



Boxholder  
Roosevelt, N.J. 08555

NON-PROFIT ORG.  
U. S. Postage  
PAID  
Roosevelt, N. J.  
Permit No. 6

# ROOSEVELT BOROUGH BULLETIN

VOLUME XIII NO. 4

ROOSEVELT, NEW JERSEY

NOVEMBER 1990

XIV

## Planning Board Report

### Exploring Preservation Ideas with the Trust for Public Land

by Susan Oxford

The Roosevelt Planning Board spent most of its November meeting discussing the possibility of working with the Trust for Public Land to create a plan for farmland preservation with limited development in the 500 acres of farmland in the northern part of Roosevelt. The Board has been considering this matter over the past several months, and has had informal discussions with Trust for Public Land (TPL) project manager Andrew Strauss at several of its meetings. The purpose of a collaborative effort between the Borough and TPL would be to ensure that a significant portion of this land remains dedicated to public open space. To explore this possibility further, the Board has asked Mr. Strauss to make a formal presentation to the Borough Council at a special joint meeting of the Council and Planning Board scheduled for Wednesday, November 28.

TPL has had a great deal of experience in this kind of project. For the past 17 years this nonprofit corporation has helped local governments and local nonprofit conservation groups protect valuable open space from the threat of development. TPL has participated in projects in both urban and rural areas across the country, including saving community gardens in the

South End/Lower Roxbury neighborhood of Boston, and assisting the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and the New York City Parks and Recreation Department to acquire land needed to create the Bronx River Trailway.

Although TPL's activities differ depending on the project at hand, the organization's general format involves three steps. First, TPL is invited by a  
*continued on page 17*

## also in this issue

Announcements.....	2
Council Report.....	3
School Board Report.....	4
PTA News.....	5
RCNS News.....	5
Water Action.....	6
Recycling News.....	8
You Can Make A Difference.....	8
Environmental Awareness.....	9
Seniors' News.....	9
Roosevelt Arts Project.....	10
Roosevelt's Civil War Connection.....	11
Synagogue News.....	11
Viewpoint: Trouble in Paradise.....	12
View from Pine Drive.....	16
Letters.....	18
Omnia Mutantur.....	23
Supporters & Contributors.....	24
Classified.....	25
Community Calendar.....	26

## Election Results

### Kaufman, Allen and Warren Win Council Seats

by Michael Ticktin

On November 6, the voters of Roosevelt elected Democratic candidates Stuart Kaufman, Lee Allen and Peter Warren to membership on the borough council. Messrs. Kaufman and Allen were elected to full three year terms, while Mr. Warren was elected for the remaining year of an unexpired term. They defeated write-in candidates Henry John-Alder, Brad Garton and Dennis Connaughton. Vote totals (including absentees) were as follows:

Three year seats:

Kaufman .....	279
Allen .....	260
John-Alder .....	168
Connaughton .....	35
Garton .....	12

One year seat:

Warren .....	248
Garton .....	166
John-Alder .....	5

*continued on page 10*

**The Borough Bulletin is  
mailed free of charge to  
Roosevelt residents.  
Out-of-town subscriptions  
are \$5.00 per year.**

## From the Editor

Now that another election has passed, we can reflect on how much we all benefit from having so many people who care enough to devote so much time and effort to running for, and serving in, unpaid offices where the only personal reward is a sense of satisfaction at having done one's best to make the community a better place for all of us. All those who take the trouble to run for office, whether we agree with them or not and whether

they win or not, deserve our appreciation, as do both those who are stepping down now and those who are continuing to serve. The high level of involvement that they all show helps make Roosevelt the special place that it is.

The next issue of the *Bulletin* will be published in January. Meanwhile, we wish everyone a Happy Chanuka, Merry Christmas and Healthy and Happy New Year.

—Michael Ticktin

## Water Action Bulletin

### Tell It!

#### How is the \$140/month Water/Sewer Bill Affecting You?

We intend to ask for help from our legislators and the DEP, and we need to know what effect the \$140./month bill is having on you. Your responses will help to illustrate the hardship the mandated project's costs impose, and may be useful in persuading our legislators to vote for pending legislation.

Your name will be withheld, if you so desire. (Some of the responses may also be part of a future Roosevelt *Borough Bulletin* article.)

#### Here are two responses:

"I can't believe I'm paying this bill! I took an early out a few years ago, and banked on being able to live on a certain amount of income for a few years. But in the meantime, my taxes and bills have more than doubled."

—Dina Coe

"We bought our house at the height of the Roosevelt real estate market. It was at the ultimate limit of what we could afford. The work situation isn't that good. It's month to month, whether we're going to be able to meet the mortgage. And the \$85 was the difference."

—John Parrott

Please send your response to:

Water Action c/o Judith McNally,  
Box 635, Local 08555

## Litter Pick-Up Report

The November 4th Roosevelt litter pick-up was a great success! We scoured the town's roadsides, school yard, cemetery and walking paths. After 2 1/2 hours of hard work, we had 55 bags of recyclables and trash, 6 tires, 2 car batteries, 1 stereo and 32 tired people.

John Minton of the Monmouth County Planning Department (Division of Solid Waste Management) hauled away the garbage; Lenny and Michele Guye-Hillis made a delicious lunch for all the participants; Rossi's and generous donations from townspeople provided pizza for our younger trash collectors; and Jon Shahn made our wonderful poster.

Many thanks to those who gave their time and energy to help keep Roosevelt litter-free. We look forward to seeing you at our spring clean-up. Watch the *Borough Bulletin* for details.

—The Roosevelt Park and Shade Tree Commission

## RAP Studio Clearance Art Sale

Roosevelt artists Jacob Landau, Bill Leech, Stefan Martin, Robin Middleman, Robert Mueller, Bernarda Bryson Shahn, and Jonathan Shahn, among others, will offer a rare opportunity for the public to acquire their own works and works by other artists in their collections in a sale to benefit the Roosevelt Arts Project.

Join in the treasure hunt Sunday, December 2 from 11 AM to 6 PM at the Borough Hall.

—from a RAP mailing

## ROOSEVELT BOROUGH BULLETIN

Published by  
Roosevelt Borough Bulletin, Inc.  
Box 221, Roosevelt, NJ 08555

### Board of Trustees

Robin Carroll, Dennis  
Connaughton, Michael Ticktin,  
Lillian Warren, Mark Zuckerman

### Editor

Michael Ticktin

### Managing Editor

Mark Zuckerman

### Treasurer

Robin Carroll

### Contributing Writers

Mary Alfare, Robin Carroll,  
Anita Cervantes, Bob Clark,  
Dennis Connaughton,  
Gloria Hazell, Henry John-Alder,  
Herb Johnson, Stu Kaufman,  
Tina Kaufman, Bob Mueller,  
Rose Murphy, Susan Oxford,  
Kirk Rothfuss,  
Hortense Socholitzy,  
Michael Ticktin, Peter Warren,  
Adeline Weiner, Helga Wisowaty,  
Steve Yeger, Mark Zuckerman

### Production

Robin Carroll, Diane Casey,  
Dolores Chasan, Donna Kaufman,  
Jeanette Koffler, Bob Mueller,  
Hortense Socholitzy,  
Dara Ticktin, Joshua Ticktin,  
Bess Tremper, Lillian Warren,  
Mark Zuckerman

### Business

Robin Carroll, Maureen Clark,  
Lillian Warren, Mark Zuckerman

Front page drawing, calendar art, and  
sketches by Jonathan Shahn

Typesetting facilities donated by MIRA

Roosevelt Borough Bulletin, Inc. is a  
New Jersey Non-Profit Corporation

The *Bulletin* is published nine times a year—in September, October, November, January, February, March, April, May, and June—and is distributed at the end of the month.

**The deadline is the 15th of the month**, except by prior arrangement with the Editor.

Please send all articles and letters in **clean typescript** (typewriter or daisy-wheel printer), or as files on IBM-compatible 5¼" or 3½" diskettes. We can accept ASCII files and output from most word processors.

## Borough Council Report

# Wetlands Permit Delayed Ten Months Borough Asks DEP to Extend Deadline for Repairs

by Adeline Weiner

At its regular November meeting, the Borough Council was able at long last to put "finis" to a ten-month-long effort to obtain a wetlands permit from DEP. Ordinance 144 was passed authorizing a deed of easement to DEP as a condition for using a section of borough wetland for rehabilitation of the sewer plant. This document stipulates that an equivalent area of wetland (Lot 34 Block 3) be placed under DEP surveillance and restricted from development.

### The Delay Story

Our borough engineer in a letter dated October 18 presented to DEP a request, known as a "force majeure", that contained a detailed list of the delays, uncertainties and new requirements imposed by DEP during the 10 month period. As things stand, DEP may order any number of minor changes that the municipality must comply with at its own expense by providing new surveys, boundary delineations, engineers' fees etc. One estimate of the unanticipated expense involved in the recent wetland permit process was well above \$20,000.

### Only Fair

The borough therefore is requesting a seven-month extension of the Administrative Consent Order deadline, from February 1992 to September 1992, allowing for the three-month review by DEP originally agreed on.

### Another Costly Waste

The Council considered some alternative methods of removal of the sandblast and paint chips material from the water tower paint project. A third test of toxic levels of lead in this debris will be made shortly. No decision will be reached but unless the next test proves otherwise, disposal options now range in cost from

\$10,000 to \$20,000. Council Member Rothfuss said that these prices, he believes, are mainly due to the companies' inflating the cost of "packaging" the stuff rather than the actual cost of the transfer to an appropriate landfill.

### No Local Danger

In answer to concerns about lead paint contamination at the water tower, he stated that a problem arises only in conditions of long term disposal that could result in soil and ground-water pollution over many years.

### A Grant for Less Litter

A resolution was passed authorizing the Mayor to apply for a grant of not less than \$4,000 under the Clean Communities Act administered by DEP to supplement the litter reduction program in the borough. Passage included the designation of Gayle Donnelly as coordinator as well as the acceptance of an "action and spending" plan under a model program.

### A Quiet One

The meeting which was singularly brief, had only four council members in attendance: Council Members Rothfuss, Magnes, Craig and Counterman. Mr. Alt was ill and the Mayor and Mr. Prezant along with Ms. Bieracka-Olejnik, Borough Clerk, were attending a Conference of Municipalities in Atlantic City. It may have been the one meeting in many months at which no mention of Insituform was heard. There was also no response, and no request for one, to a letter from the three newly elected council members asking the outgoing council to refrain from taking any course of action that would be binding on the 1992 council. Perhaps the December meeting will, at the very least, be a bit longer.

## Permit Chronology

1/9/90 Hand-delivered Freshwater Wetlands Application to NJDEP.

1/26/90 Check on status of review with NJDEP.

1/30/90 We receive a letter from NJDEP requesting information.

2/2/90 We meet with NJDEP, submitting information requested in the 1/30/90 letter.

2/7/90 We submit information sought at the 2/2/90 meeting.

2/13/90 We call NJDEP to check on status. Review not complete.

2/15/90 Check with NJDEP on status. Review not complete.

3/1/90 Check with NJDEP on status. Review not complete.

3/8/90 Check with NJDEP on status. Application has been transferred to a new reviewer.

3/9/90 Check with NJDEP on status. Review has not begun.

3/16/90 Check with NJDEP on status. Review has not begun.

3/29/90 Check with NJDEP on status. Field work to be done soon.

4/13/90 Check with NJDEP on status. No answer.

4/24/90 Check with NJDEP on status. Field investigation is complete. Wetlands delineation line is approved. NJDEP informs Borough it must look at an averaging plan for the transition area waiver.

6/5/90 NJDEP on-site meeting to delineate wetlands boundary in the area of compensation for the Transition Area Waiver.

6/19/90 Survey completed on area of compensation.

7/9/90 Notification of averaging plan. Send certified mail to Borough Clerk, Planning Board, etc.

9/13/90 Borough has proceeded with overall lot delineation and sent out certified letters to additional homeowners within 200 feet.

9/17/90 Application for Letter of Interpretation sent to NJDEP.

9/26/90 Check on status with NJDEP, who estimate the permit will be issued in two weeks.

10/4/90 Check on status with NJDEP. They indicated they cannot locate the Roosevelt file.

10/11/90 Additional information, previously submitted to NJDEP, is transmitted by telephone.

Permit received by 10/30/90.

—from a letter by Borough Engineer Kevin Toolan



## School Board Report

# County Superintendent Upholds Allen Appointment

By Bob Clark

Monmouth County Superintendent of Schools Milton Hughes ruled the October appointment of former Roosevelt School Board President Debra Allen to the paid position of Board Secretary/Business Manager to be legal in an October 29 letter to Borough resident Edwin Moser. On October 15, Mr. Moser had written to State Education Commissioner John Ellis requesting an investigation of the appointment for allegedly violating a statute which declares a Board member ineligible for a paid position unless the member resigns at least six months earlier. Mrs. Allen had resigned from the Board immediately before the appointment. Dr. Hughes, to whom Mr. Moser had sent a copy of his letter to Dr. Ellis, cited a statutory exception for the position of School Board Secretary in pronouncing the appointment lawful.

Current Board President Edward Grossman and Chief School Administrator (CSA) Harry Groveman said they believed that Dr. Hughes had provided the final word from education officials. Dr. Grossman added that the School Board Attorney told him the appointment was "defensible." Mr. Moser said, however, that he had received a complaint form from the Department's Controversies and Disputes office with instructions for filling it out if he wished to pursue his complaint. Mr. Moser said he had not decided whether to follow the complaint process.

The School Board's first public workshop on the 1991-92 school budget will be held at RPS at 7:30 P.M. on December 20. Mr. Groveman reported that items of concern at preliminary stages of budget development include long-range plans, adding a new teacher and/or reorganizing to a K-5 district, possible school expansion and the amount of money to be dedicated to upgrading the school facility.

At the Board's November 13 regular meeting CSA Groveman and Dr. Grossman reported on what had been learned while they and others attended the annual New Jersey School Boards Association (NJSBA) Convention in Atlantic City. Dr. Grossman said a legal panel discussed school districts' obligations to pay NJSBA dues, family leave for district employees, equal access to school facilities and special education requirements. Mr. Groveman noted that he spoke to representatives of over a dozen architectural firms about developing a site plan and educational specifications for a possible Roosevelt project.

The Board approved a revision to its Five-year Facility Plan to help the District to qualify for anticipated State grants. The revised Plan describes the potential need to expand the school building to deal with projected enrollments that may require splitting of two combined classes. According to the revised Plan, if this were accomplished without adding to the present facility, it would greatly reduce the District's ability to operate music, art, foreign language, basic skills, resource room, health and speech programs. The revised Plan would also allow expansion for possible preschool and day care programs at RPS, permit a separate kitchen facility for a hot lunch program, provide a health suite to replace the present substandard facility and supply space for adult educational and community recreational activities.

In the public portion of the meeting, Jane Rothfuss questioned whether the plans for expansion occurred before or after the Board learned of the potential availability of funding. Dr. Grossman pointed out that at least one facility, the health suite, does not meet state standards and will have to be expanded in less than three years. Other additions would help the District to

provide better or new programs with at least partial funding from the State.

Mr. Groveman reported that, at the Board's direction, he and Mrs. Allen met on November 5 with East Windsor officials about developing a more formal sending/receiving agreement. He shared with the Board a letter he said he intended to send to East Windsor Superintendent Edgar Thomas outlining issues that Dr. Thomas would bring before his board. These included the length of an agreement, allowing a Roosevelt Board member to serve as a nonvoting member of the East Windsor Board, increased communication between the districts and protection against tuition increases reflecting capital outlays for programs not affecting Roosevelt students.

Mr. Groveman reported that, while attending the NJSBA convention, he learned of plans to develop a lobbying organization on behalf of sending school districts. He said he expressed an interest in being actively involved on behalf of Roosevelt. At the convention Mr. Groveman hosted a panel on sending/receiving relationships. Dr. Grossman reported that the panel received a great deal of positive feedback.

The Board approved joint transportation agreements with East Windsor for bussing special education students and students attending four private schools in the area. In the public portion of the meeting, Henry John-Alder expressed exasperation that school districts, under State mandate, would have to pay for any of the cost of transporting students to private schools.

The Board's Ad Hoc Safety Committee, consisting of John Ord, Michael Hamilton, Margaret Schlinski and Robert Petrilla, planned a public meeting with the Borough Council's Public Safety Committee. Issues to be discussed included more crossing guards, crossing locations, parking lot safety,

## PTA News

by Robin Carroll

sidewalk installation, paving of paths, painting lines on streets and vegetation trimming. Members reported that David Savage is retrieving a traffic study he once did which might shed light on problem areas.

Mr. Groveman briefed the Board on the process of evaluating teaching staff, including tenured teachers. He related that social studies is the next major area of curriculum revision.

Dr. Grossman and Board member John Ord agreed to alternate as Roosevelt's legislative delegates to the NJSBA. At delegate assemblies district representatives vote on stances the NJSBA should take on pending legislation. Dr. Grossman noted that some of the votes are close; and, therefore, the position is important.

Mr. Groveman reported that short-term schedule changes allowed the District's speech therapist the opportunity to evaluate preschool children who will enter Kindergarten next year. Five families involved in the nursery school program participated. The parents were offered suggestions to assist them in readying their children for Kindergarten.

Mr. Groveman shared with the Board a letter which he wrote to Michael Cedar on October 16. The letter thanked the sixth grader for his "really fine job" presenting a display about Roosevelt and RPS at the Monmouth County Curriculum Fair. Mr. Groveman said the event was attended by over 2,000 professional educators. The letter continued, "I was very impressed by your poise in talking with the many different teachers and administrators who stopped and asked you questions about your school and your town."

This past month the PTA has been buzzing with activity. Our annual Book Fair in October was extremely successful. Everyone had a good time picking out books for themselves and to give as gifts. A lot of parents returned to the book sale in the evening to complete their purchases. The PTA appreciates all the volunteers who came out to help man the tables for this sale. We would especially like to thank JoAnne Parker for chairing this event. It was a lot of work and she did a great job.

All the children had a wonderful time at the annual Halloween Party on October 31. There was food and fun for all! A special thanks goes out to Lee Allen for all the work he does in putting this party together every year. Everyone has a good time. Thanks to all the volunteers who helped out that day, especially Teresa LePore who always does such a great job coordinating all the volunteers. We really appreciate the donation of pumpkins and decorations that was made by the Estenes family and Shady Acres Farm. The lobby looked great and the children loved the pumpkins.

The school pictures were taken on November 15 and the family portrait night was booked solid. We were pleased so many residents took ad-

vantage of this opportunity. The pictures will be back on December 6 and may be picked up between the hours of 6 and 8 p.m. Representatives from Donner Photographers will be available that evening if anyone would want to order more pictures or if you have any questions. We hope to make family picture night an annual event.

The Thanksgiving program was held on November 21. The PTA provided refreshments for this annual program and coordinated rides for the seniors who were invited for the party. We would like to thank Mary Alfare for coordinating those rides.

The PTA Holiday Shop was held on November 28 and 29. The students really enjoy this event. We would like to thank Lorraine Reimbold for chairing this project and for all the parents who volunteered to help out both in the afternoons and in the evening.

The next PTA meeting will be held on December 6 at 8 p.m. We should be starting our video series on parenting this night. Since there is no **Bulletin** in December we would like to remind you that the January meeting will be held on January 17 at 8 p.m.

We take this opportunity to wish everyone a Happy Holiday season!

## Roosevelt Community Nursery School News

by Joan Grossman

We are pleased to announce that RCNS has added two new programs to begin in January.

The first, an afternoon nursery school session, will run Tuesday and Thursday from 1 to 3 p.m. This is specifically designed for children ages 2 1/2 and up, who have never attended nursery school and is called "First Experience with Pre-School".

The second new program which will be offered is a "Mommy/Daddy (or Nanny) and Me" program. This is for children 2 to 2 1/2 years of age with an adult and will be held January through June on Wednesdays from 1 to 2:30 p.m.

We are currently enrolling children in both programs and space is limited. For information, contact head teacher

Donna Ventola at 426-9523 by December 15.

Classroom highlights include preparations for a Thanksgiving feast, prepared totally by the children and staff, along with parent volunteers the Tuesday and Wednesday of Thanksgiving week.

Holiday fundraisers include a Constructive Playthings Toy Sale, Holiday Candy and Cookie Tins and sale of our own "RCNS Childsongs II" audio cassettes. Upcoming in January is our now annual "Concert for Young Children and Their Families" and Open House. Watch the **Borough Bulletin** and bulletin board for details.

As always thanks to all of our supporters, in particular the Roosevelt Jewish Center and Roosevelt Printing.

## Water Action Group

# The "Quiet Campaign" And Other News From The Sewer Front

by Anita Cervantes

The ending of the warm days of summer has meant the end of the Water Action Benefit events. Some people's schedules have suddenly turned hectic with the beginning of the school year, some with the usual post-Labor Day "let's wake up and do some business" syndrome. But work has continued apace.

One Water Action activity that's been going on since the beginning, with little or no attention and certainly even less fanfare, is what I've come to think of as the "Quiet Campaign", more prosaically known as the letter-writing campaign.

### Keep Those Cards and Letters Coming

The original idea was simply to bring the attention of our legislators, both state and federal, and others in power, to Roosevelt's water/sewer infrastructure improvement dilemma. There was a recognition that Roosevelt is a small place, and that despite its historic status, has no one really to speak for it except its own people. Those people writing letters hoped to make of themselves a collective squeaky wheel; to gain the attention, and compel the aid, of legislators, DEP, and anyone else who would listen.

Letter-writing sessions have been held since June on an almost weekly basis at the Borough Hall, led by Judith McNally or Jane Rothfuss.

Rooseveltians involved in the campaign have sent over 600 letters, to individuals such as:

- President Bush
- Governor Florio
- Senator Bradley
- Senator Lautenberg
- Representative Smith
- State Senator Van Wagner
- State Assembly Member Farragher
- State Assembly Member Arnone
- State Senator Bennett
- Ms. Yaskin and Mr. Keith of DEP
- William Reilly of EPA

### Perseverance Pays

Some writers have followed up with responses to the responses they received. In some cases, this was rewarded with an additional letter with more encouraging information. For example, both Denise Frazier and Judith McNally, among others, wrote to Chris Smith early on in the campaign. His initial response was merely to say that this was an area over which he had no control and we couldn't expect anything from him. Not to be deterred, Denise followed up with another letter pressing her point. This time she was rewarded with a more responsive communication from Mr. Smith which, among other things, outlined the legislation being introduced by Sen. Max Baucus of Montana (S2184, the Small Community Environmental Assistance Act of 1990), and promised to support this bill should it come before the House.

The most outstanding example was the response received by Denise from State Senator Richard Van Wagner (see related article by Denise Frazier) which seems to hold some real promise in terms of State funding.

### "Care Packages"

During the summer, when the benefit concerts were being held, and Water Action activities were generating a significant amount of press attention, Denise Frazier sent "Care Packages" to everyone who was getting letters as part of the campaign. The goal was to demonstrate to these individuals that Roosevelt was not just talking to itself on this issue; that the press was hearing us, and that perhaps it would be wise for them to listen as well. Each "Care Package" consisted of press clippings and other material both informational and promotional: **Borough Bulletin** articles, the "Space Station" editorial from the **Borough Bulletin** June issue, the Asbury Park Press editorial about the number of New Jersey small towns in the same fix, benefit event an-

nouncements, and "I Love Roosevelt" bumper stickers, among other items.

Letter-writing sessions have been held on a virtually weekly basis on Thursday nights at the Borough Hall, led by Jane Rothfuss or Judith McNally.

Now, with the holidays nearly upon us and people's time for meetings growing tight, the letter-writers have decided to try a different tactic. Each month, a new "Hot Issue" will be presented in the **Bulletin**, together with a sample letter and a suggested list of recipients. It's hoped that this way even people who can't get out or who are too busy to attend a letter-writing meeting will be able to contribute to this effort (see related article by Denise Frazier).

We'll also be posting the "Hot Issue" and sample letter information on the town Bulletin Board every month.

We'd like to take this opportunity to thank our stalwart letter-writers. If we've forgotten anybody, please accept our apologies! The writers have included:

- many of our Senior Citizens too numerous to mention
- Robin Middleman
- Herb Johnson
- Howie Kaufman
- Joe Solomon
- Cynthia Imbrie
- Dina Coe
- Richard Lloyd
- Alice Lloyd
- Judith McNally
- Denise Frazier
- Ron Filepp
- Michele Guye-Hillis
- Les Weiner
- Addie Weiner
- Jane Rothfuss
- Dolores Chasan

### Other Water Action News

We've collectively written a letter to Governor Florio asking for a meeting to solicit his help in this matter, and are currently working on arranging the meeting.



## Water Action Letter-Writing Campaign

# Senator Van Wagner's Letter Gives Us New Hope

Even though the weather's getting colder, we're working on more media attention-getting events like the ones that earned us good press attention this summer. We'll keep people informed via leaflets and our town Bulletin Board, as well as, of course, the **Bulletin**.

We're trying to compile an informal collection of quotes from people in town on how the increase in water/sewer rates has affected their lives. We hope that this may be of help in convincing our legislators and DEP that we need assistance. If you have a story to tell, funny or sad, or just want your feelings included in this compendium, see the related article by Judith McNally [see page 2, Ed.].

### Benefit Event Money Still Available

As everyone probably recalls, the idea behind the Roosevelt Water Action Benefit Event series held this summer in the FDR Amphitheater was to raise money to support the Water Action group's activities: postage, copying paper, and trips to see legislators should that become necessary.

Well, there's good news and there's good news. Not only did the events generate money, but after costs were met (instrument rental, postage for press-releases, paper, oak-tag and markers for posters, and the like), there's still money left—almost \$200—enough to pay postage for a lot more letters, for gas and tolls to Washington to see our Senators, or for other needs as they may arise. If you're writing letters, contact me at 448-4068 for a supply of pre-paid envelopes.

The Water Action group meets every other Sunday at the Borough Hall at 11:30. Upcoming meetings are: 11/25, 12/9, and 12/23. If you'd like more information or have questions, please feel free to call me (448-4068), Judith McNally (448-4580), Dina Coe (448-2687), or Jane Rothfuss (448-3713).

by Denise Frazier

As a member of the Water Action group, I have been writing letters to State and Federal officials about the effect our inflated water/sewer bills have had on our community.

I have received responses from many and have returned letters to those people who've replied to me.

There is one response in particular which I would like to share with the community. This letter has encouraged and inspired me to pursue further action [see below, Ed.].

I urge the people of Roosevelt to respond to this letter and encourage Senator Van Wagner to introduce legislation that would be retroactive

funding to small towns like Roosevelt which have DEP deadlines in 1992.

The more people we can get to write encouraging letters, the better our chances to keep Roosevelt on top of the "paper pile". **Postage will be aid by Water Action, so see Anita Cervantes (448-4068) for your prepaid envelope.**

Each month in the **Borough Bulletin**, I will share other issues our community can respond to and write letters about.

In order to keep track of how many letters we generate, and by whom, I'd appreciate a note, call, carbon copy or whatever is easiest for you, so we can count your letter as part of our tally.

### Text of Senator Van Wagner's Letter

Richard Van Wagner  
Senator, 13th District  
225 Highway #35  
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701

October 26, 1990

Dear Ms. Frazier,

Thank you for letter of Oct. 24.

I will continue to seek major capital construction money for municipalities faced with Roosevelt's problem. I will also be introducing next month legislation which would provide direct aid to municipalities whose ratio of debt service for water and sewer infrastructure costs exceed the statewide average. The formula would provide the difference between the municipality's ratio and the statewide average with language mandating that it be used for reduction of the ratepayers' fees.

For example, if Roosevelt's ratio is 50% debt service to budget and the statewide average is 25%, then Roosevelt would receive the amount that constitutes the difference between the two figures. This amount would be calculated annually based upon the previous year's budget figures submitted to the Division of Local Finance and sent directly to the municipality.

Hopefully with these legislative measures we will be able to cushion the impact upon ratepayers of these mandated projects.

Sincerely,  
Richard Van Wagner

## Recycling News

# Leaf Composting: Recycling Naturally

by Stu Kaufman

The best recyclable product in Roosevelt costs nothing, comes from nature and adds to nature. It's called leaf compost. What can you do with leaf compost? I'm glad you asked.

Most New Jersey soils need an increase of organic matter. Sand soils and soils with very high clay content are improved the most by an increase in organic matter. Some benefits of adding leaf compost to soil are that drought damage to plants is reduced by increasing the water holding capacity of soil, added organic matter provides a food source for desirable soil micro-organisms, and over fertilization and excessive alkalinity or acidity are reduced by the added buffering of the soil. Overall compost improves the physical, chemical and biological properties of soil. Remember leaf compost is not considered a fertilizer; it is too low in nutrient con-

tent. It serves primarily as an organic amendment and soil conditioner.

Leaf compost can be used as an organic mulch in place of peatmoss. Silly as it sounds, we're running out of peatmoss. The peat bogs are being depleted at an alarming rate and the State wants to reverse this trend. Organic mulches are valuable because they reduce rainfall runoff, decrease water evaporation losses from soil, keep soil cooler in summer and warmer in winter, reduce soil erosion and control the spread of weeds.

Basics of starting a leaf compost pile:

1. Locate the pile in a shaded area where drainage is adequate and there is no standing water,
2. The pile should be at least 4 feet in diameter and 3 feet in height.
3. Composting may be done either in a loose pile or contained in a bin or

enclosure that is wide enough to permit air movement and has one side opened for turning the pile periodically.

4. Make sure leaves collected are in a very wet condition. Without moisture, the micro-organisms will not function.

5. Avoid packing the leaves too tightly. Too much compaction will limit the movement of air.

6. The pile must be kept moist (not soggy) for proper decomposition.

7. Periodically turn the pile.

Within a short period of time (4-8 months) the leaves will compost into a dark, crumbly product.

Expect a newsletter in the mail next month. The newsletter will contain more information on composting and the new winter-spring curb-side recycling schedule.

Thank you.

## We Can Make A Difference

# Hazards of Six-Pack Holders

by Tina Kaufman

Simple things you can do to help save the environment:

### Snip Six-Pack Rings:

Plastic six-pack holders—the rings used for canned beer, soft drinks, oil, etc.—have become an ocean hazard to birds and other marine life. How do they get into the water? They're left on the beach by careless sun lovers and wash into the ocean; or they're dumped into our waterways along with tons of other garbage, and gradually make their way into the oceans; or they're dumped into seaside landfills and erosion or wind propels them into the water. Once they're floating in the sea, they're hazards to marine life.

During a beach cleanup along 300 miles of Texas shoreline in 1988, 15,600 plastic six-pack rings were found in 3 hours.

### Did You Know:

- Six-pack holders are virtually invisible underwater, so marine animals can't avoid them.
- Gulls and terns—birds that frequent recreational areas and dumps near the ocean—sometimes catch one loop around their necks while fishing. Then they snag another loop on a stationary object. Result: they drown or strangle themselves.
- Pelicans catch fish by plunging into the water. Occasionally, one will dive straight into a six-pack ring. Result: the bird ends up with the ring stuck around its bill; unable to open its mouth, it starves to death.
- Young seals and sea lions get the rings caught around their necks.

As they grow, the rings get tighter, and the animals suffocate. Some states now require six-pack rings to be photodegradable - which means they break down in sunlight after 30 days - but that doesn't deal with the short-term problems.

### Simple Things To Do:

Before you toss six-pack holders into the garbage, snip each circle with a pair of scissors; or pull them apart with your hands.

When you're at the beach pick up any six-pack rings you find and either snip them or pull them apart before you throw them away.



## Environmental Awareness

# About Batteries

by Gloria Hazell

As the holidays near, I thought it would be apt to write about batteries. The children are expectantly awaiting the time of year when gift giving abounds. Questions such as "What are you getting?" fill the air. Quite often the answer is a toy requiring at least one battery, which we adults have to supply, because usually "Batteries are not included."

Have you ever thought about what goes into one of these magical things that allow so many items to work? I can't say I ever did until recently when I founded Natives of the Earth and began reading environmental books. I knew that there were metals included but which type, and where it went after I discarded it were of no concern to me, or so I thought. I now think differently. We should all know what happens to our garbage. Is it going to decompose safely on a landfill? Is it going to decompose at all? If not what happens to it? Styrofoam and plastics, we know, will stay around forever. Paper and food products will eventually disintegrate and go back into the earth, usually safely. But what happens to throw-a-ways such as batteries? A massive two and a half billion are trashed in this country annually.

Until recently it was thought that, as the metals used in batteries were in abundant supply, there was no reason to recycle them. Then, somewhere, someone decided that maybe recycling would be beneficial; the supplies would last longer, and the danger to the underground water systems from the hazardous metals coming from corroded batteries in landfills would be lessened. In Japan and Europe, recycling of batteries began; in this country however it is another story. One company has been reclaiming the reusable metals since the 1950's, but other than that there is almost nowhere to take them to except hazardous waste landfills. Roosevelt is unusual in the fact that here we do have a site for dropping off batteries. Please use the facility; it seems that to date it has not been used.

The metals in a battery are a mixture of two or more of the following: mercury, cadmium, lead, nickel, silver, zinc, lithium, and manganese dioxide. Of these, mercury, cadmium and lead are extremely hazardous. When a battery corrodes, these toxic metals seep out and can leak into the water under the land-fill, contaminating it. This then threatens aquatic life and wildlife as well as humans, so we must do something to alleviate the problem now.

There are throw-a-ways available which do not contain these toxic materials and can safely be put in a landfill, but the best way to help is to buy rechargeable batteries. They are slightly more expensive but can be recharged up to a thousand times each. They are well worth the extra money, and if two sets are purchased, one can be recharging while the other is in use. Rechargers are available from various sources, but one that I like is from Real Goods in California. It is run by solar power so that electricity is not used to boost those energy cells. Real Goods sell a number of models; one can recharge two sizes of battery at the same time using an add on unit. The rechargers retail for around \$20. I you would like a Real Goods catalog please write to them at: 966 Mazzone Street, Ukiah, CA 95428. You'll find it to be an interesting catalog with many environmentally sound products inside.

Instead of just giving batteries this year, why not buy rechargeables plus the recharger? You'll know you will be helping the earth. While I'm on the subject of gift giving, there are some interesting games for sale on environmental awareness. Most are for children, but I'm sure that adults will learn as well if they joined in on the fun of playing them! Please ensure that any perfume you give this year has not been tested on animals and that any gifts are environmentally sound, e.g. no furs or ivory. But recycled cards and wrapping paper; some of them are really pretty. How about giving a tree (a small sapling) as a gift, or adopt a

whale for a year, that is a great one with the kids. The Nature Co. in Princeton has some wonderful things for sale, something for everyone, wander in and browse, and while you're there have a cup of tea, on them...

I have details on all of the above, so please contact me if you would like more information. (443-2869)

Until next month, have a great holiday, and let us all pray that we have a peaceful end to the Middle East crisis.

## Senior Citizens' News

Jeanette presided at the November 13, 1990 meeting.

Our trip to see "The Hit Parade" at "Lily Langtree" in Valley Forge, PA was enjoyed by all. All performances were good—the comedian was excellent.

Our member, Sue Schmidt, has suffered a stroke. We're rooting for a complete recovery. Sue came from Minnesota a few years ago and joined our club shortly after.

We discussed the necessity for those who don't file income taxes to be sure that they receive the forms and get them in on time or we'll lose them in 1991. Jeanette will check this for us.

We receive "commodities" once a month at the Solar Village from 12 to 12:30 on the designated date. Don't be late or you'll lose them.

Nettie DeVito and Betty Perrine celebrate birthdays this month. Two beautiful (and delicious) cakes were there for them but both of them were sick and couldn't attend. Get well fast, Nettie and Betty.

Many discussions took place about future trips and luncheons. We hope to go to the Golden Coach on December 4 or 7 (1 p.m.).

Gus Chasan and Birdie Soifer were our hostesses. They set a beautiful table (tasted good too!).

—Helga Wisowaty, Secretary

## Arts in Roosevelt

# Les Weiner's RAP Event

by David Herrstrom

I invite a friend to go with me to a "reading" of a play, and she looks at me as if I had asked her to attend a performance of Beethoven's 7th on the kazoo. "Let me get this straight," her dismissive look says, "you're asking me to go to a play where the actors could be mistaken for the audience, and the scenery for the Borough Hall?"

I went anyway. It was live radio at the Roosevelt Borough Hall. A familiar place without distractions, so words thrust into the foreground, crackling with the life of argument, compassion, sarcasm, laughter. I went simply because language played on the voices of fine actors is invigorating. Of course, you have to have a good score to begin with, and Les Weiner provided it in three one-act plays, which were presented on October 6. Their voice performance, with Laurie Altman's apt musical introductions, launched the Roosevelt Arts Project's (RAP) 1990-91 season and fifth year of offering the work of local artists to the community.

### Comedy-Dramas

You could call all three plays "comedy-dramas," single dramatic encounters explored with understanding in the rhythms of wise-cracking America. The first, *Milo's Venus*, centered on the revelation of infidelity one evening by the Venus that Milo has been living with for awhile. The thrust and parry of a weary couple, who are cleaning up after a late-night party with the cloud of a dreaded, early workday morning hanging over them, are totally, unnervingly recognizable.

The lack of scenery and gesture puts more of a burden on the words, but Les captured the building tension and sudden release of argument, and he was lucky to have this convincingly realized in the timing and voices of two accomplished actors, Nelle Stokes and Joel McGuire. Les caught the inflections of Milo the car mechanic, by turns macho and conciliatory, petty and generous, caught the difference between bickering and fighting. And I

wanted to go on savoring the delicious irony of Venus's Milo, shaped by her at last.

*Laughing String* and *From the Heartland*, the middle and last plays of the evening, were linked by a character who is the son in one and father in the other. The 60-year-old son visits his cantankerous but charming 89-year-old father. The father, a successful businessman, is disappointed in his son, an unsuccessful playwright. Sounds like a setup for all the old clichés. But the father keeps a hard keel against his son's undertow of anguished resignation, and both are brought wonderfully to life by Salem Ludwig and Allan Salkin. We are left moved by their struggling in a net of disappointments—in each other, in themselves—and, at the same time, exhilarated by their loving that allows forgiveness—of each other, of themselves.

The conflict of the last play is between a father, the son in the previous, and his successful lawyer-daughter, now returned to New York after six years in Cincinnati, the "heartland." The continuity of the son become the father and the similarity of one generation's conflict to another's puts into sharp relief the subtle differences between the father-son and father-daughter relationships. The father and the daughter, played by Allan Salkin and Nelle Stokes, re-enact the scenario of disappointment, with a fine twist that the daughter is successful but not in the right way for her father.

*Laughing String* was worth the whole evening, and I will continue to attend play "readings," even though they are no more plays than Gershwin's piano setting of "Rhapsody in Blue" is his symphony. But who would not want to hear each for its own sake?

## Election Results

(continued from page 1)

The newly-elected councilmen will succeed Marilyn Magnes, Jim Alt and Warren Craig. On most major issues in the past year on which there has been a division of opinion, the three retiring council members, together with Councilman Kirk Rothfuss, have regularly constituted the majority, with Councilmen Bill Counterman and Howard Prezant in opposition. The three new councilmen, however, were endorsed by, and have expressed general support of, Messrs. Counterman and Prezant, while Mr. Rothfuss endorsed Messrs. John-Alder and Garton.

In other races, Roosevelt once again proved to be its maverick Democratic self. Senator Bill Bradley won reelection by an unexpectedly small margin state wide, but he defeated Republican Christine Whitman 324 to 124 in Roosevelt. Congressman Chris Smith defeated Democrat Mark Setaro by an overall vote of 100,089 to 55,073. Mr. Setaro won in Roosevelt 280 to 150, but lost to Mr. Smith in every other municipality in the Fourth Congressional District aside from Trenton.

In the race for two seats on the Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders, the Roosevelt totals for Democrats Frank Abate and Burt Morachnick were 266 and 267 respectively, while those for their Republican opponents, Harry Larrison, Jr. and Tom Powers were 114 and 110. The results for the whole county, however, were quite the opposite, with the Democrats getting 63,416 and 60,927 to the Republicans' 80,639 and 80,563.

The proposal to authorize \$135 million in State housing bonds was approved in Roosevelt by 261 to 115 but was narrowly defeated state wide. Proposals concerning Sunday horse racing and betting on races in casinos were approved in Roosevelt by margins of 241 to 116 and 204 to 147. Both were also approved statewide.

The total number of votes cast in Roosevelt was 481, which is approximately 75% of those registered.

## Genealogy

# Roosevelt's Civil War Connection

by Michael Ticktin

On July 4, 1863, after a long siege, the city of Vicksburg, Mississippi surrendered to Union forces under General Ulysses S. Grant. With this victory, the Union secured complete control of the Mississippi River and Grant was well on his way to becoming the commander of all the Union armies. With the Union in control of the Mississippi, the Confederate West, which included Texas and those parts of Louisiana and Arkansas not under Federal control, was cut off from the rest of the South. Its continued existence as a self-sufficient Confederate bastion thus became the responsibility of its military commander, General Edmund Kirby-Smith.

### Last to Surrender

General Kirby-Smith's greatest distinction was that he was the last Confederate general to surrender his command. Contrary to popular belief, the Civil War did not end with Robert E. Lee's surrender of his army to Grant at Appomattox Court House on April 9, 1865. Regardless of what happened in the East, Kirby-Smith had no intention of surrendering. When Confederate President Jefferson Davis and his government fled Richmond as Grant's armies closed in, it was their hope to be able to reach Texas, which had been independent only 20 years earlier and where Kirby-Smith hoped to continue resistance for years and thereby keep the Confederacy alive. Kirby-Smith did not surrender his command until May 26, 1865, after Davis had been captured and, even then, only because most of his army had gone home. Only then was the Civil War over.

### The Unsung Hero

General Montgomery Meigs was the quartermaster general of the Union army. According to Professor James McPherson, author of the award-winning **Battle Cry of Freedom**, he was the "unsung hero of Northern victory" who was largely responsible for the

fact that the Union army was "the best fed, most lavishly supplied army that had ever existed." His engineering accomplishments included the new Capitol dome, the Potomac Aqueduct and, after the war, the design of the Pensions Building. As quartermaster general, he oversaw the spending of \$1.5 billion, which was nearly half the direct cost of the Union war effort. He kept costs down by insisting on competitive bidding. He also introduced the concept of requiring manufacturers to use graduated standard measurements for uniforms. This was the origin of the selling of clothing by sizes that became a feature of the civilian economy after the war.

A Georgian by birth, Meigs' antipathy towards Robert E. Lee for having put state loyalty before national loyalty reflected the fact that he was one of that small group of military professionals from the South who had made the opposite choice and put the Union first. (This select group, for the benefit of those who are interested, also included General George H. Thomas, a Virginian, who saved the Army of the Cumberland at Chickamauga and destroyed the Confederate Army of Tennessee at Nashville while General Sherman was marching through Georgia, and Admiral David Farragut, a Tennessean, who captured New Orleans and helped ensure President Lincoln's re-election by capturing Mobile Bay with his famous order of "Damn the torpedoes—full speed ahead!") It was thus on Meigs' recommendation that Lee's estate at Arlington was made into a national cemetery so that Lee would never be able to live there again.

### The Connection

What, then, do these two military leaders have in common and, more to the point, what do they have to do with Roosevelt? What they have in common is that they are both great-grandfathers of our own long-time

resident, school board member, crossing guard, summer camp and drama group organizer, etc., Margaret Schlinski. Edmund Kirby-Smith was her mother's mother's father, while the fact that Margaret's maiden name was Meigs should make that relationship self-evident. She has long known about Kirby-Smith, indeed she has a picture of him in her living room, but she realized that Montgomery Meigs was a person of comparable importance only when the Arlington episode was mentioned in the recent television mini-series on the Civil War.

*[Note to all readers: If you have any stories about your ancestors that may be of interest to the community, please share them through the **Bulletin**.]*

## Synagogue News

This year, Chanuka begins at sundown on December 12 and ends on December 20. On Saturday evening, December 15, starting at 5:30, we plan to have our customary *latke* party, together with Israeli dancing and an art workshop for children. Everyone is invited. Please contact Director Shlomo Weiss for details (426-4238).

The Sisterhood is selling "entertainment books" for \$35 each. These books contain coupons that can be used for thousands of dollars worth of savings at restaurants, stores and other businesses both in and out of our local area. To get your book, please call Lynn Friedman at 448-5186, or Nona Sherak at 448-2797.

We wish all our members and neighbors a joyous holiday season.

—Michael Ticktin, President



## Viewpoint

by Marilyn Magnes

There is on the 1889 Atlas of Monmouth County an area labeled Paradise. In 1937 this area was incorporated and given the name Jersey Homesteads, which in 1945 was renamed Roosevelt. This article describes the trouble in Paradise as I saw it in my tenure as councilwoman from 1988 to 1990.

Trouble often takes the most mundane of forms; our particular burden is called the waste water rehabilitation project. While the cost of building the whole of the original town was about \$3.5 million, it is estimated that the cost of the waste water rehabilitation project will be about \$2.4 million. This article will give my view of how the council went about its work to solve this crisis. It had to learn about the events that took place prior to 1988, gather information on the nature of the problem and the actors involved, consider the choices, and make decisions.

### History

This crisis is the collision of two facts:

- This town, its first buildings and its underground structures, was built in the years 1935 to 1938. In the ensuing years our sewer system, over fifty years old, has become out of date and deteriorated.
- The environmental movement has become institutionalized in the form of various federal and state agencies. These have mandated increasingly tougher standards as to what individuals, businesses and communities can do to Mother Nature. The agency in this state responsible for enforcing these standards is the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).

Thus, as the condition of our infrastructure worsened, the environmental laws became more exacting.

It was during the 1970's that Congress began to enact laws to reduce air and water pollution. By the end of the

70's Roosevelt came under the scrutiny of federal enforcers who later transferred this charge to the state, in the form of DEP. Not only was the sewer plant not meeting defined standards, our water plant was also under more stringent regulations. Mandates were given to the Borough to encourage compliance with the laws. The councils during the late 70's and early 80's borrowed money and upgraded the water treatment plant. The sewer system was next.

The strategy of the previous council (1985 - 1988) was, through negotiation with DEP, to reconstruct the sewer system incrementally over a ten year period so that user fees would not have to be dramatically increased at any one time. However, the DEP refused to accept that strategy and told Roosevelt it must clean up its act by an immovable deadline or face stiff monetary penalties. The Borough has agreed to meet mandated standards set by federal and state law by February 1992.

Specifically, in an Administrative Consent Order (ACO), signed in 1985, Roosevelt has agreed to both reduce the quantity and improve the quality of the effluent discharged from the sewage treatment plant into the Assunpink.

Currently the quantity of treated waste water the Borough's sewer plant discharges averages much more than the DEP allows.

Furthermore our plant must be able to do a better job of removing pollutants, i.e. improve the quality of the effluent that is being discharged.

The ACO also defines the stages of the project necessary to correct these deficiencies and a deadline for submission to DEP of the plan of each stage. Stage I is a study of the problem and preliminary design of the solution to the problem. Stage II is a detailed construction design plan and stage III is the implementation of the design - namely the physical construction.

That, in essence, is our problem - we must, under a deadline, spend a lot of money to fix the problem, or pay a large fine and still spend a lot of money

# Trouble in

to fix the problem. Or walk away from it—which we chose not to do as a council.

So the first step toward correcting the problem defined by the DEP was to become knowledgeable about the details of what was causing the problem.

### Problem Analysis

The quality of the discharge can be improved through the installation of newer technology at the treatment plant. A relatively straightforward rehabilitation project at the plant will bring us into compliance with current quality standards as set by the DEP.

Reducing the quantity of effluent discharged has proved to be a more complicated undertaking. After water is used in a home it enters a lateral pipe which carries it to a main pipe underneath our roads. A network of mains carries this waste water to the sewer plant for treatment before it is discharged into the Assunpink. Except for a section on Lake Drive, the system works on gravity; running through the pipe on its own force. In addition to the mains under the roads there are some sections of pipe that run through wooded undeveloped land. This collection system was installed over fifty years ago and the laterals as well as the mains are misaligned, broken and in some cases collapses have occurred, all due to settling, root intrusions and the like. In addition manholes are in disrepair and manhole covers are not water tight.

Because Roosevelt is situated in a high water table area, a lot of ground water enters the deteriorated mains, laterals and manholes. This is known as Infiltration.

Because the old manhole covers are not leak proof, rain water also easily enters the system from the surface. This is known as Inflow. Together this extraneous water entering the system is termed Infiltration and Inflow—I/I. It is the reduction of I/I and the means to correct it that is the nub of this article.

# Paradise

Studies have been conducted to determine the sections where the I/I problem is most severe. There has been general agreement from two engineering firms that at this time the most severe I/I problems occur on Farm Lane, a section of North Valley and in pipes running through the woods off South Rochdale and out to Tamara Drive. Although there are other areas in town where a great deal of I/I occurs, we have been advised that this type of project should attack those areas furthest from the plant and with the most severe infiltration problems.

In the following chart we can see the estimated amount of I/I and the extent to which we are beyond compliance with DEP discharge limits.

Amounts are in average gallons per day:

- Volume exiting the waste treatment plant: 350,000
- Excess volume entering the system (I/I): 237,000
- Volume limit mandated by DEP: 250,000
- Volume by which we are over for compliance: 100,000

In broad terms the problem is - our waste disposal system is so disrupted that the amount of ground water entering the sewer pipes is more than twice the amount of the waste water generated by householders - hence we are over the limit set by DEP for how much they have permitted us to discharge from the plant into the Assunpink.

## Project History 1988 to 1990

In 1988 when I took office as councilwoman, work had already begun on attacking the problem. A section of main running through the woods from the end of Brown Street was cut off, a section of pipe passing through woods on the south side of Pine Drive was replaced and other mandated improvements were undertaken to both the water and sewer systems.

Studies and planning for rehabilitation of the plant and further I/I work were under way in preparation for

Stage I documents to be submitted to DEP for their approval. William Birdsall, Borough Engineer, submitted a plan for an innovative low technology, low cost approach to improving the quality of the discharge - this was promptly rejected by DEP. By the end of 1988 Mr Birdsall had prepared a conventional plan for rehabilitation of the sewer plant as well as a plan for replacement of main and lateral pipes in time to meet a DEP deadline for submission of the final Stage I report of the project.

In January 1989 the council voted to hire Kevin Toolan of T & M Engineering firm as the Borough Engineer. After reviewing the plans devised by Birdsall, Toolan expressed reservations about the amount of I/I reduction that could be accomplished through the work outlined in that plan. Because we were under pressure to meet the deadline and uncertain as to which engineer's estimates were correct, the council with the Mayor's concurrence voted to submit Birdsall's plans and await DEP's comments. The Stage I plant rehabilitation plans and the I/I reduction plans were both approved by DEP. (It should be noted that we learned that approval from DEP should not be construed to mean that the work will accomplish the stated outcomes; that is left to the Borough's judgment.)

Mr Toolan then began Stage II, the design phase of the project, which ultimately resulted in the specifications being published to obtain contractors' bids for construction. Early in 1990 DEP approved the design for the sewer plant rehabilitation and for the pipe replacement project. However, the process also includes numerous other approvals and permits. The last permit was approved several weeks ago. It should be noted that it took all of nine months for DEP to make this last approval. Advertisements for bids were published for a November 28, 1990 deadline for submission by contractors.

After DEP approval of the construction designs a proposal was made that the council consider another method

for reducing the I/I. Instead of replacing the sewer pipes, necessitating digging up and road replacement, the question was asked—why not use a method that simply inserts a liner through the existing pipe? The proposed advantages would be less disruption to residents along with cost savings.

Insituform, the only company currently offering this product in the area, was contacted to make a presentation to the Mayor and council. All council members became informed about the product and conferred with T & M on their evaluation of its use in Roosevelt.

The council continued to explore this option through additional meetings with Insituform and T & M with respect to cost relative to the more conventional pipe replacement solution, and effectiveness in reducing I/I again relative to pipe replacement.

The council now was faced with an array of options to consider for the rehabilitation of the underground pipes, our collection system.

## Options

Stages I and II submitted and approved by DEP call for pipe improvements to be made on: a portion of North Valley to the intersection of Farm Lane, all of Farm Lane, and an L shaped section running through woods from South Rochdale on the south side of Tamara and then out to Tamara. *Because Insituform does not currently have a method for inserting the pipe liner product into laterals, their proposals can only address improvements to the mains.* In two of the following options where a combination of pipe lining and conventional replacement are called for it has been assumed that a sub or second contractor would be involved to perform the pipe replacement of laterals. Note: All options are purported to reach the same results: a reduction of discharge from the plant into the Assunpink from 350,000 gpd to an estimated range of 300,000 to 310,000 gpd.

*continued on following page*

## Trouble in Paradise *(continued from previous page)*

### Option I

A. Work proposed: a portion of North Valley Road to the intersection with Farm Lane, all of Farm Lane, *elimination* of main from South Rochdale through the woods and out to Tamara to be replaced by new mains and laterals on South Rochdale and Tamara Drive.

B. Method: Main and lateral replacement with pipe, manhole replacement and replacement of manhole covers. Curb to curb repavement with asphalt.

C. Estimated cost: \$692,800

*Advantages:* Plan was submitted and approved by DEP. All main and lateral pipes in these sections will be removed and replaced with new pipe. Farm Lane and a portion of N. Valley will be repaved. Since Farm Lane has been designated as the next street for road repair it will have to be done anyway.

*Disadvantages:* Requires extensive disturbance of roads. May inconvenience travelers and residents. Section of pipe at corner of Tamara and S. Rochdale will be 20 feet below ground. At present the deepest manhole is 14 feet.

### Option II

A. Work proposed: Same area as above.

B. Method: Main and lateral replacement with pipe, manhole repairs and replacement of manhole covers on Farm Lane, portions of N. Valley, S. Rochdale and Tamara. Use of pipe liner (Insituform) in area through woods on S. Rochdale to Tamara. Road repavement of Farm Lane, portion of N. Valley, S. Rochdale and Tamara.

C. Estimated cost: Ranges from \$642,982 to \$696,237

*Advantages:* By leaving section through the woods in place it would eliminate the need to dig up on corner of S. Rochdale and Tamara Drive.

*Disadvantage:* A change of plans to this method will require additional approvals from DEP, time delays, additional engineering, readvertisement of bids and the ensuing costs. The condition of pipe running through the woods is uncertain. When Insituform

attempted to do a TV inspection of this area they were unable to do so because of debris and other obstructions. If area through the woods has to be dug up DEP involvement may ensue since it is a protected wetlands. Since Insituform does not do pipe replacement, another contractor would have to be involved on the job. Scheduling and coordination may become complex and lead to further time delays and additional costs.

### Option III

A. Work proposed: Same area as above.

B. Method: Insert liner in main on Farm Lane, a portion of N. Valley and through section of woods between S. Rochdale and Tamara. Replace laterals from main to curb line on Farm Lane. Repave road on Farm Lane and N. Valley. Repair manholes and replace manhole covers.

C. Estimated cost: \$651,000

*Advantages:* Eliminates necessity to completely dig up roads. Reduces inconvenience to residents and travelers. May reduce amount of time for construction.

*Disadvantages:* Requires additional engineering work, DEP approval and readvertisement of bid. Will add time and costs to project. Road will have to be dug up and repaved. Two contractors will be involved on the job. Deteriorated pipes will be left in place.

### Option IV

A. Work proposed: repair 2/3 of the original unrepaired mains.

B. Method: Pipe liner insertion through mains only.

C. Estimated cost: 18,000 linear feet @ \$75/ft.=\$1,350,000

*Advantages:* Ostensibly, does not require disruption of road surfaces. Insituform only contractor on the job. Could reduce time required for repair.

*Disadvantages:* Does not repair or replace items needed to reduce inflow of surface water. Nor does it address deteriorated laterals and manholes. Should outcome not provide enough reduction in infiltration of ground water, additional work would be required involving lateral replacement and ensuing road repair.

### Analysis of Options

*Costs:* The cost projected for Option IV does not include: cutouts for every lateral connection in town at a cost of \$247,500, pipe cleaning which is necessary prior to insertion of the liner at a cost of up to \$103,306, costs for dig ups where pipe obstructions or collapses have occurred, and costs for manhole repair and inflow items. Insituform provided three different quotes per linear foot for the pipe liner itself. I have used the lowest as an estimate. On the face of it, the other three options are relatively comparable in cost although, option III is lower by some \$40,000. However, cost projections for both option II and III do not include the additional engineering work resubmission to DEP, and rebidding of the projects.

Therefore, I have dismissed option IV as not viable and I see no appreciable cost saving by using pipe liner as in Options II and III instead of pipe replacement.

*Disruption to the community:* Options I, II, and III all require curb to curb repavement of Farm Lane. Options II and III use pipe lining through the wooded section. This would reduce the inconvenience to residents and reduce traffic problems at the intersection of S. Rochdale and Tamara. At the end of the work day all dug up areas would be filled so that access is possible.

Therefore, Option II and III present no inconvenience at the S. Rochdale Tamara intersection and the inconvenience is the same for Options I, II, III on Farm Lane.

*Construction Time:* It is purported that the pipe lining method would shorten the time for reconstruction of the mains. This assumes that the liner can be inserted with little or no work to clear obstructions and collapses. Option I has been approved by DEP and advertised for bids. Any change in the plans, such as using pipe liner, necessitates additional engineering work on the design, resubmission for DEP approval, reworking the specifications, and readvertisement for bids.

Therefore, the time saved in using either of the two pipe lining methods



could be off set by the processing time of the changes.

**Future maintenance and repairs:** Currently the mains and laterals suffer from offset joints, cracks and holes. Offset joints will not be corrected by inserting liner and it is possible that debris could collect where the liner bends to follow this curve. Mr. Toolan has cautioned us that this may present a continuous maintenance problem. Should there be breaks in the lining or should the product fail there has not been an explanation of how these repairs could be made. If the pipe lining equipment has to be brought in each time a repair is needed this would be a costly repair and it is not known if this would effect the structural integrity of the lining. If liner were used in the section of the wooded area from S. Rochdale to Tamara a failure in this section would require working in an area protected by DEP and might require their involvement in the process and would certainly add engineering fees to the cost of the repair.

Repair of conventional pipe would require digging and road replacement, a method we currently use and know. Of concern in Option I is the depth of the pipe at S. Rochdale and Tamara. As stated a depth of 20 feet must be used in order to attain the proper slope for gravity feed. (A lift station could have been used to bring the waste to the connection, but given our experiences with this technology on Lake Drive, it was not recommended.)

Therefore, I believe that future repairs and maintenance of the system would be less complex and expensive with conventional pipe replacement.

**Product integrity:** The pipe liner method is a relatively new technology. Its contractor, Insituform, has stated that its strength and life of about fifty years is the same as conventional pipe. The product is inserted through existing pipe which is left in place under the road system. The badly deteriorated sections may not provide the structural support for the inserted liner and leave weak areas prone to failure.

Therefore, for a project of this magnitude and cost burden to the residents, I prefer to rely on a known

product to be used in the reconstruction of the sewer collection system.

**Additional costs of project:** The following costs are not included in the amount stated for each of the above options.

During the construction phase of any of the options, engineering inspections are required to assure the Borough that the work is properly done. For Option I the cost of performance inspections is estimated to be approximately \$50,000. (The figure you may have heard of \$175,000 is for both the sewer treatment plant and the collection system.) At the present time bids are being solicited for award of this contract.

Costs are estimated to be lower for pipe liner inspections. For Option III using pipe liner for mains and replacing the laterals with pipe, the estimated inspection cost is \$30,000. I am assuming that it is similar for Option II since I could not find a stated figure.

Seven and one half percent (7.5%) for contingencies can be used for each of the options. This is the figure used by Mr Toolan. Contingency costs are derived by multiplying the percentage times the construction cost to cover unforeseen problems necessitating a change to the specifications.

Therefore, the inspection fees when using liner may be lower. However, the 7.5 percent contingency may not be adequate to cover the liner method since no costs are included in the construction amount for obstructions, which require the digging up of roads, removing the obstruction and replacing the road. I am particularly concerned about these additional costs.

#### **Conclusions:**

If we are simply to follow the Borough engineer's analyses and conclusions, then we should, as we have already twice voted, opt for the pipe replacement option (Option I above) without further ado or justification.

However, notwithstanding the professional's opinion, I voted for Option I, the pipe replacement option, for the following reasons:

- It's old, unexciting but proven technology.

- It guarantees addressing the whole problem where installed (arresting I/I through laterals, mains, manholes and manhole covers).
- Strategically, its use has already gone through the DEP approval process.
- Maintenance is a relatively known quantity.
- Contingency costs are relatively likely to fall within a fixed percentage of the total cost.

As I, and a majority of the council, saw it, any of the options using the pipe liner had these drawbacks:

- It is an immature technology with no possible history of integrity over the required lifespan of a sewer system which is measured in decades.
- I do not know of any way of repairing it replacement. Maintenance costs are unknown.
- From a strategic point of view, its use would require a resubmission of plans to DEP, placing us liable to greater fines.
- Because it cannot address the whole problem ( I/I through the laterals, manholes ), it has to be used in conjunction with pipe replacement—thus involving two contractors and a potential mismatch between two different technologies.
- Its effectiveness, when placed through a system as damaged as ours is (offset pipes, intruded tree roots, etc.), is in considerable doubt.
- The specter of large contingency costs (again, given the state of our system ) could haunt a project using pipeliner.

With costs of construction and inspection being approximately equal (excluding Option IV which I summarily dismissed ) my primary fear is that this seductively simply pipe lining method may lead us into costly overruns of completely unknown proportions.

In good conscience I could not have acted otherwise.

## Viewpoint

# The View From Pine Drive

by Henry John-Alder

I wish to congratulate the three newly-elected members of Council and to wish them well as they work with the incumbents to meet our challenges. I encourage all of us in Roosevelt to join together in greeting the "New Dawn" and to work together so that we will be greeting the dawn of a new age of reason.

I also wish to encourage people to take an active interest in community affairs. The business of Council is *our* business, and the records of Council business are *our* records. But while the Council meets publicly and solicits public input, we private citizens ultimately bear the responsibility of informing ourselves about our business and of becoming involved in our town's progress. We can blame only ourselves if events transpire without our input.

For my part, I would like to use this column to continue the public dialogue that I initiated while campaigning. (I hope that what I write sparks interest and that readers will respond in letters to the *Bulletin*.) The newly-elected members of Council have publicly disagreed with the way in which the present Council has handled the sanitary sewer project. Thus, it would now be appropriate to again solicit the views of the Councilmembers, and, if we hear convincing arguments before contractual commitments are made, to change our course of action. However, in the absence of convincing arguments to the contrary, the present Council members should proceed as they think best and should not simply defer to the next council. In my judgment, the major decisions about the sewer project have been consistent with the strongest evidentiary projections and have not been politically motivated. The arguments for a major role of Insituform have simply not been compelling. If stronger arguments have been or can be made, they should now be made publicly and opened to public scrutiny, particularly as some of the strongest proponents of Insituform will soon be public officials.

Remember, however, that no new arguments were voiced at two recent Council meetings when Kirk Rothfuss explicitly solicited new information. Let us also remember that within the past year, most of us were seriously worried about the \$512,000 fine that DEP continues to hold over us. Presently, our worries have subsided, and one reason for the change of emphasis is that we have progressed in a reasonable and timely manner. My personal view is that DEP will be inclined to eliminate or greatly reduce fines, as long as we have made good progress at the time of evaluation. However, we could jeopardize this new calm by taking more time for study.

The other major issue that I had hoped would have been discussed during the campaign is the future vitality of Roosevelt. This issue is sometimes known as "development" or "growth and prosperity". These terms, I think, are misnomers. Nobody would deny Roosevelt as much prosperity as possible, and experts agree that pressure to develop will again reappear. However, we should all be able to agree that growth will not guarantee improved prosperity. Indeed, if growth were poorly planned, it could not only insult our aesthetic sensibilities but also worsen our financial plight. The formula for improved prosperity may include growth, but prosperity is not an obligate result of growth. Furthermore, if growth is no better than pay-as-you-go, then what could be an argument in its favor? Surely, few among us find structures to be more visually appealing than natural and agricultural landscapes. If growth is no better than pay-as-you-go, then the real question becomes "How little will it hurt?", not "How much will it help?". We must conduct our studies thoroughly and devise our plans thoughtfully. And we must realize that even in the best of circumstances, growth will never be the financial panacea that some might envision.

Roosevelt, as small towns usually are, will always be expensive.

I will close with some personal reflections on my campaign. The experience was exciting, uplifting, insightful, depressing, and exhausting. I met a lot of very fine people, I made some very good friends, and I met an unfortunate few who will be content to believe without second thought the things they are told by their friends. I feel comfortable with what I wrote and said, because my entire campaign was conducted publicly and was drawn from the public record. At the same time, my campaign injected awkwardness into some of my personal relationships. Margaret Schlinski was right on target in expressing her reluctance to be "a joiner in the Roosevelt sense". Margaret expressed her fear of accepting doctrine at face value, of losing her identity and power to reason, of losing her friendships and of overlooking what friendship really means. I can personally attest that her fears are not baseless. Nonetheless, we have to intellectualize and overcome these fears and not let them prevent us from doing what we think is right. I decided to run for office not because I had accepted one doctrine or another, not because I had lost my identity and my power to reason, not because I was insensitive toward friends, not even because of some overriding sense of civic responsibility. I decided to run for office because, after hearing the discussions and arguments about the sewer project, and after reading his recent writings, I felt strongly that the candidate I challenged had not made the best decisions. I decided to run because I think I can do better and because I think Roosevelt deserves better. My reasoned disagreements with one of the candidates were not personal and should not have been interpreted as evidence that I had embraced one group, even if some who supported me would likely have voted for almost anyone other than the candidates on the ballot. That decision was theirs, not mine. I have not ac-

## Planning Board *(continued from page 1)*

cepted one doctrine, I have not lost my personal identity, and I have not lost my power to reason. Judge me by my thoughts and actions, not by those who gave me their votes. I resent having been cast into one group or another, and I regret things that were misconstrued as evidence of my having become doctrinaire. Most of all, I regret the strain that my campaign placed on some of my friendships. This, I think, is what makes small-town politics so difficult. We all know or know of each other, and, under these circumstances, it is not easy to accept critical challenges philosophically without feeling some personal insult. However, if we are to move forward with the strongest possible community profile, we have to engage in rigorous public scrutiny of our community affairs, and that means we must critically analyze what we as individuals have said and done. We have to be careful to focus always on the record, and we must be careful not to pass information carelessly by word of mouth. We have to speak charitably of each other and to interpret charitably what others say. We have to realize that we do not always speak as thoughtfully and we do not always listen as philosophically as we should. We have to be prepared for some hurt feelings, some bruised egos, some strained friendships. But none of this is justification for retreating from public involvement. The best thing we can do for our friendships is to be sure that we as a community move forward in the most sensible way we know. Sometimes, sensibility may not appear at first blush to be equivalent to sensitivity, but we must learn to welcome critical scrutiny of our contributions and to defer to those who suggest a better way.

local government or conservation organization to assist in a specific project to save open space. Next, after the local group demonstrates that it has a workable plan, TPL acquires the land, a process which often involves negotiating with a number of different owners. (This multiple ownership is often the biggest obstacle to preservation by a local government or conservation group.) The last step involves TPL's transfer of the land back to the local group for permanent conservation.

Such a process obviously requires substantial funding. In some cases, the funding comes from state or local bonds or appropriations, and TPL is needed only to acquire and hold the land until the funding is available. In other cases, the local government might decide that limited development is an acceptable quid-pro-quo for the permanent preservation of the remaining open space. Where that is the case, TPL's job is to acquire and hold the land until the necessary arrangements for this limited development can be made.

It is this second plan that the Roosevelt Planning Board endorsed in concept on November 7, 1990. As a preliminary step, the Board reviewed a draft "Planning Study" prepared by former Board Chairman Alan Mallach before his resignation last month to become Trenton's Director of Housing. The Draft Planning Study notes the tension between, first, the desire to preserve as open space this area of the Borough, which Mallach describes as a "gateway" into Roosevelt, and second, the pressure for development, which some residents believe may help to ease the financial pressures on current residents due to rising water/sewer costs. The Draft Planning Study sug-

gests that both of these interests might be accommodated simultaneously in a plan for limited development combined with substantial farmland preservation, implemented with the assistance of TPL.

Several steps must be taken before such a plan can proceed, and the purpose of the November 28 special joint meeting is to permit the Council to consider whether to undertake this route. First, TPL requires the commitment of the Borough behind such a project before it will proceed with its part. A formal planning study is also required, and the source of funds for conducting this study must be identified. These and other issues will undoubtedly be addressed by the Council on November 28th and at ensuing Council meetings.

In other business, Planning Board member Gail Hunton reported that both she and Alan Mallach addressed the Rutgers landscape architecture students as part of their seminar examining development options for the same 500 acres in north Roosevelt. The student projects are due to be completed this month, and the Board agreed to invite the students to present their projects to the community at a later meeting. (Although no definite date was set, Ms. Hunton later indicated that this meeting is likely to be set for some time in early January.) Several Board members noted, in this regard, that everyone should remember in reviewing the student proposals that these are simply the reflection of a class assignment, and are not related to any specific development project. The Board's next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 5, 1990.

**What's the view from your street?  
Write for the Bulletin!**



## — Letters —

To the Editor:

A special thanks to all those volunteers who worked for 6 hours Friday, November 2 flushing our water hydrant system to help keep our drinking water clean and clear: John Parrot, Hank Parrot, Ron Filipe, Scott Hartman, Scott Frazier, Tom Patterson and Steve Yeger. Also, thanks to our Water Operator, Ed Davis, for keeping a watchful eye on our system as we worked. We have been steadily getting more and more experienced hydrant volunteers, and we want to again thank those folks who have helped in the past.

—Mayor and Borough Council

To the Editor:

I thank all the voters in town. It is a nice feeling to have received such a large vote of confidence. I deeply appreciate the support you have given during and after the elections. You can avail yourself of me anytime, to address your concerns and questions.

Thank You  
Stu Kaufman

To the Editor:

To all of my friends and neighbors who supported me with your efforts and votes in this past election I extend my sincere thanks for a job well done.

To the rest of you I offer a pledge to work with you as well in the upcoming year. Our problems require all of our efforts pulling in one direction.

With humility, cooperation, hard work, and some luck we have an excellent chance of succeeding. The alternative is unacceptable.

Lee R. Allen (448-6978)

To the Editor:

My sincere thanks to all my friends and fellow residents for your encouragement, your support and your votes for Lee, Stu and me. You kept the team together. We will work very hard to continue to deserve the confidence your votes expressed on June 5th and again on November 6th.

For me, the best part of the campaign was the opportunity to talk with so many of you; we will continue to exchange viewpoints and ideas. We will keep you informed of our work.

There is so much to be done when we take office in January. We can do it if we work together.

—Peter B. Warren

To the Editor:

I am enclosing below a copy of a letter sent to the Roosevelt Borough Council so that you may inform the public of its contents.

Thank you for your assistance.

Lee R. Allen

November 9, 1990

Borough of Roosevelt

Roosevelt, New Jersey

The Mayor and Council:

At all levels of government; national, state, county, and municipal, it is in everyone's best interest to provide for a smooth transition between the time of the election in November and the time of taking office in January with a transition team assuming interim responsibilities.

In Roosevelt, you, as elected officials in the outgoing council have the moral obligation not to commit the newly elected members of the incoming council to a binding course of action.

The election of November 6, 1990 gave the three of us, Lee Allen, Stuart Kaufman, and Peter Warren, a mandate by majority vote from the people of Roosevelt. We ask you, the outgoing members of the council, to respect the wishes of the people.

Lee Allen  
Stuart Kaufman  
Peter Warren

To the Editor:

Regarding the letter written by Lee Allen, Stuart Kaufman and Peter Warren to the Mayor and Council dated November 9, 1990, and published in the **Bulletin** this month, my response is horse feathers.

If you want to form a transition team for new council members, I would be happy to meet with you, as we have in the past. But this is not really what your letter is about. Although you don't want to make it clear in your letter, what you are asking is that the current Council postpone awarding the sewer pipe line replacement contract. For you to ask the current Council to hold up this project, when you have been blasting past Councils for inaction, is outrageous.

You have advocated the Insituform product. I have done my best to allow all advocates of Insituform to present their arguments. Thousands of

taxpayers' dollars have been spent on the debate. I am not convinced that the additional time and money necessary to include Insituform as an alternate technology is in the best interest of our town. I do not see the savings, and I do not believe the technology is comparable to what the current design requires. I see no benefit to further delay.

Please don't tell me what my moral obligations are. My responsibility as a Councilperson, also elected, is to do what I believe is in the best interest of the town. As far as committing the next Council to a binding course of action, you should have realized the reality of being a Councilperson before you ran. Councils make their best decisions on issues which will affect the town for years to come. And subsequent Councils have to work with this reality. None of the current Council members took any of their decisions regarding our multi-million dollar sewer project lightly. And they will not now.

I do respect the wishes of the people of Roosevelt, and through all the debate this year I hear one underlying theme; get the show on the road. You may have your day. The bids may come in too high, financing may not fall in place for some time, any number of events could hold the award of contracts until 1991. But if the current Council is in a position to award the contracts in 1990, I believe I have a legal obligation to vote to do so. We are under threat of heavy fines if we delay, and we are seven months behind schedule. You yourselves have repeatedly expressed your concerns about this fact.

I sincerely offer my congratulations to all of you. But I hope you all realize that with your victory comes the frustrations, and sometimes heart wrenching decisions that all prior Councilpersons before you have experienced.

Sincerely,  
Kirk Rothfuss, Councilman

**Support  
the  
Bulletin**

## — Letters —

To the Editor:

A recent letter signed by the councilmen-elect requests the Mayor and Council to work with them as a transition team to assure continuity in council matters. They also asked the outgoing council to refrain from making commitments that would be binding on the new council.

I am available to meet with them and provide any information that would enable them to assume their responsibilities on the first of the year. I am also available to discuss changes in the structure of the council that would improve its operation. For I too believe that a smooth transition can only be of benefit to the community.

However, I must disagree with the view that my sole task is to smooth the way for a council which has stated that its philosophical makeup is antithetical to mine, then gracefully expire at the end of the year. The voters have spoken, but if the arrogance of this letter by Messrs Allen, Kaufman and Warren portends their actions on council then Roosevelt should take heed. This council will face tough times. Some leavening of humility rather than strident pontification would be in order at this point—any

newcomers to political office have a lot to learn, even if they think otherwise, and the new council's decisions and indecisions will be placed under the microscope as much as the current council's. The supposed unanimity pleaded for by Counterman and Prezant could more make for a dangerous rather than a productive instrument for this town's well-being.

As councilwoman, my responsibilities are to the community that elected me for the term January 1988 through December 31 1990. I see no reason to dilute that charge by the community, especially on the most significant issue now facing us. The awarding of the contract for the sewer system rehabilitation is the culmination of 3 years of my work on this council. For 3 years, with one year as utility chairwoman, I have been a member of a team that has worked on this problem. For 3 years we have negotiated with a state agency whose intransigence has come to endanger the very existence of this town. For 3 years we have had to deal on a technical level with 2 sets of engineers and their proposals for the reconstruction of the dilapidated infrastructure of our town. For 3 years we have investigated an extraordinary

range of financing options. For 3 years we have had to become conversant with engineering, legal, environmental, financial as well as political languages that the running of a small municipality in this state of the union requires of us. For 3 years we have had to listen to, assimilate and reconstrue the advice of both professionals and non-professionals, advice for which we have paid heavily. For 3 years we have studied the most critical problem ever facing this town's council. And out of this effort we have finally formulated the set of options that may—note only "may"—satisfy all parties. I simply cannot abrogate my responsibilities in this most crucial phase of the project.

Any council is bound by the actions and inactions of its predecessors. As this council was constrained in its choices, so will be our successors. In this last election we did not vote on an issue—the referendum is not part of our political process. In this last election we did vote for new council members. The new council will be formed on Jan 1, the current council's charge expires on December 31. My only moral obligation is to act according to the mandate given me on my election.

—Marilyn Magnes

To the Editor:

The last few days, I've been doing some thinking about an issue which has arisen since our recent election, and I wanted to share my thinking with the *Bulletin's* readers.

The issue is: Should we abandon the due process of bids now underway for repair to our water/sewer system because there will be three new members of Council in January? I've heard two points of view that I found persuasive.

### **Point of View #1—Stop the Process:**

This point of view says, basically, "Look. There's a perception out there on the part of the folks who voted for Peter and Lee and Stu that the Insituform process has not been given a fair hearing. More globally, they feel that after lengthy battle the pros from Dover are finally on the Council and will proceed to put everything right. If we let the bid process continue now,

those people are going to feel bitter and cheated."

"If we let the process continue, won't that create another one of these divisive fights where people are still picking at the scabs twenty years from now? Won't it perpetuate precisely the sort of wasteful and mean-spirited conflict that seems to have characterized some aspects of this election?"

### **Point of View #2—Let the Process Proceed:**

This point of view says, "For heaven's sake, Corkey Rothfuss and other Council members have worked themselves to exhaustion to move the process along so we could get DEP off our backs by showing a solid good-faith effort. This Insituform thing came up at the last minute and they still bent over backwards to give it consideration, AND opted to pay for our engineer to study the whole thing. If we abort the process now, we'll have to go through this whole bid thing again,

that will make us late, we'll run the risk of more fines, my water bill will go up AGAIN. Are we asking this Council to say that their work was worthless? Because that's what this would mean. Enough already."

I spent a fair amount of time thinking about this. I was torn.

I treasure our diversity of opinion in Roosevelt and abhor the notion that thinking alike makes life richer. I also hate with a passion the kind of thoughtless factionalism that makes itself known in knee-jerk sniping at the Council or some other body, at people because they're thought to be part of one "group" or "crowd" or another—whether it be "Peter's crowd" or "Ann Baker's crowd", or the Man in the Moon's crowd. So, I was primed to avoid conflict. Point of View #1 was coming on strong here.

On the other hand, I also have a lot of respect for Corkey Rothfuss. And I'll

*continued on following page*

## — Letters —

say it straight out, I thought this Council showed a lot of guts by biting the bullet and doing what they had to do with that water/sewer increase they had to pass last spring. It was an unpalatable thing to have to do, and they did the best job of it they could. Don't tell me that it all would have been avoidable if only my Aunt Nellie had voted for that thing your Uncle Charlie proposed fifteen years ago. The fact of the matter is that *these people on this Council, now*, had to deal with it. And they did. They knew, I have to believe, what it could mean for the widows, the young families, and the working people of this town. They dealt with a tough situation as best they could, and asking them to negate all their work seemed pretty shabby. So I found Point of View #2 persuasive also.

But in the end, what it really comes down for me is: *"Don't mess with the system."*

Under this system, Corkey and Marilyn and Bill and Jim and Warren and Leon were all duly elected or appointed, to fulfill certain responsibilities, for a certain term of office. This period of time will expire at the end of this calendar year. Then another team of people, also duly elected, will take office.

Yes, they will inherit what their predecessors did, just as this Council inherited what *their* predecessors did; and it will be binding. That's the way it works in a democracy. It may be a pain, but it's the best way we've found so far.

It's the system: it's democracy. An orderly transition of power. *Don't mess with it.*

Presumably when Peter and Lee and Stu ran, they knew the territory and what went with it. If there's conflict and bitterness as a result of letting the process continue, if people aren't grown up enough to finally see the venomous futility of this kind of behavior, so be it. You can't force people to behave. *Don't mess with the system.*

I think we should let the bid process go forward.

I got exactly this far in this piece—finished, in fact—and then read for myself what Peter, Lee, and Stu gave to our Mayor and Council yesterday.

Peter, Lee, Stu—If my candidate for President or Senator or Governor had

just won and then done something like this, I would have fired off a letter saying, "Listen, I think you've just made a big mistake. People are not going to go for this. You're over-reaching. Watch it."

You're proposing: "a transition team assuming interim responsibilities". You're saying that this is "in everyone's best interest ... at all levels of government".

You're saying that the outgoing Council has a "moral obligation not to commit the newly elected members of the incoming council to a binding course of action".

Guys, I think you're wrong—deeply, terribly wrong.

What do you mean, it's in everyone's best interest to have a transition team *assume responsibility* for government? Your letter gives the strong impression that you think this is the way things are done "at all levels of government". Not to my knowledge, not ever in the history of our government, not at any level, not under the Constitution I know and love. The folks who are elected are the folks who are responsible for government. They take office at the specified time, and hold it for the specified term, and that's that.

Guys, you propose not to *mess with the system*, but to *trash the system*.

Since when did we ask our elected representatives to just abandon ship and let the new folks come in and take over *before being sworn in*?

Are you proposing an accelerated swearing-in ceremony? Exactly which parts of government are you going to assume responsibility FOR? If there are only selected ones, how long will it take to decide which ones? And who decides? Who's in charge while this transition-into-transition process goes on?

The only reason I can think of to do what you're proposing is if there's been, beyond the shadow of a doubt, gross negligence or egregious malfeasance or something—and if there was, wouldn't you have said so by now in so many words, and made it clear that this was what you planned to propose? I sure hope so.

What do you mean, the current Council has a "moral obligation not to commit the newly elected members ... to a binding course of action"? Think

about it for a minute. *Of course they do.* If it's within their charge to make certain decisions and vote on them—whether it be Krystyna's or Nancy's salaries, or the Borough Hall heating system, or the water/sewer system, or a revised Zoning Ordinance, *that is the business we elected them to take care of.* And that course of action is binding upon you precisely because *they were elected just as you were.*

That's the way it is for the President, the Governor, the Mayor, *and that's the way it is for you.*

*That's called democracy.*

Peter, Lee, Stu—yes, you got elected. In fact, victory should be the sweeter for you because you had a contested election—a circumstance for which you, Peter, have often devoutly and publicly wished.

We had a record turnout, and each team of candidates pulled a respectable number of votes. In other words, this was not a rout.

Don't be too eager. I think your mandate from the people was to go in there and do your best, because people thought your best would be better than your opponents' best. That's democracy, and that's the system, and don't mess with it.

You just won an election, guys, not a coronation in Westminster Abbey. New dawn and all, I think you've got to take your lumps just like any other citizen who runs for office and gets elected. *Go in there and do your best, and don't mess with the system.*

And, sincerely—Good Luck.  
—Anita Cervantes

### To The Editor

I have attended the last two meetings of the School Board, and I hope to discipline myself well enough to make it a habit. I find the meetings to be quite informative, but I get rather lonely sitting with only one other private citizen. I sure would like to have some company.

The fun really begins in December. The first public workshop on the next school budget will be held at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, December 20, 1990. See you there.

Sincerely,  
Henry B. John-Alder



## — Letters —

To the Editor

This is in response to Mary Alfare's letter in the October 1990 *Bulletin* regarding New Jersey DEP's Wastewater Trust Fund which provides loans for wastewater treatment projects. Mary asks why the Council "failed to meet a deadline that could have saved us some \$1 million in financing". However, Mary's version of history is inaccurate and misleading, doing little to serve Rooseveltians' understanding of this complex issue. I would like to set the record straight, and then end with some questions of my own. Please bear with me through the details - its always more work (and less fun) to try to understand a complex situation than to read a short and sensational version!

First, Mary cited that East Windsor and Hightstown have received loans for projects. The fact that these are neighboring towns is irrelevant to our situation, although that is not what Mary implies by mentioning them. It's not as if there is (or was) a certain amount of loan money available for Central Jersey towns and these other towns got their share and we didn't. The criteria for eligibility has nothing to do with geographic location. Rather, DEP uses a numerical rating system primarily based on the type of problem to be corrected. Communities assigned a number above the cutoff of 70 are not eligible for loans. However, communities' rankings can change, if other communities with lower numbers are not ready to begin projects. This is in fact what happened to Roosevelt. In 1989 we were ranked in the "80's." In November of 1989 we were notified that we were ranked 72, and at that time the Council submitted a commitment letter required at that time to remain in the running.

In March of 1990, the Mayor and Council were notified that our ranking had dropped into the "50's." A meeting was quickly arranged at the DEP to discuss the possibility of getting into the loan program with this new ranking. Mayor Leon Barth, Council President Marilyn Magnes, Public Utilities Committee Chair Kirk Rothfuss, and Borough Engineer Kevin Toolan went to Trenton on March 22. At that meeting, they were told that we could apply

for a loan, with no guarantee of getting one, but that we would violate our Administrative Consent Order (ACO) if we did.

An explanation of one of the loan program regulations is necessary at this point in order for people to understand the conflict that confronted the Borough. DEP's regulations do not allow loan money to go to any projects that have already gone to bid or construction. The DEP says it must give pre-award approval to municipalities before they commit any funds; even then there is no guarantee that you get the money. But the regulations clearly say that you are out of the running if you have already committed funds prior to their approval.

This is the root of our "Damned if you do, Damned if you don't" situation. At the meeting in March with DEP, our representatives were told it would take the DEP a minimum of six months to review an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that is part of the application. The Borough would have to commit an estimated \$30,000 to \$50,000 for the study necessary to complete this document and submit it by June 4, 1990. A six month review would have put us at October 1990, at which time we would receive notification if we were permitted to advertise for bids. However, our consent order with DEP includes a May 1, 1990 deadline for putting the project out to bid, with fines if that deadline is missed. This is the dilemma the Mayor and the entire Council were confronted with. How do we meet our ACO deadline and at the same time get pre-award approval for a loan? The two timelines were incompatible, and DEP said so at that March meeting.

This conflict was reinforced by a May 17, 1990 letter from Assistant DEP Commissioner John Keith to Mayor Barth. In that letter, he said "should Roosevelt delay commencing construction until receiving pre-award approval (anticipated in about March 1991) it is very likely that Roosevelt would not meet the final deadline contained in the Amended Administrative Consent Order (AACO)." Later he says "the Department will not again amend the AACO compliance schedule."

The results of the March 22 meeting were discussed at the April 5 Council Agenda meeting and the April 11 regular Council meeting. Everyone in our Borough government understood the conflict, and no one felt it was wise to spend the money to gamble for pre-award approval at the risk of missing the ACO deadline. The Council and the Mayor *decided* not to meet the June 4, 1990 deadline - they did not *miss* the deadline, as Mary says.

I do not fault Mary for not understanding all of these details (although when I called Mary about her letter, she told me "I'm sure that I've studied the sewer situation in more depth than you!") I do fault her for the way she posed her question and used it as a thinly-veiled swipe at the Council and as a campaign strategy. This does not serve the people of Roosevelt well. I asked Mary how she could publish a letter filled with so many misrepresentations, and she told me she left a message at our home for Kirk to call her (so she could check out her information, she says.) Upon not receiving a return phone call, according to Mary, she went ahead and submitted her letter. This defense is lame. The day after Mary left her message on our machine, she attended the October 10 Council meeting, at which she spoke to both Kirk and myself. She asked no questions or even referred to her unanswered call. This is curious. Even more curious is Mary's decision not to call anyone else for information. Is Kirk Rothfuss the only one in Borough government who can answer such questions? Doesn't Mary have even greater access to Councilmen Counterman and Prezant and the Mayor she helped elect through a write-in campaign? Barth was part of the meeting in Trenton, and Counterman and Prezant are members of the Utility Committee. For that matter, all Council people were part of the decision not to apply.

More importantly, why didn't Mary directly **ask** the Council her question at the October 10 meeting? Maybe because she would get a reasonable answer and would not be able to distort the situation? Maybe because it is

*continued on following page*

## — Letters —

easier to inflame others if you (and they) are operating out of ignorance? I don't know how other Rooseveltians feel, but I wish that certain members of this community, who clearly have talent and desire, would use their energy for positive purposes instead of consistently being negative and undermining other dedicated people's efforts. I've seen too much of this from some folks in the five years I've lived here, and I ask myself the same question Mary used to end her letter—

**WHY?**

Sincerely,  
Jane Darden Rothfuss

To the Editor:

Responding to Mary Alfare's letter in the October 1990 issue:

Mary, my understanding of what happened with respect to the state funds available for Wastewater Treatment differs from yours in several crucial respects. Because they're crucial, I want to share with the rest of our community the difference between the picture you paint and the understanding I have of what happened.

FIRST: my understanding is that there wasn't an "inability" or a "failure" to meet the funding application deadline. Rather, there was a **decision by the Council** to not apply for the funding.

Here's why, as I understand it: the approval process for these funds apparently takes as long as eight months. This would mean that **we'd have missed the interim checkpoints mandated by the DEP's Administrative Consent Order (ACO). This would have rendered Roosevelt liable for more fines from DEP.** Not only that, a **REQUIRED** part of the application procedure is an environmental impact study—**which DEP themselves conservatively estimate could cost at least \$30,000.** And mind you—we could have spent the money for the impact study, with **NO** guarantee that we'd get the funding.

**Which deadline would you have ignored, Mary?**

SECOND: you claim that "residents have been writing to our State and

Federal legislators asking for relief from the financial burden of our sewer repair *at the request of the borough council*" (italics mine). To the very best of my knowledge, Mary, this is **SIMPLY NOT TRUE.** Rooseveltians have been writing letters largely as part of a campaign organized and implemented by the Water Action people. In fact, if you look, you'll see an article in this issue of the **Bulletin** about this very same "Quiet Campaign". Sure, when the Council heard about it, they applauded it. Why not? But as far as I know, they neither initiated nor requested the letter-writing campaign.

Your implication, as I read your letter, is that the Council was lazy and put all the work on the backs of the people, that they got us gullible trusting residents all pumped up to write letters, and then failed in their public trust through their "fail[ure] to meet a deadline". I just can't see it.

Let's suppose the Council had put us at risk of more fines and beatings-up by DEP as a result of missing the mandated interim checkpoints, and prolonged the process by another eight months. **Would we have seen a letter from you in the Bulletin applauding the Council's foresight in applying for this funding?**

I think maybe there are some other interpretations that could have been applied to the situation you described in your letter. For example:

- Perhaps you could have dug a little deeper in your phone call to DEP, and spoken to someone familiar with Roosevelt's situation. Perhaps Mr. Staples, with whom you indicate you spoke, doesn't have a detailed handle on the facts of every single municipality's case; this would certainly be understandable, given his responsibilities as DEP's Press Officer. Thus, perhaps he didn't know the details of **why** Roosevelt **elected** not to meet the application deadline.
- Perhaps you could have dug a little deeper by taking the time to speak with the responsible Councilmembers. Maybe then you'd have discovered that the correct phrase would have been that

Roosevelt was **not included in the application process**, not that we weren't included in the funding.

- Perhaps, if you'd done either or both of the above, there might have been enough of a question about what happened to cause you to reconsider the accusatory tone I, at least, hear in your letter.

Perhaps, just perhaps, you were a bit anxious to rush to judgment, to paint the worst possible picture of a bumbling, ineffective Borough Council. Perhaps?

It begins to sound a little less black-and-white now, don't you think? Maybe some of these problems are more complex, and deserve a little bit more in the way of thoughtfulness and a little bit less in the way of accusation, than I feel you demonstrated in your letter. I see no evidence in your letter that you devoted any thought to answering the question, "What would the better alternative be? What would I have done?"

Well, I'm asking it. Wouldn't we all be better off if we spent our energy asking those kinds of questions instead of rushing to judgment?

I feel that these problems deserve the problem-solving **best** in each of us, not the acrimonious worst. I hope you agree.

—Anita Cervantes

**The Bulletin tries to print all signed letters it receives.**

**Please address your letters to the editor, and send them to:**

**Roosevelt Borough  
Bulletin  
Box 221  
Roosevelt NJ  
08555-0221**

## — Letters —

To the Editor:

I spoke with Rose Murphy after her letter appeared in last month's **Borough Bulletin** to learn what shared recollections we had of last spring and the candidates' night that never happened. She immediately told me that she had written her letter as she remembered it.

I think my memory is more accurate. I mailed the identical notice to all four candidates about two weeks in advance of the scheduled candidates' night. Sometime about a week before the event Stu Kaufman called me and told me that he was not going to participate because he had heard that Peter Warren and Lee Allen were not going to show up. I asked him where he had heard that, since they had not called me, and he said they called David Brahinsky, the moderator. I tried to talk him into participating, but he refused. Warren and Allen did not have prior commitments. They simply told Brahinsky that they weren't going to participate.

I next called Rose to urge her to participate, so that I could talk Stu into taking part. I thought it would do both of them good, even if Warren and Allen refused to show up. I operate on the presumption that people want to know what the candidates have to say about matters of concern to this town.

Contrary to her letter, Rose never agreed to participate. She did waver during our telephone conversation, which led me to believe I might still

have a chance to get some of the candidates together. So I went to her house to try some more persuasion.

During that discussion, when it seemed as if I might be able to talk her into it, she suggested that a statement from Warren and Allen might be read. According to her letter, "I was told this was not allowed by the Democratic Committee Chair."

This is preposterous! The first year I ran for committeewoman (1988) I had to be out of the area for the scheduled candidates' night. I considered this a liability because I wanted the voters to at least have some idea of why I was running. So I submitted a statement which was read. I would never have told Rose that a written statement "was not allowed," since I had found it necessary to use that method myself.

I responded to her suggestion by noting that the voters would not have the chance to ask questions of the candidates if they only submitted a statement, and that such statements appeared in the **Borough Bulletin**. Candidates' Night extends that discussion, and enables voters to dig beneath the surface of the statements to get at deeper explanations.

In no way did she present the suggestion as a condition of her participation, and in no way did I disallow the reading of statements. She simply dropped the subject, apparently agreeing with me that their statements were already in the **Borough Bulletin**.

In our recent conversation, Rose acknowledged that I contacted her at least five days before the scheduled Candidates' Night, and that we both knew at that time that Warren and Allen were not going to participate in the event. In fact, I worked up to the time of the event to make it happen, hoping that at least some of the candidates were interested in letting the public know why they were running for office.

There has been nothing unfair about the way Candidates' Night is handled. The candidates receive the same notice in the same mail delivery. In 1989 the candidates all had equal time to present their views, and the public had the opportunity to learn about those who aspire for office in Roosevelt. No one complained that it was unfair. What make it unfair in 1990?

The fairness issue comes in the fact that by refusing to participate in the 1990 candidates night, Allen and Warren deprived Rose Murphy and Stu Kaufman of an opportunity to get their positions out to the public. It's too bad that Rose does not see that. Instead she accepted a self-serving, revisionist version of events provided to her so she could write her letter to the **Borough Bulletin** in time for the 1990 general election.

Sincerely,  
Ann Baker

---

### **Omnia Mutantur... (Everything Changes...)**

by Peter Warren

**New Kids on the Block...** Samantha Nicolle Cedar, Danielle Cokely, Cassandra and Kirsten Hill, Michelle Najecki, Sarah Elizabeth King Tuloss.

**Celebrating...** Fifty years of living in Roosevelt as of Hallow'een, George and Elizabeth Symons.

**Moving In...** John Jacobs, Wayne Orndorff and Richard Stalcup to Joe Solomon's house on Clarksburg Road; Chris Travis, to Cathy Petrilla's house on Tamara.

**Moving Out...** No one.

**Building Permits...** In Roosevelt were valued at \$108,000 in 1990 (10 months), \$283,000 in 1989, \$489,000 in 1988.

**On the Market...** As of November 14, 16 houses for sale, 0 houses for rent.

**Scary...** Jennifer Block, national grand prize winner of the Freddy Kreuger trivia game, made up by David Miller and given a cash prize after dinner at the Hard Rock Cafe.

**Rising...** Volume of recycled newspaper, glass and cans from 17.2 tons in the 1st quarter to 19.3 tons in the 2nd quarter to 22.5 tons in the 3rd quarter.

**Flowing...** In October, (uncalibrated meters): water for domestic usage 128,000 gpd; sewerage 218,500 gpd.

**Buried...** About 140, in Roosevelt Cemetery; 3 in 1990, 3 in 1989 and 1 in 1988.



# Supporters & Contributors, Vol. XIII

Printing of the *Bulletin*  
furnished by  
**Prints of Windsor**  
*Quality Printing & Copying*

Princeton Arms Shopping Center  
Dorchester Dr. & Old Trenton Rd.

West Windsor

**448-3400**

**Action  
Packaging  
Automation, Inc.**

*Packaging Machine  
Manufacturing and  
Distribution*

*Contract Packaging*

The Factory, Oscar Drive

**448-9210**

**Roosevelt Deli**  
*Groceries & Italian  
Specialties*

**443-5111**

**MIRA**

*Quality List Maintenance  
and Mailing Services*

*Data Entry  
Lettershop  
Typesetting*

*Inventory & Distribution*

The Factory, Oscar Drive

**443-4495**

**Gary Edelstein**  
*Cabinetmaker*

The Factory, Oscar Drive

**443-3216**

**Tom Hague & Son**

*Heating & Air  
Conditioning*

*Commercial &  
Residential*

The Factory, Oscar Drive

**448-5424**

**Roosevelt  
Auto & Truck  
Service, Inc.**

*Quality Car Care*

**448-0198**

Reuben D. Alt & Family  
Leon & Freida Anish  
Paul Bauman  
Jack & Ella Bermowitz  
Rose Canape  
Anita Cervantes  
Maureen & Bob Clark  
Louis & Anna Cohen  
Robert & Vivian Crozier  
Joe & Jo Drapola  
Robert & Lottie Eisner  
Shan & Bert Ellentuck  
Paul & Peggy Gerling  
Sarah & Irving Goldberg  
Mr. & Mrs. Sidney Goozner  
Aaron, Max & Casie Grossman  
Stephen & Jo Ellen Grossman  
Karyn & Eitan Grunwald  
Michele & Leonard Guye-Hillis  
Cynthia Imbrie  
Henry, Kate & Wesley John-Alder  
Mark & Karen Kangas  
Kurt & Helen Kleinman  
Norma Kushner  
Jacob Landau  
Ruth & Henry Leibson  
Clara J. Levinson  
Leo & Fay Libove  
Sol Libsohn  
Jill Lipoti & Brad Garton  
Tal Littman & Becky Rowe  
Stefan Martin  
The McKoy Family  
Elizabeth Mellor  
Harold & Lenore Mogin  
Hyman & Frances Mondlin  
Alicia & Brian Moore  
Robert & Diane Mueller  
Andrew & Rachel Mueller-Lust  
Norman & Judith Nahmias  
Susan Oxford & Warren Craig  
Ilse Riesenfeld  
The Rocchias  
Jack & Frieda Rockoff  
Jane & Kirk Rothfuss  
Norm & Elinor Rudin  
Leonard & Clare Sacharoff  
Helen Seitz  
Linda & Frederick Septak  
Bernarda Shahn  
Connie & George Shally  
Elaine Smotroff  
Hortense & Sidney Sochowitzky  
Marty & Renee Sokoloff  
Ellen Sorrin & David York  
Judith Trachtenberg  
Alice & Bill Warshaw  
Joe & Diane Zahora

**If Your Name Isn't Here,**

***It Should Be***

**Send in Your Tax-Deductible  
Contribution Today**

***Roosevelt Borough Bulletin***

**Box 221**

**Roosevelt, New Jersey 08555-0221**

# Bulletin Classified

The **Bulletin** publishes free of charge classified listings from Roosevelt residents and businesses, and from those in the immediate vicinity with ties to Roosevelt. Write: **Roosevelt Borough Bulletin**, Box 221, Roosevelt, NJ 08555. Contributions are appreciated and are tax-deductible (suggested: \$40 per year, \$5.00 per issue).

ARTS	HOMEIMPROVEMENTS/CONSTRUCTION	MUSIC INSTRUCTION
<p><b>Bob Husth</b> Artist • Photographer Box 142, Local 08555 426-9153</p>	<p><b>Air Conditioning • Heating Refrigeration</b> Tom Hague &amp; Son Sales • Service • Installations Free Estimates Energy Specialists Custom Sheetmetal Work 448-5424</p>	<p><b>Anita Cervantes</b> is now teaching again: Piano Lessons • Chamber Music Coaching Children • Adults 448-4068 Morning &amp; Evening Hours Available</p>
<p><b>Now Available on Cassette:</b> David Brahinsky's <i>Takshaka!</i> Songs &amp; Stories for Children of All Ages <i>How Endless It Is, and How Good</i> Original Songs for Adults \$9.00 per cassette, post paid Phone 443-1898 or write Box 88, Local and place your order</p>	<p><b>Complete Bathroom Remodeling</b> Tile Installation Tal Littman 448-2221</p>	<p><b>Guitar Instruction, ages 7 and up</b> David Brahinsky 443-1898</p>
<p><b>AUTOMOBILESERVICING</b></p>	<p><b>Custom Plus General Contractors, Inc. Roosevelt, NJ</b> Small Job to Total Construction Roofing • Wood Decks • Patios Additions • Renovations Bathrooms &amp; Kitchens Remodeled Custom Closets • Insulation Installed Formica</p>	<p><b>PERSONAL</b></p>
<p><b>Roosevelt Auto &amp; Truck Service</b> Quality Car Care 7 AM-6 PM Mon-Fri • 8 AM-3 PM Sat 448-0198</p>	<p>Major &amp; Minor Repairs References Available • Fully Insured Free Estimates • Certified Contractor 10% Senior Citizen Discount 448-9136</p>	<p>Please cross off 443-6540 and write in 448-5215 for Ann Baker. <i>Do it now</i> while you are reading this and before you forget.</p>
<p><b>BABYSITTING/DAYCARE</b></p>	<p><b>Gary Edelstein</b> Cabinetmaker 443-3216</p>	<p><b>PETCARE</b></p>
<p><b>Traci Connaughton • Age 15</b> 443-6736</p>	<p><b>E. Rich General Contractors</b> Custom Work • Repairs Everything Under Your Roof Free Estimates References Supplied Harry • Edna 426-4949</p>	<p><b>"TLC" Grooming Salon</b> Dog &amp; Cat Grooming by Appointment No Tranquilizers Used Pick Up &amp; Delivery Available Call 443-6218</p>
<p><b>BUSINESS SERVICES</b></p>	<p><b>Peter Wikoff</b> General Carpentry Repairs • Additions • Remodeling New Kitchens Installed Windows &amp; Doors Replaced</p>	<p><b>REALESTATE</b></p>
<p><b>Data Processing Consulting</b> PC &amp; Main Frame Richard Dalin 448-9299</p>	<p>Many Years' Experience in Roosevelt Local References Furnished on Request 259-7940</p>	<p><b>Adlerman, Click &amp; Co. Realtors &amp; Insurers, est. 1927</b> Has Sold More Houses in Roosevelt Than any Other Broker May We Help You Sell Yours at the Best Possible Price? <b>Rooseveltians Serving Roosevelt:</b> Mel A. Adlerman Milton Sadovsky (448-2380) Ruth Sadovsky (448-2380) Marilyn Magnes (448-6402) Sam Adlerman (448-0396) Alice Lifland</p>
<p><b>FORSALE</b></p>	<p><b>HUMAN SERVICES</b></p>	<p><b>Grace Kaufman</b> Your Roosevelt Realtor Associate at Weidel Realtors 448-6200 (office) • 443-4049 (evenings)</p>
<p>Childcraft crib, high chair, car seat, potty, strollers, tricycle, girl's clothes (18 mos.-3 yrs.), toys, etc. Call 448-0059 weekends</p>	<p><b>Attention Roosevelt Students</b> Would you like some extra help in math, algebra, geometry, etc.?  Free Tutoring is Available Call Mary King 448-5096</p>	<p><b>Marilyn Ticktin</b> Sales Representative &amp; Realtor Associate at Fox &amp; Lazo 426-4000 (office) • 448-0363 (evenings)</p>
<p><b>HELP WANTED</b></p>	<p><b>ROSSI'S PIZZA, DELI &amp; LIQUOR STORE</b> Hot &amp; Cold Subs • Pizza Calzones • Pasta Other Fine Italian Dishes Catering &amp; Party Tray Available Limited Seating in Back Room Open Mon. 6:30 AM - 7:00 PM (pizza closed on Mondays) Tues.-Thurs., Sun.: 6:30 AM - 10 PM Fri. &amp; Sat.: 6:30 AM - 11:00 PM</p>	<p><b>RESTAURANTS/TAKE-OUT</b></p>
<p><b>Full &amp; Part Time Jobs</b> within walking distance Mailing Services • Data Entry Advancement Opportunities Informal Atmosphere Ideal Part-Time Work for Students, Homemakers &amp; Seniors MIRA, The Factory, Oscar Drive Call Luisa Moran at 443-4495</p>	<p><b>Tutors Wanted</b> to help with free tutoring program for Roosevelt students. A rewarding way to help the children of our community Call Mary King at 448-5096</p>	



2	3 <b>Deborah</b> Borough Hall 2:00 PM <i>Frieda Rockoff, Pres.</i> (448-0674)	4 <b>Senior Citizens</b> Boro Hall, 2PM <i>Jeanette Koffler, Pres.</i> (448-2259) <b>Planning Board</b> Borough Hall 8:00 PM <i>Mel Friedman, Ch.</i> (448-5186)	5 <b>Board of Ed.</b> Agenda Meeting RPS, 7:30 PM <i>Ed Grossman, Pres.</i> (448-9385)	6 <b>PTA</b> RPS, 8 PM <i>Adeenah Yeger, Pres.</i> (443-5848) <b>Zoning Board</b> Boro Hall, 8 PM <i>Lou Esakoff, Ch.</i> (448-3166)	7	8
9 <b>Roosevelt Water Action</b> Borough Hall 11:30 AM <i>Judith McNally</i> (448-4580)	10 <b>Borough Council</b> Agenda Meeting Boro Hall, 8:00 PM <i>Leon Barth, Mayor</i> (448-1870) <i>Marilyn Magnes, Council President</i> (448-6402)	11 <b>Board of Ed.</b> Action Meeting RPS, 7:30 PM <i>Ed Grossman, Pres.</i> (448-9385)	12 <b>Borough Council</b> Borough Hall 8:00 PM <i>Leon Barth, Mayor</i> (448-1870) <i>Marilyn Magnes, Council President</i> (448-6402)	13 <i>Recyclables Collected</i>	14	15 <b>Congregation Anshei Roosevelt</b> Chanuka Party Synagogue 5:30 PM <i>Shlomo Weiss</i> (426-4238)
16	17 <b>Congregation Anshei Roosevelt</b> Synagogue, 8 PM <i>Michael Ticktin, Pres.</i> (448-0363)	18 <b>Blood Pressure Check</b> Solar Village 12:30-2:00 PM	19	20	21	22
23 <b>Roosevelt Water Action</b> Borough Hall 11:30 AM	24	25	26	27 <i>Recyclables Collected</i>	28	29
30	31					

There are free exercise classes for residents at the Borough Hall each Tuesday and Thursday, 10:00 AM-11:00 AM  
The RPS Library is open each Tuesday evening, 7:00-9:00 PM (Margaret Schlinski, Librarian)

Is your organization having a meeting or event? Write the **Bulletin** (Box 221, Local) or call Helga Wisowaty (448-0049)