

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2018 10:54 PM
To: Kevin Nerwinski; pkiriakatis@lawrencetwp.com
Subject: Re: 2018 Budget

Thanks for the updated numbers - a few questions

what is the 3 or 5 year projection for increases based on a 3% increase and which of the requests would be giving in 2019 and 2020? For instance - are we giving the police one car this year and one car next year? Are we planning increases in staff for police and inspections next year?

Also am i correct that if we reduce the maintenance costs for the fire apparatus that we could use part of our surplus if an emergent repair came up? Are we planning \$100,000 on a continuing basis or do we anticipate a decrease once larger repairs are completed

In the adjusted numbers you sent am i correct that we are not purchases any vehicles for the police?

thanks
Cathleen

On Wed, Feb 21, 2018 at 2:28 PM, Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Mayor and Council:

First, I hope that the 2018 Budget presentations met with your satisfaction. Peter and I are hopeful that we can get some direction from you as early as possible with regard to the budget you would approve for adoption. Although we believe that the proposed increase will best set us up for minimizing the impact of the coming budget years, we do understand your role as elected officials and want to present you with alternatives to the formal recommendation. Based upon some of the feedback we have heard from you, Peter has prepared a path to a 2 ½ cent and 2 ¾ cent increase. Both include an additional Class III Officer and do NOT eliminate personnel increases that I think we desperately need to improve services within our other departments.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH "OPMA" LAW, DO NOT RESPOND SUBSTANTIVELY TO THIS EMAIL. THERE CAN BE NO EXCHANGE OF IDEAS OR THOUGHTS AMONG YOU BY EMAIL ON THE ISSUE DISCLOSED HEREIN. THE PURPOSE OF THIS EMAIL IS TO PROVIDE YOU WITH IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING A PENDING TOWNSHIP ISSUE. YOU MAY CONTACT ME DIRECTLY SHOULD YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.

Kevin

From: Peter Kiriakatis [<mailto:pkiriakatis@lawrencetwp.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 1:40 PM

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 1, 2018 3:51 PM
To: Peter Kiriakatis
Cc: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: RE: 2018 Budget

Thanks Peter

Can you be more specific on minimal? If all variables were the same for next year with anticipated staffing increases in police is that minimal within the cap or zero or a penny

And I promise I won't hold you to it just trying to wrap my arms around if we cut now can we spread it over the next year or two or are we outside the cap if we wait

On Mar 1, 2018 3:42 PM, "Peter Kiriakatis" <pkiriakatis@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Hi Cathleen,

Please see the responses to your questions below.

what is the 3 or 5 year projection for increases based on a 3% increase and which of the requests would be giving in 2019 and 2020? For instance - are we giving the police one car this year and one car next year? Are we planning increases in staff for police and inspections next year?

With the 2018 recommended budget increase, the township budget within the next 2 or 3 years should see a minimum increase, dependent on future staffing or barring any unforeseen circumstances. The main focus will be on Police Rank and File staffing levels. After speaking with Construction, staffing for inspectors and office personnel will be sufficient moving forward.

Also am i correct that if we reduce the maintenance costs for the fire apparatus that we could use part of our surplus if an emergent repair came up? Are we planning \$100,000 on a continuing basis or do we anticipate a decrease once larger repairs are completed

Yes, absolutely. If an emergency repair needed to be completed that was in excess of the budgeted line item, an emergency could be authorized and raised in the following budget year (funded through surplus).

Yes, this \$100,000 would continue to be funded in the budget on an annual basis for repairs and ongoing maintenance.

In the adjusted numbers you sent am i correct that we are not purchases any vehicles for the police?

With the potential addition of a Class III SLEO, funding would come from police vehicle purchases being reduced from 7 vehicles to 6 vehicles, this would be in addition to "Other Expense" reductions to Accumulated Sick Leave Fund and General Insurance Funding.

Respectfully,

Peter

From: Cathleen Lewis [mailto:cathleenmlewis@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2018 10:54 PM

To: Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com>; pkiriakatis@lawrencetwp.com

Subject: Re: 2018 Budget

Thanks for the updated numbers - a few questions

what is the 3 or 5 year projection for increases based on a 3% increase and which of the requests would be giving in 2019 and 2020? For instance - are we giving the police one car this year and one car next year? Are we planning increases in staff for police and inspections next year?

Also am i correct that if we reduce the maintenance costs for the fire apparatus that we could use part of our surplus if an emergent repair came up? Are we planning \$100,000 on a continuing basis or do we anticipate a decrease once larger repairs are completed

In the adjusted numbers you sent am i correct that we are not purchases any vehicles for the police?

thanks

Cathleen

On Wed, Feb 21, 2018 at 2:28 PM, Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Mayor and Council:

First, I hope that the 2018 Budget presentations met with your satisfaction. Peter and I are hopeful that we can get some direction from you as early as possible with regard to the budget you would approve for adoption. Although we believe that the proposed increase will best set us up for minimizing the impact of the coming budget years, we do understand your role as elected officials and want to present you with alternatives to the formal recommendation. Based upon some of the feedback we have heard from you, Peter has prepared a path to a 2 ½ cent and 2 ¾ cent increase. Both include an additional Class III Officer and do NOT eliminate personnel increases that I think we desperately need to improve services within our other departments.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH "OPMA" LAW, DO NOT RESPOND SUBSTANTIVELY TO THIS EMAIL. THERE CAN BE NO EXCHANGE OF IDEAS OR THOUGHTS AMONG YOU BY EMAIL ON THE ISSUE DISCLOSED HEREIN. THE PURPOSE OF THIS EMAIL IS TO PROVIDE YOU WITH IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING A PENDING TOWNSHIP ISSUE. YOU MAY CONTACT ME DIRECTLY SHOULD YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.

Kevin

From: Peter Kiriakatis [<mailto:pkiriakatis@lawrencetwp.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 1:40 PM

To: Kevin Nerwinski

Subject: quarter or half cent reduction.xlsx

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 6:33 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Re: Sheft Property

Kevin,
Sorry been a hectic week but I appreciate you circling back
I'm ok with us starting negotiations as you outlined.

You should talk to neighbors about how they did Carson woods, I believe some paid over time
Thanks

On Wed, Apr 25, 2018, 4:33 PM Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

-C-

I have heard from the other council members who have authorized me to proceed but I do not want to do so without hearing from you and any other concerns you may have. Let me know where you are with this. Talk to you soon. I am in all day tomorrow if you want to call.

Kevin

From: Kevin Nerwinski
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 11:29 AM
To: 'Cathleen Lewis'
Subject: RE: Sheft Property

-C-

We actually used more this year (but that was out of the ordinary) from our Open Space account, but we historically have a \$200,000 positive differential in what we collect and what we expend. Our bond payment (\$273,000) will actually be greatly reduced by 2020 creating more of an opportunity to rebuild the account (and one of the reasons why I don't want to bond for an acquisition) (estimated to be approximately \$400,000 per year if all things remain static).

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 2, 2018 10:14 AM
To: Peter Kiriakatis
Cc: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: RE: 2018 Budget

Thanks Peter,
Without the cap bank what would our Max increase have been for this year?
We also have available 2017 cap bank next year, correct?

On Mar 2, 2018 10:07 AM, "Peter Kiriakatis" <pkiriakatis@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Hi Cathleen,

The forward looking plan was to keep any potential increase next year at a penny or under and remain under both, the Levy Cap and Appropriations Cap, with the intention of adding police officers as we anticipate retirements. Under the 3 cent recommended increase we are utilizing a portion of our expiring 2016 Appropriation Bank and a portion of our expiring 2015 Levy Cap Bank. Without utilizing either of these they will expire in their entirety. A one cent increase next year will not put us over either cap, if everything remains relatively constant. Two cents could start to put pressure on the caps, but they are dependent on factors which we don't know at this point (e.g. health care and pensions being the two largest). The appropriations and levy cap for this years' budget were aided by the increase in ratables due to BMS, whereas next year's cap calculations will not have this increase, specifically the cap ceilings will be more restrictive in 2019.

Respectfully,

Peter

From: Cathleen Lewis [mailto:cathleenmlewis@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 1, 2018 3:51 PM
To: Peter Kiriakatis <pkiriakatis@lawrencetwp.com>
Cc: Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com>
Subject: RE: 2018 Budget

Thanks Peter

Can you be more specific on minimal? If all variables were the same for next year with anticipated staffing increases in police is that minimal within the cap or zero or a penny

And I promise I won't hold you to it just trying to wrap my arms around if we cut now can we spread it over the next year or two or are we outside the cap if we wait

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 3, 2018 8:47 AM
To: Peter Kiriakatis
Cc: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: RE: 2018 Budget

Got my book today, one last sort of budget related question
The email dispatch cost for 2018 is there any increase over last year ?

On Mar 2, 2018 2:42 PM, "Peter Kiriakatis" <pkiriakatis@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Hi Cathleen,

Without the appropriation CAP Bank, appropriations for the 2018 Budget would have to be reduced by approximately \$260,000 or a little more than 1/2 cent.

Yes, that is correct, currently the Township has approximately \$2 million of appropriation CAP, half of which will expire after the adoption of the 2018 Budget.

Respectfully,

Peter

From: Cathleen Lewis [mailto:cathleenmlewis@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 2, 2018 10:14 AM
To: Peter Kiriakatis <pkiriakatis@lawrencetwp.com>
Cc: Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com>
Subject: RE: 2018 Budget

Thanks Peter,

Without the cap bank what would our Max increase have been for this year?

We also have available 2017 cap bank next year, correct?

On Mar 2, 2018 10:07 AM, "Peter Kiriakatis" <pkiriakatis@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 7, 2018 10:47 PM
To: Kevin Nerwinski; Greg Whitehead
Cc: Christoher Bobbitt
Subject: Stranded resident

I got a message from a resident that there is a downed tree on Toftrees that has blocked off the dead end.
I know you've got a long list already but wanted to make sure it's on there
Thanks
Cathleen

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2018 10:43 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Re: FW: Gulick House Concept and Zoning
Attachments: image001.jpg

Glad to see this moving forward

On Fri, Mar 23, 2018, 9:56 AM Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Mayor and Council:

Please see the email below and the attachments to this email as provided by Brian Slauch. It is a concept plan to subdivide the Gulick House property and an zoning amendment. When you have a chance, please review this and contact me to discuss. Care One is eager to move this forward, but I wanted to hear from you first.

Kevin

IN COMPLIANCE WITH "OPMA" LAW, DO NOT RESPOND SUBSTANTIVELY TO THIS EMAIL. THERE CAN BE NO EXCHANGE OF IDEAS OR THOUGHTS AMONG YOU BY EMAIL ON THE ISSUE DISCLOSED HEREIN. THE PURPOSE OF THIS EMAIL IS TO PROVIDE YOU WITH IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING A PENDING TOWNSHIP ISSUE. YOU MAY CONTACT ME DIRECTLY SHOULD YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.

From: Brian Slauch [mailto:bslauch@cchnj.com]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2018 11:08 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Cc: Philip B. Caton
Subject: Gulick House Concept and Zoning

Dear Kevin,

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 5:52 PM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Re: Sheft Property

How much is our yearly open space revenue?

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 11:44 AM
To: Clerk; Kevin Nerwinski; Christoher Bobbitt
Subject: Re: FW: Name Change for the Environmental Resources and Sustainability Green Advisory Committee

We should check on grants issue but I think that sustainable nj actually uses the term "green" team

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 6:42 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Re: Safe Exchange Zone

I'm all for the safe exchange but the idea of registration is problematic for me for a few reasons :
The requirement is onerous for many due to the nature of these transactions . (Ie I'm at work find an item and respond at 4 that I can meet on my way home at 515 at exchange spot I hear back at 5 pm that seller can meet)

The requirement may make residents less likely to use the spot

By collecting the names we are giving the impression that we are in some way vetting them or verifying them which we are not

This spot should just be making what is already occurring more centralized. So when people use the parking lot they know where to find the person. And it shows residents we r proactive.

The spots placement should be such that they can be at anyone entering or exiting the police station which provides comfort to the parties and hopefully a camera that might capture info in case there is an incident.

Also who is monitoring that authorized users are using the spot?

The registration part creates too many burdens for us and residents and gives the impression of responsibility when we are trying to limit liability

Again, I'm all for the safe exchange spot without this one provision

Thanks
Cathleen

On Thu, Apr 26, 2018, 3:49 PM Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Mayor and Council:

See attached Ordinance that will be on the agenda for next meeting unless otherwise instructed. Please let me know your thoughts if you are against it going on the agenda.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH "OPMA" LAW, DO NOT RESPOND SUBSTANTIVELY TO THIS EMAIL. THERE CAN BE NO EXCHANGE OF IDEAS OR THOUGHTS AMONG YOU BY EMAIL ON THE ISSUE DISCLOSED HEREIN. THE PURPOSE OF THIS EMAIL IS TO PROVIDE YOU WITH IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING A PENDING TOWNSHIP ISSUE. YOU MAY CONTACT ME DIRECTLY SHOULD YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 2, 2018 6:24 PM
To: Kevin Nerwinski; Greg Whitehead
Subject: Sink hole
Attachments: Screenshot_20180502-182324.png

Not sure if you've seen this but there is a sink hole by the new playground

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 3, 2018 11:10 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Re: Sink hole

Thank you

On Thu, May 3, 2018, 11:09 AM Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

-C-

We are on it. The contractor that installed the water line did not properly back fill the area. He has been notified and repairs will be made asap. The area has been blocked off. Thank you!

Kevin

From: Cathleen Lewis [mailto:cathleenmlewis@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 2, 2018 6:24 PM
To: Kevin Nerwinski; Greg Whithead
Subject: Sink hole

Not sure if you've seen this but there is a sink hole by the new playground

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 8, 2018 12:25 PM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Cc: pkiriakatis@lawrencetwp.com; Ken Pacera
Subject: Re: "SALT" Charitable Contribution Law

The \$15000 is because it's possible that someone who would have to write 2 checks won't find it worth it if the amount is too small, so \$15000 is a bit arbitrary but I figured a good benchmark

Is the 2,693 all times of properties or just homes? Businesses will still be able to itemize and won't be impacted the same way

And one last question for perspective's sake how many total properties are there in town ?

On Tue, May 8, 2018, 12:10 PM Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Cathleen:

How many homes have property tax bills higher than \$10,000? 2,693 properties pay more than \$10,000 in overall real estate taxes (based on the 2017 rate of 2.787). And higher than \$15,000 I will ask about the \$15,000 (what is your thought on that number?). (Ken, can you provide me with the number of houses over \$15,000 if it's not too burdensome to do?).

Is there anything that would prohibit a county wide fund to be utilized as a shared service? I don't believe the creation of the fund is burdensome (a resolution and opening a separate account with our bank), but the administration of it will be. Holding our taxpayers money with other municipalities in a County fund would create more administrative work (and management issues) than any benefit we would realize (PETE: What do you think?).

If we did our own could we then use it to also house a nonprofit that could be used to fund investment in recreation? Ie fireworks, field improvements, scholarships etc. The way I am reading the law, the funds must be held in a separate (dedicated) fund...and I would think co-mingling with other dedicated accounts would violate that provision. (PETE: What do you think?).

Kevin

From: Cathleen Lewis [mailto:cathleenmlewis@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 8, 2018 11:56 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Re: "SALT" Charitable Contribution Law

A few questions:

How many homes have property tax bills higher than \$10,000? And higher than \$15,000

Is there anything that would prohibit a county wide fund to be utilized as a shared service

If we did our own could we then use it to also house a nonprofit that could be used to fund investment in recreation? Ie fireworks, field improvements, scholarships etc

Thanks

Cathleen

On Tue, May 8, 2018, 11:46 AM Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Mayor and Council:

Attached please find a recent *Local Finance Notice* for your review. It describes the new law regarding the municipalities establishing charitable funds to collect property tax payments as "donations" from taxpayers with no guarantee that it will meet its intended purpose of providing a tax deduction to counteract the loss of the property tax deduction for amounts above \$10,000. There are many questions to be asked and answered on how this will all be executed. But rest assured, it will be a significant additional administrative strain on our finance and tax departments.

Kevin

Kevin P. Nerwinski, Esq.

Municipal Manager/QPA - Township of Lawrence

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 7:08 PM
To: Greg Whitehead
Cc: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Sink hole
Attachments: IMG_20180510_190553.jpg

Greg,

I was out for a walk and noticed this by the sewer, czn u check to see if there's concern that sinkhole will form or get better

It's on burning tree by the corner of vanderveer

Thank s

Cathleen

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 2:52 PM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Quick question

What is the background behind resolution 10 b? The Gordon Ave parking one
Im around so feel free to call me. Just wanted to give you some time to get the info
Thanks
Cathleen

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2018 3:00 PM
To: Kevin Nerwinski; Clerk; David M. Roskos
Subject: fair and welcoming
Attachments: Human Relations Welcoming Resolution - Lawrence.docx

ok here's my latest attempt at the fair and welcoming resolution - my additions are highlighted

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 27, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Re: FW: Ribbon Cutting Ceremony

I'll be there closer to 1, it will be my lunch hour

On Wed, Jun 27, 2018, 11:12 AM Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Mayor and Council:

This is a follow up received from Cobblestone Creek. Start time is 12:30 pm.... Have a great day everyone!

Kevin

From: Howard [mailto:hrdeutsch@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 27, 2018 8:20 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Re: Ribbon Cutting Ceremony

Hi Kevin,

Just wanted to let you know that beginning at 12:30 pm on Friday we will be offering complimentary burgers, other light fare and refreshments for all event attendees. Please feel free to have the Township attendees join us then if they would like to partake prior to the ceremony commencing at 1pm.

Best,

Howard

On Tue, Jun 26, 2018 at 4:28 PM Howard <hrdeutsch@gmail.com> wrote:

Kevin,

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 11:32 AM
To: David M. Roskos; Clerk; Kevin Nerwinski; Christopher Bobbitt
Subject: Re: FW: Welcoming Community Resolution

I want to make sure we are all on the same page, these are the 2 paragraphs that you have concerns on correct?

THIRD: No department, employee or official of the Township of Lawrence shall take part in the registration or reporting of individuals based on religion, race, ethnicity, national origin or immigration status.

SIXTH: The Township of Lawrence, including its departments, employees and officials shall not expend Township funds or resources to enforce Federal Immigration Laws unless required by Federal or State statutes, regulations, court decisions or directives and guidelines of the New Jersey Attorney General.

If that is the case I see nothing inconsistent with what Mark provided and these 2 paragraphs.

Paragraph 3: In arresting someone for an indictable offense no one is registering or reporting on individual based on the criteria above, they are reporting them based on their committing a crime.

Paragraph 6: We are not expending funds or resources to enforce federal immigration laws, we are expending funds to provide back up to protect our own citizens should a federal investigation go awry. In none of the instances cited would Lawrence PD be involved in detaining or capturing a resident for immigration purposes. They might however provide protection to other residents should a suspect flee or use force.

If we try to carve out an explicit exemption I would caution that we need to be careful to say that only in the case of an individual committing a crime do we report status. This piece is critical as you want to make sure that there is not a concern that if someone reports a crime that their status would be reported

thanks
Cathleen

On Tue, Jul 10, 2018 at 2:17 PM, David M. Roskos <DRoskos@eckertseamans.com> wrote:

Mayor and Council Members : Set forth below is the Police Chief's response to my inquiry on certain aspects of the proposed Welcoming Resolution.

I am not able to endorse Paragraphs 3 and 6 as written, given his input.

I am also not sure if the Council is still intending to ask the Chief to attend the next meeting but thought you would all benefit from his response to my inquiry.

I can mark up the last iteration sent out by Councilwoman Lewis in terms of my concerns but was not sure if I should be waiting until further discussion takes place.

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 11:32 AM
To: David M. Roskos; Clerk; Kevin Nerwinski; Christopher Bobbitt
Subject: Re: FW: Welcoming Community Resolution

I want to make sure we are all on the same page, these are the 2 paragraphs that you have concerns on correct?

THIRD: No department, employee or official of the Township of Lawrence shall take part in the registration or reporting of individuals based on religion, race, ethnicity, national origin or immigration status.

SIXTH: The Township of Lawrence, including its departments, employees and officials shall not expend Township funds or resources to enforce Federal Immigration Laws unless required by Federal or State statutes, regulations, court decisions or directives and guidelines of the New Jersey Attorney General.

If that is the case I see nothing inconsistent with what Mark provided and these 2 paragraphs.

Paragraph 3: In arresting someone for an indictable offense no one is registering or reporting on individual based on the criteria above, they are reporting them based on their committing a crime.

Paragraph 6: We are not expending funds or resources to enforce federal immigration laws, we are expending funds to provide back up to protect our own citizens should a federal investigation go awry. In none of the instances cited would Lawrence PD be involved in detaining or capturing a resident for immigration purposes. They might however provide protection to other residents should a suspect flee or use force.

If we try to carve out an explicit exemption I would caution that we need to be careful to say that only in the case of an individual committing a crime do we report status. This piece is critical as you want to make sure that there is not a concern that if someone reports a crime that their status would be reported

thanks
Cathleen

On Tue, Jul 10, 2018 at 2:17 PM, David M. Roskos <DRoskos@eckertseamans.com> wrote:

Mayor and Council Members : Set forth below is the Police Chief's response to my inquiry on certain aspects of the proposed Welcoming Resolution.

I am not able to endorse Paragraphs 3 and 6 as written, given his input.

I am also not sure if the Council is still intending to ask the Chief to attend the next meeting but thought you would all benefit from his response to my inquiry.

I can mark up the last iteration sent out by Councilwoman Lewis in terms of my concerns but was not sure if I should be waiting until further discussion takes place.

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 3:37 PM
To: David M. Roskos
Cc: Clerk; Kevin Nerwinski; Christoher Bobbitt
Subject: Re: FW: Welcoming Community Resolution

I think your reading of three is too broad but am open to suggestions on how to address it

I think your language on 6 works and I'm ok removing 9

I believe the last paragraph goes to over all intent and have no issue with it

I personally would like to see a new resolution that takes into account this conversation, any typo recommendations plus some of the language I sent along to address staff concerns. That might help move the conversation along

Thanks

On Wed, Jul 11, 2018, 1:06 PM David M. Roskos <DRoskos@eckertseamans.com> wrote:

They are the two paragraphs. I have other comments but they were my immediate concerns.

It seems that Paragraph 3 indicates no employee shall "take part " in any reporting of immigration status . Maybe I am reading it too broadly but that seems to be the intent.

I read General Order 3.05 sent by Chief Ubry to indicate in Section III B. 4 that if you are making an arrest for an indictable offense or a DUI you must inquire about citizenship and immigration status.

Furthermore, you must notify ICE if you believe the person may not be lawfully present in the USA.

I think we could rework Paragraph 3 so it doesn't create concerns but still encourages people to come forward and report crimes no matter their status.

Paragraph 6 could be improved, I would eliminate "not " and replace it with "only " and eliminate "unless" and replace it with "to the extent " since the Chief has indicated we may expend Township resources when requested to by ICE.

I also see no need for the last paragraph ,which was not in the Maplewood Resolution at all.

I also see no need for Paragraph 9 and I have some typo comments.

My general thought is the Resolution can be much shorter and concise and eliminate potential problems.

I defer to the majority of Council on the adoption of any Resolution but want to share my concerns.

From: Cathleen Lewis [mailto:cathleenmlewis@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 11:32 AM
To: David M. Roskos; Clerk; Kevin Nerwinski; Christopher Bobbitt
Subject: Re: FW: Welcoming Community Resolution

I want to make sure we are all on the same page, these are the 2 paragraphs that you have concerns on correct?

THIRD: No department, employee or official of the Township of Lawrence shall take part in the registration or reporting of individuals based on religion, race, ethnicity, national origin or immigration status.

SIXTH: The Township of Lawrence, including its departments, employees and officials shall not expend Township funds or resources to enforce Federal Immigration Laws unless required by Federal or State statutes, regulations, court decisions or directives and guidelines of the New Jersey Attorney General.

If that is the case I see nothing inconsistent with what Mark provided and these 2 paragraphs.

Paragraph 3: In arresting someone for an indictable offense no one is registering or reporting on individual based on the criteria above, they are reporting them based on their committing a crime.

Paragraph 6: We are not expending funds or resources to enforce federal immigration laws, we are expending funds to provide back up to protect our own citizens should a federal investigation go awry. In none of the instances cited would Lawrence PD be involved in detaining or capturing a resident for immigration purposes. They might however provide protection to other residents should a suspect flee or use force.

If we try to carve out an explicit exemption I would caution that we need to be careful to say that only in the case of an individual committing a crime do we report status. This piece is critical as you want to make sure that there is not a concern that if someone reports a crime that their status would be reported

thanks

Cathleen

On Tue, Jul 10, 2018 at 2:17 PM, David M. Roskos <DRoskos@eckertseamans.com> wrote:

Mayor and Council Members : Set forth below is the Police Chief's response to my inquiry on certain aspects of the proposed Welcoming Resolution.

I am not able to endorse Paragraphs 3 and 6 as written, given his input.

I am also not sure if the Council is still intending to ask the Chief to attend the next meeting but thought you would all benefit from his response to my inquiry.

I can mark up the last iteration sent out by Councilwoman Lewis in terms of my concerns but was not sure if I should be waiting until further discussion takes place.

Dave Roskos

From: Mark Ubry [<mailto:mubry@lawrencetwp.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2018 7:48 AM

To: David M. Roskos

Cc: Kevin Nerwinski; Clerk

Subject: RE: Welcoming Community Resolution

Dave,

I never saw the resolution until you sent it to me. I have attached our Standard Operating Procedures for the Enforcement of Immigration Laws and Arrest Procedures.

As for your concerns on paragraph 3, the Department is required to follow Attorney General Directives #2007-3 <http://www.nj.gov/oag/newsreleases07/ag-le-directive-2007-3.pdf> this requires us to inquire a person's status for arrests of indictable crimes and DUI our procedures are outlined in the Arrest Procedures General Order specifically Section III.B.4. on pages 3 and 4.

As for Paragraph 6, we may expend Township resources when requested by ICE. Several times throughout the year ICE will contact our Department and inform us they are conducting a planned arrest at a location in Lawrence, Usually early in the morning while people are asleep. They ask us to assist for several reason, in case something goes wrong there will be instant radio communication with local law enforcement and for a uniform presence so people

(neighbors family members) see the police vehicle and local law enforcement and realize a criminal act is not taking place, since ICE normally drives unmarked vehicles and are not in uniform. How we handle these requests for assistance are outlined in the Enforcement of Immigration Laws General Order under Section III.E on page 4.

I hope this answers your questions, if you have any other concerns let me know.

Mark Ubry

Chief of Police

Lawrence Township PD

2211 Lawrence Road

Lawrenceville, NJ 08648

609-844-7101

From: David M. Roskos [<mailto:DRoskos@eckertseamans.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 4:48 PM

To: Mark Ubry

Cc: Kevin Nerwinski; Clerk

Subject: FW: Welcoming Community Resolution

Mark : I think you have seen the attached Resolution. We are going to edit the Resolution and my biggest concern is the Third Paragraph indicating no Tp. employee will take part in "registration or reporting of individuals based on...national origin or immigration status."

Does the Police Department have any reporting obligations ? I have to assume if you arrest someone who is not a legal visitor to this country you notify somebody in due course ?

I just want to avoid any claims down the road that the resolution authorized you to stop doing some activity you already do and will continue to do.

The Sixth Paragraph worries me too since we may spend money on sending something to federal authorities , because you have to.

Thanks for your reply .

Dave

From: Clerk [<mailto:Clerk@lawrencetwp.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2018 4:30 PM
To: David M. Roskos
Subject:

This e-mail message and any files transmitted with it are subject to attorney-client privilege and contain confidential information intended only for the person(s) to whom this email message is addressed. If you have received this e-mail message in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or e-mail and destroy the original message without making a copy. Thank you.

Neither this information block, the typed name of the sender, nor anything else in this message is intended to constitute an electronic signature unless a specific statement to the contrary is included in this message.

This e-mail message and any files transmitted with it are subject to attorney-client privilege and contain confidential information intended only for the person(s) to whom this email message is addressed. If you have received this e-mail message in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or e-mail and destroy the original message without making a copy. Thank you.

Neither this information block, the typed name of the sender, nor anything else in this message is intended to constitute an electronic signature unless a specific statement to the contrary is included in this message.

This e-mail message and any files transmitted with it are subject to attorney-client privilege and contain confidential information intended only for the person(s) to whom this email message is addressed. If you have received this e-mail message in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or e-mail and destroy the original message without making a copy. Thank you.

Neither this information block, the typed name of the sender, nor anything else in this message is intended to constitute an electronic signature unless a specific statement to the contrary is included in this message.

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 3:37 PM
To: David M. Roskos
Cc: Clerk; Kevin Nerwinski; Christoher Bobbitt
Subject: Re: FW: Welcoming Community Resolution

I think your reading of three is too broad but am open to suggestions on how to address it

I think your language on 6 works and I'm ok removing 9

I believe the last paragraph goes to over all intent and have no issue with it

I personally would like to see a new resolution that takes into account this conversation, any typo recommendations plus some of the language I sent along to address staff concerns. That might help move the conversation along

Thanks

On Wed, Jul 11, 2018, 1:06 PM David M. Roskos <DRoskos@eckertseamans.com> wrote:

They are the two paragraphs. I have other comments but they were my immediate concerns.

It seems that Paragraph 3 indicates no employee shall "take part " in any reporting of immigration status . Maybe I am reading it too broadly but that seems to be the intent.

I read General Order 3.05 sent by Chief Ubry to indicate in Section III B. 4 that if you are making an arrest for an indictable offense or a DUI you must inquire about citizenship and immigration status.

Furthermore, you must notify ICE if you believe the person may not be lawfully present in the USA.

I think we could rework Paragraph 3 so it doesn't create concerns but still encourages people to come forward and report crimes no matter their status.

Paragraph 6 could be improved, I would eliminate "not " and replace it with "only " and eliminate "unless' and replace it with "to the extent " since the Chief has indicated we may expend Township resources when requested to by ICE.

I also see no need for the last paragraph ,which was not in the Maplewood Resolution at all.

I also see no need for Paragraph 9 and I have some typo comments.

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 10:35 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Nixle and social media alerts

Kevin

Know need to address until you are back but somewhere along the line the alerts changed from crash to accident, we were doing so well.

Can you please remind everyone who sends alerta that the term should be crash.

94% of crashes are caused by human error and are not accidents calling them such removes driver responsibility

Thanks

Cathleen

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 27, 2018 12:20 PM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Turf field

Kevin, on the turf field at Zimmer have you spoken to the other sports about paying in to the cost?
Thanks
Cathleen

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 27, 2018 2:31 PM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Re: Nixle and social media alerts

Thank you

On Mon, Aug 27, 2018, 2:29 PM Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Cathleen:

Just sent out a reminder to all who make Nixle alerts for the Township.

Kevin

From: Cathleen Lewis [mailto:cathleenmlewis@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 10:35 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Nixle and social media alerts

Kevin

Know need to address until you are back but somewhere along the line the alerts changed from crash to accident, we were doing so well.

Can you please remind everyone who sends alerta that the term should be crash.

94% of crashes are caused by human error and are not accidents calling them such removes driver responsibility

Thanks

Cathleen

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 3, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Police in schools

A large debate on police in schools popped up over the weekend on a Facebook group. One comment has me looking for a piece of info, just for my own edification at the moment. Can you find out how many (if any) arrests have been made inside our schools in the last 10 years and if we didn't have any police in schools in the time (although I think we did) how many were made in the time we had SROs in the school?

Thanks

PS no need to deal with this until Tuesday, hope you have a good long weekend

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 4, 2018 9:21 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Re: Police in schools

Thanks

On Tue, Sep 4, 2018, 9:03 AM Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Hey Cathleen:

I have asked the Chief to see if this information can be compiled for you. I will let you know when I receive a response. Have a great day!

Kevin

From: Cathleen Lewis [mailto:cathleenmlewis@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 3, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Police in schools

A large debate on police in schools popped up over the weekend on a Facebook group

One comment has me looking for a piece of info, just for my own edification at the moment.

Can you find out how many (if any) arrests have been made inside our schools in the last 10 years and if we didn't have any police in schools in the time (although I think we did) how many were made in the time we had SROs in the school

Thanks

PS no need to deal with this until Tuesday, hope you have a good long weekend

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 7, 2018 10:54 AM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Re: Response from PD on data request

Thank you

On Fri, Sep 7, 2018, 10:50 AM Kevin Nerwinski <knerwinski@lawrencetwp.com> wrote:

Cathleen:

See the response below I received this morning from Chief Caloairo:

I did an analysis of arrest data from Lawrence High School and Lawrence Middle School for the last 10 years. My findings showed that we had an SRO at LHS/LMS up until and including the 2009-2010 school year. Below are the finding:

Lawrence High School:

55 arrests on school property in last 10 years, 11 arrests were made when we had an SRO assigned to the school

Lawrence Middle School:

23 arrests on school property in the last 10 years, 8 were made when we had an SRO assigned to the school

If you would like any more information, please let me know.

Brian

Kevin Nerwinski

From: Cathleen Lewis <cathleenmlewis@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2018 1:10 PM
To: Kevin Nerwinski
Subject: Vest

There's lots of options but here's one example

http://www.uniteduniform.com/aba-uniform-shirt-carrier-4-pocket/?sku=AB-ABA-USC1-4-Navy&gclid=CjwKCAjwrNjcBRA3EiwAIIQvq4H7O6-Ak2cByznMHSUGOOUIvEnDTFswSOdW98NjkDZF3Kg-2gsQLBoCg94QAvD_BwE