

**:Montville Township Public Library  
Board of Trustees Meeting  
March 10, 2008  
Montville Township Public Library  
90 Horseneck Road  
Montville, New Jersey 07045**

---

**The meeting was called to order by President, David Dalia at 7:30 p.m.**

**Gary Bowen Julie Cohan David Dalia Ed Ernstrom Randee Fox  
Peter King Donald Kostka Deborah Nielson Charles Schmidt**

**Patricia K. Anderson, Library Director  
Mark Tabakin, Attorney for Board  
Elaine Wood, Recording Secretary**

**Guest: Bernice Bailine, Business Manager**

**Absent: Susan Max**

**David Dalia** stated that prior notice of the Meeting had been published in accordance with the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**MOMENT OF SILENCE**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

Meeting was opened at 7:30 p.m.

**David** asked for a motion to adopt the February 11, 2008 Minutes.

**Julie:** Moved the Motion

**Charles:** Second

**All were in favor.**

**Peter** asked if **Gary** Bowen was still considered “absent” from the February 11, 2008 meeting since **Susan Max** was present and is a designee for **Gary** Bowen.

**Mark** said ‘his position was filled in for him” by the presence of **Susan Max**.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no representatives present for the Public Comments session.

**REPORTS OF OFFICERS:**

**President**

**David** reported on the “Snow Date” of the prior week stating that he was notified by **Patricia** that the roads were bad. He in turn contacted Steve Toth who agreed that the roads were indeed bad but the town’s priority, for a matter of public safety, was to plow the public roads first before they

got to lots such as the library. Since Steve could not commit to a time and he would not be able to get to the library, it was agreed that the library would be closed. **David** asked the Buildings and Grounds Committee to look into getting bids from outside contractors to compare their prices with the Town for possible use for next year.

**Charles'** concern was that we are currently paying the town for these services. **David** said that we would then not use the town's services and deduct that amount from the town.

**David** noted that **Patricia** has been sending out some new reports, such as the Patron Report and a report that now identifies who is using the buildings and the meeting rooms. He said that if anyone cared for continued Director's Reports from **Patricia**, they should inform him. **Patricia** was not certain if everyone received the "Meeting Room Report" as it was not included in his/her packets but she did e-mail the report to the members. She said that occasionally there would be some meetings that the township sponsors that may not make it into the report until the following month as she had to rely on the applications coming to her.

### Treasurer

No Report

### Secretary

No Report

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

### Finance

**Donald** informed the Board that **Julie, Edward, Peter** and he had a general meeting at the library on this date, but there was nothing to report.

### Personnel

**Peter** noted that he had a couple of meetings but did not have a formal report. He stated that his committee was reviewing objectives and the path that the Library would be taking in the future. He said that he had planned on having more meetings between now and the April Board meeting and once he had all the information compiled he would then present it to the Board.

### Buildings and Grounds

**Peter** said that **Patricia** had received correspondence from Tom Mazzaccaro stating that he wanted the Library to pay for the paint for the girders on the outside of the building as it is not in their budget. **Peter** said that Mr. Pagano had previously done some work for the Library and he was going to come back in the spring (possibly next spring). **Patricia** noted that it was not certain if they were going to use him since it was uncertain if the windscreen was going to stay up. She said that the painting was a separate company, who gave them a quote of \$14,000.00. It was submitted to the township as a capital request. She also noted that she had not heard back from the township on any of the capital requests. She was not sure if the township intended to fund the job. She said that the Township Administrator did call her approximately two weeks ago and asked what the number one capital project was, to which she informed her that the front doors were the priority item as they are in very bad condition. She did get the feeling that there was something that they would do but that they more than likely had to prioritize their projects.

**David** noted that “painting” would fall under the category of maintenance and was not a capital project; therefore we could not ask the town for assistance.

**Edward** said that he did have a discussion with Justin’s father regarding the painting of the steel gusset and it requires a special preparation that was not put on originally. It cannot be sandblasted because the galvanizing would come off and then it would start rusting. He suggested a product made by Sherwin Williams that can go directly on galvanized material. **Patricia** said that there is a proposal by Mr. Pagano, but he could not do it until the spring.

**Patricia** also said that there was a need for a meeting with Chuck’s Landscaping regarding the sprinkler situation within the next month, as there appeared to be some underground leaks. She said she would set up a date that is convenient for everyone.

### **Patron Services**

**Charles** said that Patron Services had a meeting and they came up with three objectives that they would like to try and achieve:

1. More-friendly programming for all different ages.

Currently there are more programs for adults and children but there is a lack of programs for the teenage group.

2. Staff Training for Customer Service.

After studying the survey that was initiated by **David**, it appears that there is a need for staff training for customer service. **Patricia** was asked to look into having someone come in on a fairly regular basis to train the staff via a small seminar, etc.

3. Sign for front of building.

After speaking with **Patricia**, **Charles** found out that the Library Foundation has the possibility of producing \$10,000 that they might be willing to contribute for the sign. However, the electronic signs are estimated to be from \$20,000 to \$25,000. **Charles** asked for permission from the Board to research this project further and inquired as to whether the Board would consider funding the balance of the sign.

**David** said he would give the “approval” for half of the \$25,000.00, but since he is only one member, it would need to be taken under consideration.

**Deborah** stated that the High School is getting a new sign and they have been researching the project and looked at the sign in front of town hall which was about \$29,000.00 – it is “V-shaped” and multisided and their sign came in at approximately \$20,000.00. She had met with the PCC President and spoken to them about multi tasking with the sign, and perhaps when the school wasn’t using their sign in the summer months – the library could use it. The people who are handling the project are Allison Menelo and Kathy Linder. They want to replace the sign in the exact same location that the current sign is.

**Patricia** said she had met with the High School and town a few years ago and did get information at that time regarding vendors and they came out and she had some old price quotes but they would need to be updated. **Charles** said that once the sign goes up he would like it to be totally

enclosed. **Charles** inquired as to what the Board's preference was. **Edward** suggested amber colored and double sided, while **David** thought it would make sense to consider what the High School has done as a reference, selecting something similar without duplicating their sign. **Edward** thought that perhaps there could be a sponsor mentioned on the bottom of the sign to which **Charles** disagreed.

**Patricia** added it might be a good idea if a Board member attended the next Foundation meeting to show some interest and introduce themselves as often times the Library does come into discussion at their meetings. **David** asked if they affected the consolidation with the Friends - **Patricia** said they do.

### **Resolutions/Motions**

**Resolution (a)** ... to accept check register for February 1 through February 29, approving checks exceeding \$750.00 in the amount of \$81,064.42 not exceeding \$750.00 in the amount of \$15,560.98.

**Charles** moved  
**Randee** 2<sup>nd</sup>

Not hearing any discussion, **David** asked for a Roll Call

**All were in favor.**

**Resolution (b)** ... Variance between check register and cash disbursements and value of checks drawn is attributed to voided check number 5635 in the amount of \$513.20.

**Charles** moved  
**Randee:** 2<sup>nd</sup>

Not hearing any discussion, **David** asked for a Roll Call

**All were in favor.**

**Resolution (c)** ... to accept the Central Pack service agreement for the year 2008 with a 25% discount amounting to \$5,506.50. Four installments of \$1,376.62.

**Edward** moved  
**Charles:** 2<sup>nd</sup>

Not hearing any discussion, **David** asked for a Roll Call.

**All were in favor.**

**Resolution (d)** ... to have the employees of the Montville Township Public Library park in the upper areas of the parking lot during business hours.

**Edward** moved  
**Randee:** 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Charles** said he felt the resolution was incomplete, as it did not make any provision for "handicapped" employees/situations. **David** asked for a friendly amendment to make exceptions

for persons who have a “handicapped” sticker.

**Charles** also inquired as to what would happen if they don’t park in their designated areas. While **Patricia** did not anticipate any problems with the employees, she did feel it was a good idea to have a written policy, designating employee parking.

**Julie** inquired what precipitated this resolution. **Peter** noted that all the parking spots in front of the library were filled with employees’ parked cars, leaving no spaces available for patrons. **Deborah** said that when she came in this evening, she observed patrons parking in the upper lot and asked that an amendment be made to read “the section that was closest to the field – closest to the high school”. **David** suggested to “deem it the first row” and **Charles** added “the 15 spots furthest from the building”.

**Mark** suggested leaving the resolution exactly the way it is and said it is now up to **Patricia** to inform the staff that the Board has passed a resolution saying that the staff must use the upper lot and then inform them exactly what the “upper lot” means.

**Deborah** made an observation noting that this is not meant to be punitive. It is just meant to help the patrons get into the library quicker and to keep the Library’s policy consistent with the Municipal policy over at town hall. **Patricia** said that the personnel who have been employed by the Library for the past 10-15 years, and have been parking in the same spot, would have a hard time adjusting to the new policy and she expected to hear negative feedback from them.

Not hearing any further discussion, **David** asked for a Roll Call.

**All were in favor.**

Resolution (e) ... to accept the 2008 budget with total operating expenses of \$1,639,039.00 and total Capital expenses of \$248,470.00 between total expenses of \$1,887,509.00. (Side A ended and picked up again on Side B of tape. Note: Resolution (e) on the Agenda reads differently).

**Edward** moved to Table.

**Donald** 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Mark** informed the Board that you have to have a motion in order to consider it is tabled, but he understood the spirit and intent as to where the Board wished to go. He also said that there is no discussion when an item is tabled, to which **David** suggested to go back and handle it in the manner it should be done.

**Charles** moved the motion

**Randee:** 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Julie** said we could just correct the number as to what it should really be - \$193,470.00 should really be \$248,470.00. She noted that the totals had to be equal on both sides.

**David** said that the Board had passed a temporary budget in January 2008 and that it would be good for three (3) months - meaning that after the April meeting, they would be without a budget. **Mark**’s recollection was that it was retroactive to January 1, 2008. **David** inquired as to how they could get by without a budget for 15 days. **Mark** said it would be pro-rated, a one month extension based on last year’s budget.

**Bernice** said that the Budget had been given out months ago and that there were minimal

changes.

**Mark** said that the Board had some choices:

1. A pro-rated budget and carry it through April; or
2. Schedule a special meeting for purposes of having just a short meeting for the discussion of the budget prior to March 31, 2008, which would be an advertised meeting with a full Board for purposes of discussing the budget.

**David** did not want to schedule an extra meeting to which **Edward** proposed a sixty (60) day extension of a temporary budget, at the conclusion of the first ninety (90). **David** said he wouldn't want to do more than thirty (30) days.

**Gary** noted that as we are anticipating a "table" and a motion to "table" - we should not be discussing it. He also noted that he was uncertain as to what the purpose of the table was.

**Charles** asked **Edward** if he had reviewed the budget. **Edward** said he didn't get any attachments as to the hours to back up the personnel and only received the budget by e-mail on Friday.

**Patricia** said he received the budget five (5) weeks ago and had he wanted additional backup, all he had to do was ask for it at that time.

**David** said that it is usually the prior year's Budget Committee who reports on the budget, not the Finance Committee.

**Charles** asked if this Budget had been approved. **David** said he was open to discussing it.

**Donald** wanted to see the details behind the 15% increase in operating expenses.

**Edward** said that there were no details at all on the personnel to which **Patricia** replied that she was told not to put in the exact percentage increase as they are still in the middle of negotiations.

**Charles** noted that even if the budget were approved based on the hours, that doesn't mean that the number of hours could not be curtailed.

**David** said that the bulk of this would come under Union Negotiations anyway.

**Donald** noted that the Board was proposing increasing spending by over 15%.

**Edward** felt that an extra month would at least give the Board a surplus and believed that there should be at least a 3% surplus.

**Charles** noted that the excess was always put into capital improvement.

**Edward** felt that the number could be increased; some could be surplus and some of it could be dedicated to capital. He also noted that he was not certain as to how many hours of staff time the Board was purchasing.

**David** said we could always reduce the hours; we just could not increase hours. He suggested that that could be done by resolution at any time during the year.

**Donald's** concern was that it appeared to be saying "you can spend at this level" and fundamentally it would increase spending 15%.

**Patricia** said this wasn't done last year and salaries and wages went up 5.2%. **Donald** said that the operating expenses were going up 15.45% over 2007's actual numbers. He noted that he looked at "actual to what is going to be spent next year – that would be the real increase".

**Julie** suggested that some of the increases in the 2008 budget were because the Library's personnel were understaffed in 2007.

**Charles** said that his understanding of a budget was to take the anticipated amount of income and divide it and come up with a rough figure. He suggested that even if the budget was surpassed, it does not mean that you can't go back and readjust the figures.

It was also suggested that the increase was mainly due to salaries, wages and utilities.

**Patricia** said salaries and wages were based on 3% for 2007 as it has not been negotiated yet, but at some point retroactive pay was going to have to be considered for the Union with an additional two (2%) percent for 2008.

**Edward** said that that didn't tell the Board how many people were on the payroll. His concern was the Library being overstaffed and over-funded.

**Patricia** said that 10% of the budget would be going into capital.

**Deborah** asked **Patricia** if she had increased her staffing or had given them more hours, to which **Patricia** replied she had not, but did have one vacancy. **Edward** wanted to see hourly data in the form of a report. Another concern of his was why we are not competing the purchase of books.

**David** suggested that perhaps these issues could be decided on a committee level as this was neither the time nor the place to address all these issues.

**David** asked if anyone cared to make an amendment to the budget.

**Edward** asked to eliminate the purchase of bottled water (page 3). **Bernice** thought that the library might have a lease on the purchase of water. **Edward** submitted two changes: 1) to omit water; and 2) eliminate fill-in pay.

**Patricia** noted that the amount for fill-in pay was \$2,300.00 for 2006 and a little over \$4,000 in 2007. She also noted that approximately three months ago the Board approved an increase in the stipend for the party who fills in for **Patricia** when she is not there.

**\*David:** "\$758 - \$132 for salaries - \$3,000 for supplies".

**David** made a friendly amendment

**Donald:** 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Julie** noted that the Board was making a cut in the budget under salaries of \$4,000.00, and asked if both items were being approved?

**Mark** said that "no" they were not approving both right now, but they had just reduced their budget by \$4,000.00.

**Donald** said that **Edward** had specifically mentioned “fill-in” pay.

**Mark** said that that was a different motion.

**Randee** asked for clarification on what “fill-in” pay was and if it meant that when the Director was not in the building, was fill-in pay allocated to the person filling in for her? **Peter** said the Board was not quite sure what fill-in pay was for.

\***David** said that was not on the table presently. “The item that was on the table was reducing the \$762 to \$758.”

**Mark** said that the 6000 account has in it line items – by reducing the overall line item of the 6000 account by \$4,000.00 means just that.

**Julie** said she did not believe there were any account numbers between 6000 and 6010. She requested an explanation of what these numbers were.

**David** asked if there was further discussion.

**Donald** asked if there was any detail behind the \$762,000 to which **Patricia** said there was and it was given to the Board at an earlier date. She said there was a sheet with all of the salaries for each individual along with their medical benefits. She said 5% was added to the total for 2007 because there were no wage increases paid out for the year 2007. **Bernice** said the only two people not listed were **Patricia** and herself as they are not union employees.

(**Bernice** excused herself at 8:20 p.m. to get the back up.)

**Patricia** said she had the fill-in worksheet on her desk as she was working on it before the meeting. She was able to get through 2006, which was \$2,300 but she went back 230 hours at \$10.00, which comes to \$2,300. She said she wanted to go back and pull all her time sheets as she wanted to see where she was on this date. Out of 230 hours, 105 hours were vacation, one personal day and one floating holiday. It ended up being 108 hours that she was out of the building and there was no assistant director. The only person filling in for her when she wasn't there, for a total of 108 hours, was Elaine Reiss. In 2007, it was more than that and she hasn't gotten through her time sheets to look at exactly where every hour was accounted for. She noted that a large portion of it was vacation.

**Randee** asked is this person was responsible and in charge when the Director is not in the building. **Edward** said only in the daytime as evenings and weekends, no one is in charge. **Randee** suggested that it might be improper for the Board to expect this person to take on added responsibilities and not compensate her for it.

**Edward** said she is a union employee and it is not in the contract to single out one member and show them favoritism.

**Randee** asked what her contracted title was. **Edward** said “Reference Librarian”. At this time **Mark** noted that this person has not been riced and it was inappropriate to have this discussion.

**David** said that there is no protocol for this situation and suggested that the policy was being inconsistently applied. He said that the concept of “fill-in” pay was going to be looked at again at a future date.

**Charles** remarked that a policy had already been set in place by the Board regarding the fill-in pay and if there were any amendments regarding that policy, perhaps it could be done at another time, but now was the time to vote on the budget.

**David** was in agreement and suggested that the first step had been taken by taking out the \$4,000.00. If need be, changes regarding the “fill-in” issue could be made at a later date. For the sake of voting on the budget, he suggested that they move on. He asked if there was further discussion concerning the budget.

For information purposes only, **Deborah** informed the Board that the Township Committee was working on their municipal budget and noted it was going to be very “lean” as word was received last week that Governor Corzine had introduced the state budget. Montville lost state funding in the amount of \$231,000.00, which was not anticipated; therefore re-examination of the municipal budget was necessary. She requested that the Library do the same and asked that all line items as well as capital be reviewed. She noted that capital projects, including those requested by the library, have not been voted on as the state is in a serious fiscal situation. Anything that is not absolutely needed, will be taken out of the budget, including capital projects. She expressed her concern regarding the Library’s request for 50/50 matching funds from the municipality for their capital and cautioned them that only 4 votes are needed in order to appropriate these monies.

In the matter of fill-in pay, she gave the example Fran Vanderhoof (non-union) filling in for Frank Bastone, Township Administrator, last week, as he was on vacation, and there was no fill-in pay. She requested that the library take into consideration the fact that the municipal employees do co-mingle and do talk with the library/town employees and suggested that they work on “consistency” in the matter of fill-in pay. Otherwise there would be hard feelings and ill-will, which would create a no win situation.

**Mark** asked if it was a net reduction of \$5,000.00 - \$4,000.00 in account 6000 and \$1,000 in 60134 on page 3. Reducing the water expense from \$3,000 to \$2,000.

**Edward** said it was not just for the water – but that line item was being reduced.

**Donald** asked if they could have made requests for other cuts that are non-specific. He brought up the actual spending for 2007 and to look at what was being proposed for 2008.

**David** asked Donald for specific line items that he cared to address as a friendly motion.

**Peter** said that would be the reason for the extension to which **David** said that if it doesn’t pass then they would further discuss an extension

**Gary** stated that he was concerned and tended to think “no” mainly because ... (indiscernible)

**David** asked for a roll call

**Gary** Bowen – No

**Mark** asked – “as amended”?

**Randee** asked what we were voting on.

**Mark** said his understanding was that this was a friendly amendment.

**David** said that this budget, less \$5,000.

**Mark** said that the vote was for approving the budget at less than \$5,000.00.

**Bernice** asked where the \$5,000 was coming from.

**Mark** said that \$4,000 was coming out of account 6000 and \$1,000.00 coming out of 60134.

**Randee** said she did not understand the question – “if I vote yes, that means it passes without the \$4,000 and if I vote no, it doesn’t pass at all?”

**David** said that’s right – we don’t have a budget.

Roll Call continued.

**Gary Bowen** – No

**Julie Cohen** – Yes

**David Dalia** - Pass

**Edward Ernstrom** – No

**Randee Fox** – Pass

**Peter King** – No

**Donald Kostka** – No

**Deborah Nielson** – No

**Charles Schmidt** – Pass

**David Dalia** – No

**Randee Fox** – Abstain

**Charles Schmidt** - No

**Mark:** “Seven “nos”, one “yes”, one “abstention” which actually counts in the affirmative of the vote, so by lack of action you voted with the negative. The motion fails.”

**David** asked for an emergent motion, to which **Mark** said there was no need for an emergent motion. Another motion could be made under “New Business”.

**Charles** made a motion to extend the present budget by thirty (30) days from March 30, 2008, which would bring them up to April 30, 2008.

**Julie:** 2<sup>nd</sup>

**David** asked for a Roll Call.

**All were in favor.**

### **OLD BUSINESS**

**Donald** wanted to re-visit the topic of “fill-in” pay. His concern was why would the Board pay someone to fill in as it is limited to only one individual and costs the Library a couple thousand dollars a year.

**Mark** wanted to make a comment to set the record straight, in terms of “public sector”. He said the idea of acting pay is very prevalent in the public sector. It happens with the Board of Ed with teachers in charge: if a principal is out of the building, there is a teacher in charge. There is also the issue with police departments, where Lieutenants and Captains act in higher ranks and they receive differentials for doing so. He noted that there is precedent in Town – when supervisors

are out people have been appointed, at least temporarily, to be filling in positions and under civil service, acting out of title is an issue as well. He stated that that the precedent in the public sector was very well established – not to say it’s right or wrong, he just wanted it to be clear.

**David** suggested to **Donald** that since he is on the Personnel Committee, he was free to make a recommendation to the Board which would then be added as a resolution to be discussed and then voted on.

**Peter** commented that the history of fill-in pay occurred when the Board was without a Director. **Peter** further stated that once the Library did get a director, the policy was left in place. **David** said it was a unique situation but did not want to discuss it at this time but thought it was best to handle it at the Personnel Committee level.

**Edward** requested that at the April meeting he would like to revisit the mileage rate that was discussed at the last meeting now that there is new information from the Mayor. He said he would like a new resolution that would compare mileage rates for non-union employees to the Mayor’s data that she recently furnished. **David** was in agreement.

Continuing under Old Business, **Peter** commented that **Patricia** stated in her past Director’s Report, that “on February 14 the Director attended the monthly Planning Council Meeting of MAIN Inc. and said that it takes 14 hours to run this program, but they can’t work past 4:30 and can’t work weekends and they are shutting down the library three days”. **Patricia** clarified that OLIS worked for Morris County under the Department of Human Services and their Director informed the Directors of the Library at the last meeting that this particular re-indexing project took at least 14 hours and they said they did it as quickly and efficiently as they could. She could not give a judgment on how long it takes to run those kinds of reports, as she was not familiar with the system. She also noted that this included all of Morris County, not just Montville Library – every library was shut down. She stated Dennis Sandow, Trustee of the Long Hill Library, spoke about this at the Board of Trustee’s last meeting in February. She noted that he attended the OLIS meeting as well and gave the same talk as he presented to the Board last month. She stated that this seemed to be the pattern that these projects take approximately 2 to 3 days.

**Peter’s** concern was that the hours are controlled by the Union contract and the effects on all the libraries were adverse. Patricia said that there was no one to call and Montville had to do a lot of their own troubleshooting and if the problem were severe enough, they would have to call Verizon directly. It was noted that they were expecting a shut down for Labor Day as well.

It was suggested that perhaps the Board would send a letter supporting Mr. Sandow’s complaint.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no New Business to report.

**8:45 p.m. Charles** made a motion to go out of Open Session and into Executive Session for the purpose of discussion of collective bargaining.

**All were in favor**

**At 9:20 a motion was made by Peter King to reconvene from Executive Session to Open Session**

**Julie: 2<sup>nd</sup>**

Open Session was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.