENT AGENDA: ALL MATTERS LISTED BELOW ARE CONSIDERED TO BE ROUTINE IN NATURE AND WILL BE ENACTED BY ONE MOTION. THERE WILL BE NO SEPARATE DISCUSSION OF THE ITEMS. IF ANY DISCUSSION IS DESIRED, THAT PARTICULAR ITEM WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA AND WILL BE CONSIDERED SEPARATELY.

Monthly Reports:

1. Municipal Clerk Report – February 2008
2. Tax Collector Report – February 2008
3. Sussex County Health Department Report – February 2008
4. Sussex County Public Health Nurse Activity – February 2008
5. Police Department Report –February 2008
6. Municipal Court Report – February 2008
7. HTMUA – Minutes of 2/4/08
8. Finance Officer Report –January 2008
9. Planning Board Minutes – 1/24/08
10. Zoning Board Minutes – 1/3/08
11. Construction Certificate Activity Report – January 2008
12. Construction Certificate Activity Report – February 2008
13. Construction Permit Activity Report – Hardyston -February 2008
14. Construction Permit Activity Report – Hamburg – February 2008
15. Finance Officer Report – February 2008

Minutes:

1. Regular Minutes of 2/19/08
2. Executive Session Minutes of 2/19/08
3. Special Meeting Minutes of 2/26/08
4. Workshop Minutes of 2/26/08
5. Executive Session Minutes of 2/26/08
6. Regular Minutes of 3/4/08
7. Workshop Minutes of 3/4/08
8. Special Meeting Minutes of 3/11/08

Agreements/Applications/Licenses:

1. Raffle – Lafayette Township PTO
2. Raffle – Vernon Education Foundation
3. Raffle – St. John Vianney R.C. Church
4. GTBM Inc. – Info-Cop Device License GSA Renewal Contract

A motion was made by Kievit to approve the consent agenda as presented, seconded by Hamilton. All in favor. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

**MINUTES OF THE HARDYSTON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
MARCH 18, 2008**

ORDINANCES:

1st READING:

2008-03

CALENDAR YEAR 2008

**ORDINANCE TO EXCEED THE MUNICIPAL BUDGET APPROPRIATION LIMITS
AND TO ESTABLISH A CAP BANK
(N.J.S.A. 40A: 4-45.14)**

WHEREAS, the Local Government Cap Law, N.J.S. 40A: 4-45.1 et seq., provides that in the preparation of its annual budget, a municipality shall limit any increase in said budget to 2.5% unless authorized by ordinance to increase it to 3.5% over the previous year's final appropriations, subject to certain exceptions; and,

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 40A: 4-45.15a provides that a municipality may, when authorized by ordinance, appropriate the difference between the amount of its actual final appropriation and the 3.5% percentage rate as an exception to its final appropriations in either of the next two succeeding years; and,

WHEREAS, the Township Council of the Township of Hardyston in the County of Sussex finds it advisable and necessary to increase its CY 2008 budget by up to 3.5% over the previous year's final appropriations, in the interest of promoting the health, safety and welfare of the citizens; and,

WHEREAS, the Township Council hereby determines that a 1.0% increase in the budget for said year, amounting to \$61,663.33 in excess of the increase in final appropriations otherwise permitted by the Local Government Cap Law, is advisable and necessary; and,

WHEREAS the Township Council hereby determines that any amount authorized hereinabove that is not appropriated as part of the final budget shall be retained as an exception to final appropriation in either of the next two succeeding years.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED, by the Township Council of the Township of Hardyston, in the County of Sussex, a majority of the full authorized membership of this governing body affirmatively concurring, that, in the CY 2008 budget year, the final appropriations of the Township of Hardyston shall, in accordance with this ordinance and N.J.S.A. 40A: 4-45.14, be increased by 3.50%, amounting to \$215,821.66, and that the CY 2008 municipal budget for the Township of Hardyston be approved and adopted in accordance with this ordinance; and,

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that any that any amount authorized hereinabove that is not appropriated as part of the final budget shall be retained as an exception to final appropriation in either of the next two succeeding years; and,

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that a certified copy of this ordinance as introduced be filed with the Director of the Division of Local Government Services within 5 days of introduction; and,

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that a certified copy of this ordinance upon adoption, with the recorded vote included thereon, be filed with said Director within 5 days after such adoption.

A motion was made by Ross to approve Ordinance 2008-03 on first reading, seconded by Kievit. All in favor. Motion carried.

ORDINANCES:

2nd READING:

2008-02

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF HARDYSTON, COUNTY OF SUSSEX,
STATE OF NEW JERSEY AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING CHAPTER 88, FEES,
OF THE REVISED GENERAL ORDINANCES**

**MINUTES OF THE HARDYSTON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
MARCH 18, 2008**

BE IT ORDAINED by the Municipal Council of the Township of Hardyston, County of Sussex, State of New Jersey, as follows:

SECTION 1. Chapter 88, Fees, of the aforesaid Revised General Ordinances is hereby amended and supplemented with the addition of Section 88-12, Recreation fees, to read as follows:

§ 88-12. Recreation fees.

A. The following minimum and maximum recreation fees for Township camps, programs, facility rentals and fundraisers are hereby established:

TYPE	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Summer recreation day camp registration fee- First child for one session	\$60	\$100
Summer recreation day camp registration fee- Each additional child per session	\$50	\$80
Summer recreation day camp registration fee- First child for two sessions	\$115	\$150
Summer recreation day camp registration fee- Each additional child for two sessions	\$95	\$125
Program fees	\$1	\$5
Facility rental fees	\$35	\$200
Fundraisers (per person)	\$1	\$3

B. The DPW Superintendent shall recommend annually program fees for all programs run through the Recreation Department. Such recommendation shall include a description of each program and the fees being requested.

C. Said fees shall be adopted by the governing body by resolution and a copy of said resolution forwarded to the Chief Financial Officer and the Auditor. No fees shall be collected until the appropriate resolution has been adopted by the governing body. A copy of the fee schedule shall be made available to the public through the Township Clerk's Office.

SECTION 2. Chapter 88, Fees, Section 88-8(M), Summer Recreation Day Camp Registration Fee, of the aforesaid Revised General Ordinances is hereby repealed.

SECTION 3. All ordinances of the Township of Hardyston which are inconsistent with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

SECTION 4. If any section, subsection, clause or phrase of this ordinance is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid by any court or competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the remaining portion of this ordinance.

SECTION 5. This Ordinance may be renumbered for purposes of codification.

SECTION 6. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon final passage, approval and publication as required by law.

**MINUTES OF THE HARDYSTON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
MARCH 18, 2008**

A motion was made by Ross and seconded by Kievit to open the meeting to the public. All in favor. Motion carried. No public comment. A motion was made and seconded to close the meeting to the public. All in favor. Motion carried. A motion was made by Lasinski to approve Ordinance 2008-02 on second reading, seconded by Hamilton. All in favor. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. School Budget Presentation – Hardyston Township Board of Education

Dennis Tobin, Chief School Administrator and Linda Alvarez, School Business Administrator/Board Secretary presented the proposed school budget to the Council.

- B. Resolution of the Mayor and Council of the Township of Hardyston, County of Sussex, commenting on and objecting to the 2008 proposed Round Three Rules of the Council On Affordable Housing (COAH)

WHEREAS, the Township Council of the Township of Hardyston intends, by way of this resolution, to express its comments and objections to the proposed third round housing rules of the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH); and

WHEREAS, the regulations and the population and employment projections and multipliers will have a devastatingly negative effect upon Hardyston Township and the State; and

WHEREAS, the regulations are arbitrary, capricious and unreasonable, should not be adopted and should be redrafted to more realistically address likely growth with realistic population and employment multipliers; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Township of Hardyston hereby expresses the following comments and objections to the proposed COAH regulations:

1. **The population and employment projections are unreasonable**, arbitrary, and capricious because they are not founded in any realistic population and employment projection techniques. The Statewide population trend is downward, not upward. Net out-migration is the trend for both employment and population.
2. The population and employment distributions by county are unreasonable, arbitrary, and capricious for the following reasons:
 - a. Commercial and industrial markets are driven by national and international forces, which are ignored by the regulations and COAH projections;
 - b. The location of economic growth depends on the economic marketplace. The marketplace is not demanding commercial and industrial development at levels as high as the levels of commercial and office space growth projected, in general, and particularly in the remote locations, where the COAH projections indicate it will occur;
 - c. Commercial and industrial growth is limited by unallocated sewer capacity, vacant land, and the policies of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (hereinafter "State Plan") and the other State Agencies (especially NJDEP). These limiting factors should be used to more reasonably assess the likely and preferred growth of both population and economic development.

MINUTES OF THE HARDYSTON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
MARCH 18, 2008

3. **The COAH Rules should not be divorced from the State Plan as they are by the population and employment projections, by Rule Section 5:94-3.16 and Appendix A.** The State's adopted policies require all State agencies, including DCA and COAH, to follow the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. Mount Laurel II requires affordable housing policies to conform to the State Plan. The proposed rules should be revised to properly conform to the State Plan. COAH, OSG and NJDEP (together with other State agencies) should more carefully coordinate their respective policies pursuant to the State Plan rather than advocate excessive goals and objectives that are unrealistic and inconsistent with the State Plan and the Mount Laurel II decision. Therefore, the population and employment projections should be revised. Also, the related county distributions should be revised based upon the growth areas of the current State Plan and the limiting factors described in paragraph 2 above. Unallocated sewer capacity, NJDEP regulations, NJDOT plans, the Highlands Act, and the Pinelands Commission limitations should be used to more carefully to limit projections of population and employment growth. Existing approvals prior to January 1, 2004 should also be used to limit growth projections.
4. **The Rules should be amended to make it clear that a municipality does not have to zone to follow the COAH projections of population and employment as long as it complies with its actual growth share obligations and the State Plan. See N.J.S.A. 5:94-2.3, which states...**

"a municipality may rely on its own household and employment growth projections provided the total growth share resulting from the municipal household and employment projections exceeds the total growth share resulting from the household and employment projections provided in appendix F." (Emphasis added).

This requirement should be removed and municipalities should be required to address only actual growth.

5. The employment projections required by the formulas in "Appendix D" are arbitrary, capricious, and unreasonable. They are not based on empirical data in New Jersey, particularly suburban and rural New Jersey. Empirical data proves that actual employment in suburban and rural New Jersey is much lower per square foot than Appendix D suggests, particularly for retail, offices, self-storage centers and warehouses. For example, COAH's Appendix projects 100 new jobs for a typical self storage facility (e.g. Byram Self Storage). The actual employment at the existing Byram Self Storage is two to three employees.
6. **COAH's Third Round Rule Proposals will excessively curtail Economic Development.** The revised third round proposal includes a requirement that a municipality provide one affordable unit of housing for every 16 new jobs created (the initial third round proposal had a 1 unit per 25 jobs ratio). The "new job" criteria will apply to employers moving from one NJ municipality into a new facility in a neighboring or nearby municipality drastically increasing the costs of relocating businesses.

COAH is seeking, as part of third round efforts, to standardized municipal developer fee ordinances (ordinances that allow developers to make contribution towards a municipal COAH obligation in lieu of actual construction of a unit). As part of this effort they are establishing regional costs to construct new affordable units. This regional unit cost will be the basis of a standardized developer fee ordinance (COAH is also considering direct collection of fee for non-residential construction). COAH has calculated

**MINUTES OF THE HARDYSTON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
MARCH 18, 2008**

statewide average cost of constructing a single new affordable unit to be \$161,000 for Region 1.

COAH is considering a rule that would require the construction of COAH units with developer fee ordinance contributions within a specified period of time. Failure by a municipality to construct units within the time period specified by COAH would result in the municipality forfeiting developer escrow funds to the State of New Jersey.

Practical local application:

XYZ Company moves 300 high tech jobs to a brand new facility in your community from another municipality. The landing of those 300 new jobs triggers an affordable housing obligation under COAH's proposed third round rules. 300 jobs divided by 16=18.75 (say 19 units). 19 units @ \$161K/unit=\$3,059,000 to be raised in order to meet your municipality's new obligation. Obviously no manufacturer or large (non-retail) business will offer to pay this fee thus leaving you the choice of either passing up the economic development opportunity or passing the cost on to your municipal taxpayers. Such employers will locate in other states or countries with more favorable regulatory provisions. This will perpetuate New Jersey's out migration of employment and population.

7. **Demolitions** – Municipalities should not be penalized with an additional growth share obligation if an occupied unit is demolished and rebuilt. Many of the homes in the lake districts and older neighborhoods are undersized and are in need of drastic updating. It does not seem appropriate to then have to penalize homeowners with a payment in lieu fee for their share of the growth share obligation. The same can also be said for commercial redevelopment.
8. **Special rules should be established for the Highlands Area.** Recognition should be made that the growth that has been seen in the Highlands region will not be seen at the same rate in the upcoming period. Public Water and Sewer is not as readily available in the Highlands as it is in other areas of the state. There is also a marked lack of available land for large scale development projects. COAH rules should not be established for municipalities in the Highlands region until there is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two agencies, until the Highlands Preservation Area is considered in reducing the Third Round Projections, and until there is a clear understanding between COAH, the Highlands Council, NJDEP, and the municipalities where development can be accommodated. There is no way for a municipality to adequately plan for growth if the playing field keeps shifting.
9. **The schedule for expected compliance based on a June adoption is far too rapid.**
10. **Guidance should be given on how and by whom the Equalized Assessed Value (EAV) is calculated.** Some assessors refuse to or are unable to calculate the EAV prior to a Certificate of Occupancy being issued; therefore, the developer's fee should be based on the value listed in the HUD Warranty.
11. **The proposed rules are not really Growth Share.** Rather than providing an organic model that "grows" communities based on adopted local policies and planning, COAH would have all towns grow to meet population and employment forecasts and "average densities" from a larger area. This

**MINUTES OF THE HARDYSTON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
MARCH 18, 2008**

12. forecast growth, and its assignment to municipalities is a form of top-down forced growth.
13. **Home Rule vs. COAH Rules.** If a lack of vacant land can be demonstrated, a municipality can potentially reduce the COAH housing allocation, but a town asking for such an adjustment may open their local zoning to State manipulation, since COAH would be able to seek out additional underdeveloped sites and force the municipality to rezone for an overstated projection of growth.
14. **Overzoning Will Induce Growth and Increase Sprawl.** COAH's requirement that municipalities zone for the entire COAH "projected" growth share from the outset will assure a cycle of speculative investment and "vesting" (in COAH terms) of sites that will go into housing plans quickly but will be hard to remove when they prove unneeded because the growth that could not occur and did not occur.
15. **Set-Aside Ratios Are Too High.** The set aside ratios under the rule have staggering cost implications. The mandated costs to transfer, subsidize or create Affordable housing fees to construct non-residential floor area (\$11 to \$32 depending on use) will make looking beyond New Jersey the obvious choice for anyone hoping to build a warehouse or other industrial or commercial building.
16. **Where's the Data?** The data should have been provided simultaneously with the proposed rules. COAH has been asked at several public hearings to provide the underlying data used to assess growth capacity, so municipalities and counties could independently replicate this process and check for accuracy. While these data have not been released to date, they may not be needed to prove that growth capacity has been grossly overestimated, since assumed densities are seriously overestimated in Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5.
17. **Failure to Use Up-To-Date Data.** MOD4 parcel data, which is widely used by counties and municipalities in their planning, was not available for COAH's Vacant Lands Study, despite the fact that it "...would have indicated the development status of these (non-exempt) parcels".
18. **Growth Capacity is Elusive.** COAH's estimates of growth capacity are highly unreliable. Vacant land capacity estimates assume that growth will occur at equal or greater densities than seen in historic development patterns, despite the lowered densities that have resulted from widespread appropriate zoning changes around the State during the past several decades.
19. **COAH Overestimated Growth Areas with Sewers.** Growth Areas assumed by COAH include not only the sewer service areas in Planning Areas 1 and 2 and Centers, but also the vast (and soon to be removed sewer service areas) (SSA's) that have been "on the books", but unsewered, for many years. As NJDEP promotes State Plan policies to protect the Environs by better managing wastewater treatment for growth areas and Centers, the presumed growth capacity of these disappearing SSA's will disappear as well, further concentrating too much growth on too little usable land.
20. **COAH Overestimated Growth Capacity in the Highlands and Other Areas Targeted By the State for Low-Growth.** Failure to account for the very limited capacity for growth in the "Highlands Planning Area" for towns who opt-in to the Regional Master Plan will result in significant overestimates of growth in these areas, since COAH's consultants assumed that even these lands would continue to develop according to patterns set in place long ago,

**MINUTES OF THE HARDYSTON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
MARCH 18, 2008**

not the current zoning laws and especially the upcoming Highlands RMP restrictions on development.

21. Rules Force Excessive Densities Not only will meeting this COAH mandate require major departures from the adopted policies in local Master Plans and ordinances, but the new development forecasted won't easily be accommodated at COAH's "average" densities. Municipalities will resist attempts to "force-fit" overdoses of growth onto the land that will remain after these flawed assumptions play out, and may be encouraged to seek out alternatives to the COAH process. When SSA's that have been removed by DEP are excluded and some of the land assumed to be available proves not to be, densities required to accommodate the forecasted growth will have to be even higher than the "average densities" used by COAH, which are in some cases already higher than the actual densities in these communities and higher than NJDEP policies and regulations allow.

22. Re-Petitioning Deadlines/Requirements Are Unrealistic.

To remain under the jurisdiction of COAH, Hardyston will be required to re-petition with an amended Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan by December, 2008. Assuming the rules become effective June 2008, this will be an extremely tight deadline for the township to analyze the regulations, comprehensively plan for a community altering surge of growth, conduct public meetings, and be adopted by the Planning Board and endorsed by the Governing Body. COAH should extend the deadlines and reduce the submission requirements for re-petitioning to permit sufficient deliberation, public participation and policy development before an action plan must be set in place.

There is no time for a "vision" process that will garner public input to help establish the community objectives for where development should and should not occur. In municipalities where this has not yet happened, zoning strategies will need to be developed in just a few months, offering very limited opportunities for public participation. In fact, some of the changes required for substantive certification will appear as "radical transformations", and a hostile electorate will want to know how such important changes were "slipped in during summer break".

COAH should reduce the checklist of requirements for the initial housing element submission to permit something achievable, and require subsequent submissions of supplemental documentation within the limited timelines. This approach would enable municipalities to respond intelligently and with better thought-out plans that have had the opportunity for some meaningful public input, community assessment and acceptance.

COAH should also allow phase-in zoning for inclusionary development. Rather than beginning the cycle of speculative investment in these lands, zoning should cover a shorter forecast period, it should be targeted to the "low" growth forecast (i.e. two to three years), and then supplemented as necessary in response to monitoring of growth.

**MINUTES OF THE HARDYSTON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
MARCH 18, 2008**

23. Forecast Growth from 2004 to 2018 is Substantially Overestimated

COAH revised its third round methodology to establish the statewide affordable housing need for the period 1987 to 2018, extending the Third Round compliance period from January 1, 2004 – January 1, 2014 (under the old rules) to January 1, 2004 – December 31, 2018 under the draft rules.

- 24. Forced Growth Share is Anti-Planning.** The proposed rules require municipalities to develop a plan to address an overstated growth share obligation from projections that are partially based on unprecedented historic growth during the high-growth period from 1993 to 2002. Actual growth since 2004 has been much lower than the projections.

24. COAH Must Not Usurp Municipal Zoning Powers.

A municipality may utilize its own growth projections for a growth share adjustment only when such projections exceed those provided in COAH's Third Round rules (5:94-2.3(d)). However, the procedures for a downward adjustment to growth share in 5:94-5.2 provide COAH with authority to modify the municipality's housing element and fair share plan. While a municipality seeking a downward adjustment to its growth projections pursuant to NJAC 5:94-5.6 through a vacant land adjustment may be able to reduce the growth share obligation, requesting such an adjustment appears to open municipal zoning up to mandatory amendments as specified by COAH.

This results because COAH may request a letter from the owner of a particular property indicating the site's availability for inclusionary development, and even compel the adoption of local, regional or state policies that fly in the face of the adopted SDRP.

- 25. The 3% and 1% housing trust fund fees will be insufficient to pay the cost of RCA units.** Therefore, the fees should be increased and RCA minimums removed.

- 26. Retroactive calculation of "growth share" back to January 1, 2004 is unreasonable, unrealistic and unfair.** The retroactive regulation results in imposing affordable housing obligations on municipalities for development projects that were already approved prior to the first set of adopted third round growth share rules and now, prior to these draft rules. This unreasonable retroactivity penalizes municipalities even if they were fully compliant with Round 1 and 2 of COAH's rules. Hardyston Township fully complied with Round 1 and Round 2, and made every effort to comply with the first set of 3rd Round rules, and now is being excessively penalized by COAH's retroactive calculations. The new projections and growth share multipliers further penalize municipalities by nearly doubling the growth share multipliers for development that was approved before these regulations and built since January 1, 2004. Municipalities, like Hardyston Township, will be unable to "retrofit" prior approved projects with what is now effectively a 20% growth share obligation. The regulations fail to provide a means through which municipalities can address that obligation without forcing them to absorb the cost.

**MINUTES OF THE HARDYSTON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
MARCH 18, 2008**

- 27. The Rules will impose substantial burdens on existing property tax payers in contravention of the Fair Housing Act.** The Fair Housing Act (N.J.S.A 52:27D-311(d)) prohibits COAH from forcing municipalities to raise or spend municipal revenues in order to provide low and moderated housing. The rules, and in particular the retroactive growth share calculations impose a significant financial burden that will ultimately be born by the taxpayers because municipalities have no means of recovering the associated costs.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to e-mail and mail this resolution to COAH, the Office of Smart Growth, the State Planning Commission, the Highlands Council, Governor Jon Corzine, the Sussex County Freeholders, the Sussex County Planning Board, local legislators and surrounding municipalities.

A motion was made by Kievit to approve the resolution as presented, seconded by Hamilton. All in favor. Motion carried.

C. 2008 Budget Introduction

Township Manager Marianne Smith gave a written and verbal presentation on the 2008 Municipal Budget. A motion was made by Ross to approve the 2008 Municipal Budget as introduced, seconded by Kievit. All in favor. Motion carried.

D. Correspondence

1. Town of Newton
2. Franklin Village, LLC
3. Franklin Village, LLC
4. County of Sussex
5. County of Sussex
6. County of Sussex
7. NJ State League of Municipalities
8. NJ State League of Municipalities
9. NJ State League of Municipalities
10. NJ State League of Municipalities
11. NJ State League of Municipalities
12. NJ State League of Municipalities
13. NJ State League of Municipalities
14. State of NJ
15. State of NJ
16. State of NJ
17. State of NJ
18. State of NJ
19. State of NJ
20. "New Jersey Future" Newsletter

A motion was made by Ross to approve the correspondence as presented with the exception of #1 and #4, seconded by Kievit. All in favor. Motion carried.

MANAGERS REPORT: Manager Marianne Smith gave a written and verbal report on the following:

- 2008 Budget
- COAH and Waste Water Management Planning
- Strategic Long-Range Planning
- Lake Association Meeting

**MINUTES OF THE HARDYSTON TOWNSHIP COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
MARCH 18, 2008**

BILLS TO BE PAID: A motion was made by Ross to approve the bill list as presented, seconded by Kievit. All in favor. Motion carried.

PUBLIC PORTION: A motion was made and seconded to open the meeting to the public. All in favor. Motion carried. No public comment. A motion was made and seconded to close the meeting to the public. All in favor. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT: A motion was made by Ross to adjourn, seconded by Kievit. All in favor. Motion carried.

Jane Bakalarczyk, RMC/CMC
Municipal Clerk

