

the Borough property, reviewed and photographed everything and finished the 2016 application. Mr. Altamura went on to explain what the following pages contained regarding coverages with side-by-side comparisons. Mr. Altamura asked the Mayor and Council if they wanted to be added to his email list. Mr. Negreann mentioned that since inception over \$1.2Million in incentives dividend refunds.

2. Renew Membership in the Municipal Joint Insurance Fund – Mr. Negreann explained that every three years JIF asks if you want to renew the membership, and asked Mr. Altamura if that was something he would recommend, and his responded yes. The New Jersey Joint Insurance Fund with the MEL umbrella is financially solvent and encourages the Borough to join for another three years, which River Edge was a founding member since 1986. Mayor Moscaritolo thanked them for doing the comprehensive risk analysis on and for the Borough. Mayor Moscaritolo mentioned a previous meeting with the Traffic and Safety Committee about possibly eliminating a crossing guard at a specific location and wanted to know if GJEM would make a recommendation. Mr. Altamura stated he could survey the location and do a full report.
3. Stormwater Bid – Mr. Negreann informed everyone that four bids were received for the catch basins to be installed at the intersection of Elm Ave. and Greenway Terr., Elm Ave and Concord Drive, Kensington Rd and Fifth Ave., the base bid was \$104,580.50 from Marini Brothers, the low bid. There are two alternates the Sewer Sub-Committee are not recommending either due to cost and not needed at this time. The Sewer Sub-Committee is recommending awarding this bid tonight to Marini Brothers, resolutions 15-331.
4. Change Orders #1 and #2 for Cherry Blossom Park – Mr. Negreann stated that the Architect has requested two change orders. The first change order has to do with fill which was a variation of Alternate #1 we had seen for \$3,800.00, there is also material that is stockpiled onsite and to dispose of that material would be \$2,200.00. Change Order #2 has to do with installing PVC sleeves underneath the walkways as shown on the plan for about \$1,500.00. This is just thinking for the future if there is some sort of irrigation, not to say you couldn't pipe underneath these locations in the future but if you wanted to do it now while we are installing infrastructure it would be an additional \$1,500.00. The most important change order here is #1, for work to continue we asked the Borough Attorney for a legal opinion on the validity of the change order, to which he responded. If you want to consider change order #1 and not do #2 at this time you would need to amend resolution #15-335 when it comes up for consideration. Mayor Moscaritolo mentioned that both resolutions are on the agenda, Mr. Negreann stated it is one resolution for change orders 1 and 2. Councilman Mignone stated that the fact that we are now awarding a change order which should have been awarded as an alternate as part of the original project, which he brought up that night, doesn't see how this is a valid procedure. Because now we don't know if we had awarded the base plus alternate "a" if another contractor would have gotten the bid and if we would have gotten a credit based on the reduction on the amount that was put in for the amount of the alternates. Mr. Sarlo based his opinion on the information from Mr. Miller, he couldn't make a determination on what Councilman Mignone was saying, and he was going off Mr. Miller's opinion that this was a minor field improvement, it fit within a minor site field amendment. Councilman Mignone said this was an alternate under the original bid which we didn't award and now we are trying to award it by a change order, which he felt wasn't a valid process. The other thing with the PVC, it's not showing on the plans so it's a new item. It is a minor amount but it's not showing on the plan, how do we make these kinds of change orders without either having Mr. Miller here to explain them and having back-up documentation to see exactly what is being proposed. One has to do with the potential of

it should have been an alternate and the other is a complete change to the plan which wasn't on the originally.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING –

Motion by Councilwoman Murphy, second by Councilwoman Busted to open.

All in favor 6-0

John Higgins, 580 Clarendon Court – He wanted to address the issue of the proposed ordinance discussing proposing businesses in residential/commercial neighborhoods between the hours of 11pm to 5am. Resident since 1978, he among other residents have moved here for good reasons, one is the schools, and another is the quiet enjoyment of peace of the neighborhood. This town has a real small town feel and it is a right that is recognized by the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey in a decision where the high court in facing a similar situation involving the town of Springfield made a few comments. It said the municipality has the right to secure and maintain the blessings of quiet seclusion and to make available to its inhabitants the refreshment of repose and the tranquility of solitude. Then the court continued with noise created in the still of the night may be a disturbing distraction effecting the sleep and rest of people in their homes. Many of the homes that are facing the new 7-11 are going to be effected because their bedrooms face the 7-11, they will be dealing with lighting, both the interior and exterior of the store, the people who come in the nighttime hours to make purchases, car doors slamming, people talking, radios playing, some cases engines idling, deliveries being made in the night. The ability to have this peace and quiet and enjoyment which the court spoke is going to be disturbed. We understand the town is desirous of attracting business, all though historically the businesses in this town with one or two exceptions have all closed by 10pm and some cases even earlier. It is his understanding that owner of Carousel which is in the Asian shopping center currently closed his doors is currently going to stay open during the night to be competitive and he thinks this will extend to other businesses injuring the character of the town. We know Kinderkamack Road is a thoroughfare but it isn't the kind of thoroughfare like Route 17 or Route 4, where you have business after business, high traffic area. The amount of traffic on Kinderkamack Road during the evening hours is relatively light. He and other residents want to tell the Mayor and Council that we very much support the proposed ordinance to limit the operation of businesses in the proposed C1 zone, that is a zone that is residential and borders on Kinderkamack Road. We want to limit it to the hours of 5am to 11pm and the stores closing from 11pm to 6am. Mr. Higgins handed to the Deputy Clerk a petition that states: we the undersigned River Edge residents request that the Mayor and Council pass an ordinance prohibiting businesses from opening between the hours of 11pm to 6am in residential neighborhoods. The number of signatures is approximately 40, and he is asking permission from the Mayor and Council to send supplemental signatures for people that have been on vacation and only recently gotten back to town. Mr. Higgins want to thank the Mayor and Council for their consideration and he thinks that ordinance as proposed is very reasonable, it takes into account the needs of the businesses and also takes into consideration the needs and quiet enjoyment and peace of the neighboring residents. He hoped the council will agree and pass this ordinance.

Herb Ouida, 591 Clarendon Court – He supported what Mr. Higgins stated and asked everyone in the audience to stand up that agreed also. He knows there is one other point that hasn't been made, these guys say they were lead to believe that this was ok, in their initial petition they said it and they were misled, but the law is clear and they are lawyers, only you have that authority to set the hours. This isn't a question of structure, it's a question of hours, we are not just talking about 7-11, and we are talking about a zone, a residential area. He understands that 7-11 also plans to have another 7-11 where Mr. Bob's is. Fine that is the zone and where it belongs, non-residential. Any municipality has to protect the hours of operation that is your responsibility, he was here to plead with council for the sake of our children that play on the street, and River Edge

is a very special place. When an issue like these comes out we are all here. He asks that you support John's resolution.

Mary Donohue 542 Fifth Ave. – Resident since 1952, and glad there wasn't a 7-11 that was open all night. She respects the fact that the New Jersey Supreme Court states that we have a right to have peace and tranquility in our towns. We live in a peaceful quiet town and we don't need a 7-11 operating all night, and she is disappointed that we are here discussing this matter. It should have been taken care of along ago not necessarily this council but in past councils, someone should have had the fore thought on this, she is again very disappointed that the question is even brought up. And since you have the authority, the power, to decide this question she thought all of the residents here and all the people she knows that aren't here will remember in November what we do in September. She begs the council to not let this operation in the middle of this quiet town take place.

Ann Marie Brown, 574 Clarendon Court – Expectation and Investment are two seemingly unrelated words that come to my mind when discussing the 24 hour ordinance arises, typically the conversation that she has heard around peers have gone something like this: well what about the 7-11's expectations they were told one thing and now council wants to change their minds, what about the millions they have already invested in their property and the building they put up. Over the past month she has thought about these words more and more and has finally come to realize something. She went on to explain that on April 21, 2001, 14 ½ years ago her husband and she bought their first home at 574 Clarendon Court, directly behind the 7-11 with a great deal of expectation at that time for that purchase. Some of these expectations at that time included we would have a nice neighborhood filled with children and friendly neighbors. Please note that as of today our 22 homes on Clarendon Court you can find 30 children that range in age from 16 to about 7-8 months old. We expected to find a safe neighborhood where our children could walk home from school, we found that. We expected to find peace and quiet during the night hours while our children are sleeping and we are sleeping from a long day of work. For the most part we have found that, we are realistic with our backyard on Kinderkamack Road, we do have some noise. We expected the residential zone where businesses close by 10pm when we first bought our house, the gas station was open and did close at 10pm and kept their property beautiful and clean, we expected that to stay the same. We expected an increase in property taxes, Lord knows we didn't expect this much, but that is a separate issue. But our biggest expectation was that our investment in our property would grow over time and one day we would reap the reward of a return when we decided it was time for us to retire and sell our home to downsize. So over time we personally invested a lot of our money into our homes to improve it and make it what we want for our families, and also to improve our investment. We have all worked hard to insure that our children are growing up in the environment that we have come to expect when we all bought our homes. Recently my husband and I considered refinancing our mortgage, but before doing so we asked a friend who is a local real estate agent to give us his professional opinion on our home price before we called for a private appraisal. His words were your property is worth some much now, but once that business opens 24/7 you can guarantee the home value will decrease and by the way good luck with selling it in the future. Here are my new expectations for her future here in River Edge should this ordinance be pasted, higher taxes, throw peace and quiet out the window because she will have a light shining into her bedroom everyone night 24 hrs. every day, noise of the cars, rowdy patrons coming all night, and has ready experienced the noise at 5:30 am for the dumpsters and delivery of the cinder blocks for the construction of the building and the demolish of the building because she thought it was an earth quake. She can expect that when the dumpsters are empty she will experience that same earth quake every time, and every time when there is a delivery truck I will have that experience, at 5:30 am or 2am. Her other expectations that are now new about the safety of her family being

in jeopardy with the constant transients in all hours, and if you google it there are plenty of articles, one recently in Lodi where there has been violence at 7-11 locations, and the value of her home is going to take a nose dive. The point is to ask council a question, which in reality is a rhetorical question, what makes any business not just 7-11, any business's expectations to be open 24 hrs. and their investment of millions of dollars to build their property more important than the time her and her neighbors have spent here in town. What makes this new comer more important than the longevity you have here in the town of River Edge. What makes their millions more important than the millions we have spent in our tax money, and our investments of our homes? Here is the simple answer, our expectations and investments should be more important for one simple fact our investment and expectation comes in one four letter word v-o-t-e. We have the power to vote in November and if you are not going to respect our request as a council, we can exercise our right to not vote for you. Kinderkamack Road is a C-1 residential zone we ask you to do the right thing tonight, to preserve the peace and quiet that we have, to protect our investments and our expectations.

Dan Bruen, 581 Clarendon Court – He supports the ordinance to limits the hours of operation in a residential/commercial zone. He thinks its good business to respect your neighbors, when moving into neighborhood at least has some consideration for the people, they are your neighbors. He feels that his vote allows the council to represent him not the businesses.

Derrick Talty, 582 Clarendon Court – He has the youngest family on the street, and asked the council if they would want a business in their backyard 24 hrs. a day, his boy's bedroom is right there. When he was younger he went to 7-11 and was loud and didn't care what was going on, but would you want that in your backyard. He thought the ordinance was a great idea, he supports the business being in town, helping with the taxes. He is going to take his sons out in the backyard to throw the ball around there is the 7-11, when they go to sleep at night they are going to hear car doors banging, radios playing, dumpsters being dropped, and him waking up at 5am trying to put his kids back to sleep.

Anna George, 99 Howland Ave. – Just moved to town a year ago, currently living in an apartment, moved to River Edge because of the school system and the setting, the peace and quiet. In listening to everyone she feels she has bade the right decision, but at the same time she is a little concerned with the town now changing. She moved from New York, and is contemplating on buying a home and she supports John's petition.

Jennifer Smith Esq., Gibbons PC – She is here on behalf of 7-11 Inc., her colleague Jason Tuvel was previously here on July 6th, and at that time with him was Mr. Ken Barnes, the Director of Real Estate as well as David Roberts who is a professional planner with Major Consulting. At that hearing there were facts that were put on the record, along with testimony on the record. Mayor Moscaritolo mentioned that there was statements made but none under oath and it wasn't testimony. We heard from your colleague Mr. Tuvel, the planner, and a representative of 7-11but don't describe it as testimony because it wasn't. Ms. Smith the statements were made like the statements were made here today, not under oath either. But at the conclusion of that hearing a number of council members indicated that more study was required. The Borough wanted to do its homework, its due diligence a quote from the transcript. To engage the services of a planner, to look more carefully at the issue, and it was her understanding at that the point the council then voted to table the ordinance. Mayor Moscaritolo stated that was correct. Ms. Smith continued by saying it didn't adjourned the ordinance to a specific date in the future, voted merely to table it. It is also our understanding there haven't been any additional studies that have been done since that time, or a professional planner been retained since that time, is that correct. Mayor Moscaritolo stated they were not there to answer questions. Ms. Smith stated that if she were incorrect the council would tell her, and it seemed to her that there is a new public hearing

going on, and we are just a little confused about the procedure, about whether the hearing was happening without any additional notice. Mr. Sarlo said it wasn't a public hearing, every meeting has to be open to the public and any member of the public can come up and speak, when we open up on a second reading of an ordinance we open it to the public for that specific ordinance and that is what happened at the last meeting. When looking at his agenda it is on for discussion at the work session meeting, when the Mayor and Council open to the public speaking about anything they so choose, he wouldn't describe this as another public hearing because at this point if it goes back on for a second reading, it would be listed again and opened to the public again at that time. Mayor Moscaritolo stated that at this point the ordinance is still on the table until there is a motion, second, and a vote to take it off the table, wanting the record to be clear. The ordinance is still tabled, but the public wishes to be heard as do you. Ms. Smith said that was great and completely understandable, but what we are concerned about is we submitted a letter earlier to today, hopes the council has a copy of if not she has additional copies. Mr. Sarlo mentioned that he provided a copy to council. Ms. Smith asked if the motion was tabled but not adjourned to a date specific so if the ordinance is going to be considered again she is sure everyone in the room would want to know the date as to the new public hearing would be held which the new ordinance would be introduced, another notice published and another public hearing so everyone here can express their statements in the context of the public hearing so 7-11 can come in the context of the public hearing and quite frankly everyone benefits from hearing each other, she was sure there were people who would have liked to have heard the prior statements that were made concerning lighting, concerning noise that were made by the professional planner at past hearings. By having this disjointed method she thought it deprived everyone the opportunity to hear that together. Her question or comment is whether what is being done here tonight is leading up to the ordinance being taken off the table and acted upon, if so she believes that is contrary to 40:49-2. Mayor Moscaritolo asked if she was telling council without any authority that the ordinance cannot be taken off the table tonight. Ms. Smith replied by saying not that it couldn't be taken off the table tonight, but it cannot be acted upon. In the letter that we send in today we indicated that under 40:49-2 there is a process, an introduction of an ordinance, once introduced the ordinance is published in the paper announcing the public hearing. Mayor Moscaritolo said council agreed that was done. Ms. Smith said that was initially done and a public hearing was held and the public hearing was closed on July 6th, there was a motion to close the public hearing at that point, there was a motion to table the ordinance but there was no adjournment, Mayor Moscaritolo stated that the motion to table the ordinance was made before the hearing closed, Ms. Smith said that was a motion to close and a motion... Mayor Moscaritolo stated he just wanted to get the facts straight, the motion to table was made before the public hearing was closed, during the public hearing there was a motion by Councilwoman Busted to table it, there was a second, and a vote. It was tabled during the public hearing, tonight it is on the agenda for further discussion, and if and only if it is taken off the table then it will be listed for a public hearing for a second vote, unless it is amended. If it is amended then it has to be republished again in the newspaper. Ms. Smith said that she knows it's in her letter but just (inaudible) so everyone hears it, 40:49-2 specifically put in place so that everyone does have notice of the public hearing and it talks about setting the time and place for the meeting for which further consideration of the ordinance shall be "notice shall state the time and place of such publication or at any time and place to which the meeting for the further consideration of the ordinance shall from time to time be adjourned. There was no adjournment to a date, it was tabled, so respectfully under 40:49-2 the council needs to bring the ordinance back not by taking it off the table but by reintroducing and publishing the notice. It is a basic public fairness. Mayor Moscaritolo disagreed with Ms. Smith as an attorney not as the Mayor. Ms. Smith understood Mayor Moscaritolo disagreeing with her, but case law was given, given you sites of statute that whenever an ordinance is to be considered it needs to be adjourned to another date. There were other people that were here last time who spoke and those people were not given

notice that again today there would be further consideration of this ordinance. It is not just about 7-11 or not 7-11, it is about making sure everyone in the public knows that there is going to be a continued public hearing and you are saying that is what may potentially happen that everyone who was in the room on July 6th knows when to come back, when to show up again to voice their opinion, and that wasn't done. On July 6th everyone walked out of the room, there was no date saying when to come back and continue the conversation. So as a result she doesn't think the council is able to act upon the ordinance tonight. Ms. Smith mentioned that they went through a sufficient amount of statements and doesn't want to take up time by going through all that again, so she just wanted to reiterate the statements that were made by Mr. Barnes, and Maser Consulting, we do think that a lot of those statements do address those concerns, and the fact there was a public hearing back in 2012 where things like lighting and noise and operations were all considered and were all decided and the public at that time did have the opportunity to come out and speak to those issues. Now three years later and the building is under construction and these issues seem to be coming up once again. With that we reiterate the comments that were made and we reply on those comments and hope that the council will look to 40:49-2 and not bring the ordinance back up without following the proper procedure. Thank you. Councilwoman Murphy asked if she had something she wanted to hand out, Ms. Smith replied it was what was sent to Mr. Sarlo. Mayor Moscaritolo stated that the letter of objection and the July 6th transcript was circulated to the council.

Damian Albergo, Esq., Partner of Cole Scholtz, Hackensack – He represents the property owner, 584 Kinderkamack, LLC. The property owner of the subject of this ordinance which is leased to 7-11. As you may recall I appeared before you on July 6th, the last time this matter was discussed and he spoke in opposition of the proposed ordinance and he plans on doing so today. He wanted to correct one statement that was just made by the Mayor regarding procedurally what occurred on July 6th. In looking at the transcript the public hearing was closed on page 72 of the transcript and then the motion to table was acted upon on page 80. On July 6th there was sufficient opposition to this ordinance and he does appreciate the fact that many resident were there today speaking in favor of the proposed ordinance. He also was a resident of River Edge for a very long time, he was born here and lived here with his parents until he purchased a house then sold it and back living here temporarily until they move into his new house. He really does understand this town, its character, and businesses in town for all these years and the significant defects substitutively with this ordinance existed on July 6th remains today. At the conclusion of the hearing on July 6th the decision to table the proposed ordinance was unanimous regardless of political affiliation. The reason why you tabled it was because you recognized that it lacked any sufficient need to have this ordinance pass Constitutional mustard and that it was the opinion of at least one member of this council that more work needed to be done in order to support the ordinance. As one councilmember put it “it would be prudent to table the ordinance and do some more investigation into some more planning with our planner and make sure we get it right, and if at the very least the motion to table fails I would like to provide accommodations for this particular business and move forward the ordinance for restricting the hours of operation”. Well we confirmed with the Borough Clerk that you did nothing else in terms of commissioning studies, or having planners provide evidence, and no planner or any other witness that he knows of has provided sworn testimony in front of this body to provide a rational for the ordinance. The only thing that we have heard in support of this ordinance has been speculation and fear from a number of residents about what might happen in the future if rowdy hooligans go to 7-11 at God knows what hours of the night, unloading the dumpster and making noise, all those things can be address under current ordinances. Restricting the hours of operations in of its self isn't going to fix any of that. What he would like to say is that substitutively the reason all of you had unanimous tabled this ordinance last time haven't changed. The only reason you would be passing it this time is to curry favor in an election year. He didn't think that was right for the

business that many of you promised could be open 24 hours when you were on the Planning Board and voted in favor of the resolution to allow 7-11 to open for 24 hours. Now all of a sudden it's an election year and it seems like some of those same people are changing their tunes. Mr. Albergo also wanted to point out the sort of reinforce one of the things that Ms. Smith mentioned before that any vote on this ordinance is procedurally improper, he wanted to simplify the legal discussion because under N.J.S.A. 40:49-2 once you have the second reading of the ordinance you have three options, you can reject it, pass it, or pass it with amendments, you done none of those things. Tabling it isn't one of the options in the statute. Any vote in favor of this ordinance today would be procedurally defective. Put aside all the substitutive defects that we just mentioned, it would be defective because you didn't do it right the first time. If you want to try and consider this ordinance you have to start from scratch, notice, first reading, and second reading, and if you do this now in the face of that clear statutory requirement that in itself will cause this ordinance to fail. At the last meeting we talked about grandfathering his client because of the significant reliant reliance and investment it made in this property based upon the promise its tenant would be allowed to be open for 24 hours. And I heard Ms. Brown speak about the reliance and the understanding that she had when she moved into this town her property value would increase but I submit to you that there is very different reliance's at play and the distinction is tremendous. The property owner's expectation that her property would just forever increase in value was not based upon the promises made specifically by officials who run the town, where in the case of his client and the 7-11 were promised to be allowed to be open for 24 hours was made by a number of people sitting up there on the dais and now want to go back on their word. Anybody that moves into town or buys a home anywhere and thinks that their house just going to increase in value no matter what forever they may be honest in their belief but it's not based upon reasonableness. When a business partner invests in this town based upon a resolution given to them by member of the Planning Board it is reasonable for them to reply upon and move forward with their business affairs based upon that. So at the very least whereas a number of people on this dais were talking about grandfathering his client in under the old ordinance, and that even the Mayor at the last hearing said that was something that should be spoken about, he finds nothing in the proposed ordinance that actually does grandfather in his client and it is very clear that this ordinance or proposed ordinance is a very targeted and a very discriminatory attack against his client. At the very least you should grandfather this property under the old ordinance, if you don't and you adopt this ordinance as drafted it will be the wrong reason for a variety of reasons. It will harm his client and harm 7-11, and will pull the rug out from underneath them based upon promises made by people sitting up on the dais today. It will send a broader message to the business community that you can't trust the elected officials in River Edge because their words and promises are meaningless, and the ordinance will ultimately be set aside after an expensive litigation that my client will fight if your decision interferes with his good relation with 7-11. Thank you.

Vincent Guiliano, 205 Manchester Rd – He is here because he believes the council is sitting with a dilemma on their hands, it a quality of life issue as to whether or not this town should be allowing businesses to open for 24 hours, but at the end of the day the council needs to decide if they want 24 hours businesses, there a currently a couple, the council should take under advisement the idea of passing an ordinance that gives you the power to make a determination on a business by business basis repetition in a 3-5 year period.

Sigmond Pohan, 584 Clarendon Court – His concern was a domino effect of the 24 hours and other businesses. He doesn't want to see the town disrupted.

Renee Buren, 581 Clarendon Court – She is in favor of the ordinance and against 24 hour businesses other than the present ones. She understands that 7-11 makes less than 10% of their revenue after 11pm at night. They are coming into the business wanting to be a good neighbor

and they are not acting as a good neighbor. You all represent us and should favor with the side of the citizens because the business will make money but the citizens need to be happy with where they are living and you don't want to lose that, so she asks that you consider the ordinance.

Eileen Daily Chusid, 931 Poplar Ave. – She stated that she wouldn't be directly affected, and came tonight because she is very much in favor of welcoming businesses to town as neighbors. She felt the previous attorney presented a hostile lecture. She felt 7-11's architecture was an improvement for Kinderkamack Rd. and as neighbors we are not asking a lot. She knows they need to be open in the morning for coffee drinkers, but they are going to open another site ½ a mile away. What was wrong with saying that after midnight please visit our nearby site? She wishes them to be successful and a little bit of accommodation on everyone's part. Dunkin Donuts found out there was no business after 11pm. Some of this is unfounded fear and some is a little bit of how do we see our town in the future. Do we want to be a north/south venue, is that the direction we want our town to go.

Marylisa Santos, 578 Clarendon Court – She supports the ordinance for limiting the operation hours, her windows directly face the 7-11 and she is a light sleeper which she know she won't be able to sleep with all the noise. Wants the peace and quiet preserved.

Andrea Ouida, 591 Clarendon Court – Resident for 45 years and she would never have purchased a home if she spotted a 7-11 with one of those big signs. It will change the character of the town, and having it open 24 hours will hinder the character more.

Jay Patel, 637 Kinderkamack Rd. – He is the owner of Carousel and will be financially hurt by the 7-11 opening for 24 hours, 7-11 doesn't care about the residents, they are only looking to make money. He supports the ordinance and it limiting the hours from 11pm to 6am.

Chris Brown, 574 Clarendon Court – He stated that the suits talked a lot about process, and it sounds like maybe the process didn't like it should have from the get go. The also talked about precedent and statute. The council has the ultimate statute, the case was already set in the Supreme Court for Springfield. We would really hope that you will protect this and fight it til the end, do what is right, fight for what is right. They talked about threats, the ultimate one was there, everyone one is "the lawsuit and the legal fees". The salt of your town are the residents who are here tonight. They talked about surveys and everything else, in essence this is a survey, you know what is right, the statutes are there, if it goes to the Supreme Court take it that far, you have the right to do it. He went to mention other 7-11 robberies, specifically in Little Falls recently, he doesn't want that in River Edge.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING –

Motion by Councilwoman Murphy, second by Councilman Papaleo.

All in favor 5-0

MOTION TO EXIT WORK SESSION, ENTER REGULAR MEETING AT 8:20PM.

Stephanie Evans, RMC
Municipal Clerk