

---

---

**Feasibility Study for Possible Shared Services  
For Emergency Services  
For FMERPA  
(Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Planning Authority)**

---

---

**Task 4  
Neighboring Municipalities Shared Services  
Final Report**

---

---

**Prepared by  
Jersey Professional Management  
23 North Avenue East  
Cranford, NJ 07016**

**July 7, 2008**

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

TASK 4 SUMMARY.....3

METHODOLOGY.....7

MUNICIPAL COURT OVERVIEWS.....8

    MONMOUTH BEACH BOROUGH

    SEA BRIGHT BOROUGH

    SHREWSBURY BOROUGH

    SHREWSBURY TOWNSHIP

    WEST LONG BRANCH BOROUGH

MUNICIPAL COURT OPERATION ANALYSIS.....19

    STAFFING

    FACILITIES

    HOURS OF OPERATION

    COURT ACTIVITY STATISTICS

    REVENUE AND EXPENSE

MUNICIPAL COURT RECOMMENDATIONS.....22

POLICE DEPARTMENT OVERVIEWS.....24

    BUDGETS

    STAFFING

    DISPATCH

    FACILITIES

    VEHICLES

    CALLS FOR SERVICE

    CRIME STATISTICS

    SHREWSBURY TOWNSHIP

POLICE DEPARTMENT ANALYSIS.....29

    BUDGETS

    STAFFING

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

DISPATCH  
FACILITIES  
VEHICLES  
CALLS FOR SERVICE  
CRIME STATISTICS  
POLICE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS.....32  
    PRIMARY RECOMMENDATION  
    SECONDARY RECOMMENDATIONS  
        MONMOUTH BEACH/SEA BRIGHT POLICE MERGER  
            DISPATCH  
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (OEM).....35  
FIRE DEPARTMENT OVERVIEWS.....38  
    MONMOUTH BEACH BOROUGH  
    SEA BRIGHT BOROUGH  
    SHREWSBURY BOROUGH  
    SHREWSBURY TOWNSHIP  
    WEST LONG BRANCH BOROUGH  
    NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITY OVERVIEW SUMMARY  
        NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES WITH FIRE DEPARTMENTS  
            SHREWSBURY TOWNSHIP  
FIRE DEPARTMENT ANALYSIS.....45  
    LOSS OF FORT MONMOUTH PAID FIRE DEPARTMENT  
    NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITY RESOURCES  
        FACILITIES  
        PERSONNEL  
        EQUIPMENT  
        DISPATCH SYSTEM  
        FIRE ALARM ACTIVITY  
FIRE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS.....47  
    RECOMMENDATION #1 – MAINTENANCE OF CURRENT SYSTEMS  
    RECOMMENDATION #2 – AUTOMATIC MUTUAL AID

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

RECOMMENDATION #3 – USE OF COMMON DISPATCHING AGENCY

RECOMMENDATION #4 – FUTURE PAID DAYTIME FIREFIGHTERS

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE OVERVIEWS.....51

    MONMOUTH BEACH BOROUGH

    SEA BRIGHT BOROUGH

    SHREWSBURY BOROUGH

    SHREWSBURY TOWNSHIP

    WEST LONG BRANCH BOROUGH

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES ANALYSIS.....56

    VOLUNTEERS

    FACILITIES

    DISPATCH

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE RECOMMENDATIONS.....57

    PRIMARY RECOMMENDATION

    SECONDARY RECOMMENDATIONS

ATTACHMENT 1 – SELECTION OF ADJOINING MUNICIPALITIES FOR INCLUSION IN FMERPA

    SHARED EMERGENCY SERVICES STUDY

ATTACHMENT 2 – KICK-OFF MEETING AGENDA

ATTACHMENT 3 – FORT MONMOUTH FIRE DEPARTMENT EMERGENCY RESPONSE RECORD IN

    NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **INTRODUCTION**

On May 1, 2008 Jersey Professional Management entered into a contract with the Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Planning Authority (FMERPA) to conduct a Shared Emergency Services Feasibility Study designed to evaluate the impact of the closure of Fort Monmouth (scheduled on or before September 2011) on the emergency services in the Boroughs of Eatontown, Oceanport and Tinton Falls (Host Municipalities). The study encompasses a broad view of emergency services that includes municipal court operations, police services, emergency management operations, fire services and emergency medical services.

Task 4 addresses the impact of:

1. The closure of Fort Monmouth, and
2. The subsequent reuse and redevelopment of these lands, upon selected neighboring municipalities.

There are twelve municipalities that border the three host communities, but the impact of the closure of Fort Monmouth on these twelve municipalities varies greatly, particularly with respect to the provision of emergency services. For example, the most distant of these neighboring municipalities are Wall Township and Middletown Township. Both Wall Township and Middletown Township have significant population bases and land areas. They provide most municipal services, relying heavily on full time employees to oversee these services. The other municipalities that border the Host Municipalities are the Borough of Red Bank, the City of Long Branch, the Township of Ocean and Neptune Township; which are similar to Wall Township and Middletown Township.

For the reasons set forth above, the selection of the neighboring municipalities to be included in Task 4 focused on the following criteria:

1. Municipalities directly bordering the host communities.
2. Municipalities located in close proximity to Fort Monmouth lands.
3. Municipalities with smaller populations that would be more likely to benefit from shared service agreements with one or more of the host communities.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

4. Municipalities that have existing shared service agreements, both formal and informal, with one or more of the host communities.

The analysis attached entitled “Selection of Adjoining Municipalities for Inclusion in FMERPA Shared Emergency Services Study” (see Task 4 Final Report, Attachment 1) was utilized to assist in the selection process. The initial selection decision that was made by Jersey Professional Management and endorsed by the FMERPA Project Manager involved the inclusion of the following municipalities:

1. Little Silver Borough
2. Monmouth Beach Borough
3. Shrewsbury Borough
4. Shrewsbury Township
5. West Long Branch Borough

Ultimately, Little Silver Borough elected to not participate in this study and a subsequent request was made by the Borough of Sea Bright to be included in this study. This request was based upon the Borough of Sea Bright being a School Sending District to the Oceanport School District and being a part of the Shore Regional School District that includes the Boroughs of Oceanport, Monmouth Beach and West Long Branch. Even though the Borough of Sea Bright’s expression of interest was made over thirty days into this 2 month long study, FMERPA requested that Jersey Professional Management (JPM) include Sea Bright, which was accomplished.

A Community profile has been developed for each of the Neighboring Municipalities so that their characteristics can be better understood. Also, so these five municipalities can be compared with the three Host Municipalities. The Community Profile for both the Host Municipalities and the Neighboring Municipalities is located in Addendum A attached to this Final Report. Please note the significant differences as highlighted by the population, square mileage, etc. listed in the spread sheet on page 2 of Addendum A.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

### **TASK 4 SUMMARY**

Task 4 recognizes that the closure of Fort Monmouth will have an impact beyond the boundaries of the Host Municipalities. Accordingly, the scope of this study, that initially concentrated on the three Host Municipalities, was expanded to include the five municipalities noted above that will be referred throughout this section as the “Neighboring Municipalities.” Task 4 was conducted by a team of consultants from Jersey Professional Management to be referred to as the “JPM Study Team”, each with expertise in one or more of the respective emergency service areas.

The scope of the examination of the Neighboring Municipalities was necessarily less comprehensive in scope than the examination that was performed with respect to the three Host Municipalities. The focus of this section of the overall Feasibility Study was on the extent to which the recommendations for shared emergency services for the three Host Municipalities could be extended to include one or more Neighboring Municipalities.

With the exception of the loss of the emergency services functions related to major events and/or disasters and/or significant HAZMAT events, municipalities surrounding Fort Monmouth would not usually have a need to use the Fort’s emergency service resources. With respect to emergency service functions related to major events and/or disasters and HAZMAT events, and possible impact from the pending closure of Fort Monmouth, extends to all of Monmouth County (particularly the Coastal Monmouth County area), as well as other counties beyond.

The recommendations that are a part of Task 4 section of this overall study were shaped by the following factors:

1. The shared service models developed for the Host Municipalities under Tasks 1, 2 and 3.
2. An analysis of the data provided by the five Neighboring Municipalities.
3. The ability of the shared service models developed for the Host Municipalities to accommodate any or all of the Neighboring Municipalities.

In the approach to considering one or more of these Neighboring Municipalities for inclusion in one or more of the proposed shared emergency services functional areas of court operations, police services, fire services, emergency medical services, and emergency management, it must be recognized that not all of these functional service areas come under the municipal government umbrella. Just as with the Host Municipalities, the Fire and Ambulance/EMS services are generally independent to

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

varying degrees from the municipal government. The respective municipalities, as well as these independent volunteer organizations, would need to accept the shared services approach, or, the shared services models, which have been developed and recommended in this section of this Feasibility Study.

Generally speaking, smaller communities are able to best benefit from a shared services approach due a variety of factors including but not limited to the following:

1. Declining State Aid being provided to municipalities with populations fewer than 10,000 and more particularly municipalities with populations fewer than 5,000.
2. State imposed municipal expenditure caps as well as new caps on tax rate increases.
3. Staffing in many smaller municipalities frequently involves part time individuals who are not available to the public during all normal business hours.
4. Space constraints in many smaller municipality offices coupled with an environment of escalating construction costs
5. Limitations on dealing with specialty functions, particularly in a field such as police services.
6. Limitations on being able to fully react and respond to unusual times of high service demands.
7. Limitations on being able to fully react and respond to employee absences without incurring overtime expenses.

Smaller communities located in reasonable proximity to the Fort Monmouth base, but are not a part of this study; include Fair Haven Borough, Little Silver Borough and Rumson Borough. Upon consideration of engaging a consultant to prepare any possible Implementation Plan, it is recommended that this Feasibility Study Final Report be shared with these other municipalities in the area, to determine if they have interest in the various recommendations for shared emergency services included in this report.

It is important to note that while the five municipalities selected may be prime candidates for inclusion in the various shared emergency services options that have been developed, the full list of municipalities that could benefit from this Fort Monmouth Region shared emergency services study extends beyond the Host Municipalities and the five selected Neighboring Municipalities.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

The Shared Services recommendations included in this study and Final Report, are summarized below for each of the five emergency services included in this Study:

**Task 1, Municipal Court Services** – The primary recommendation related to the Host Municipalities involves the establishment of a joint court operation that would include the Borough of Eatontown, the Borough of Oceanport and the Township of Shrewsbury. The Task 4 analysis concludes that this Host Municipality option would serve as a solid foundation for the establishment of a Regional Municipal Court operation. With the likely transfer of the Fort Monmouth’s Mallette Hall property from the Federal Government to the Borough of Eatontown, a Regional Municipal Court serving all of the Neighboring Municipalities as well as additional surrounding municipalities would be a sound concept. This approach would reap multiple benefits in the areas of cost savings, cost avoidance for capital improvement costs in several municipalities and enhanced service levels.

**Task 2, Police Services** – Similar to the Task 1 recommendation, the primary recommendation in this section of the overall report involved the establishment of a joint police department between the Boroughs of Eatontown and Oceanport. Again, this is a solid model that could serve as the foundation for an even larger policing organization that could include all of the Neighboring Municipalities as well as other surrounding municipalities. This recommendation as it relates to the Neighboring Municipalities is again tied to the transfer of the Fort Monmouth’s Mallette Hall property from the Federal Government to the Borough of Eatontown. There may be some potential impediments to this Task 4 recommendation that are identified, and accordingly, potential alternative approaches are also set forth.

**Task 2A, Office of Emergency Management (OEM)** – With sound OEM models already in place in all but Shrewsbury Township (due to its small size), there is less of a need to provide a more sweeping shared services approach in this emergency services area. The recommendation for the Host Municipalities involves the joint funding of a part time OEM Administrator position to handle a portion of the burden of the local OEM Coordinators by assisting with administrative duties. These duties are somewhat overlapping from municipality to municipality. This same recommendation would be easily expanded to the Neighboring Municipalities and would have the same positive impact. Accordingly, the Task 4 recommendation re-iterates exactly the Task 2A recommendation.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**Task 3, Fire Services** – The basic conclusion with respect to the fire services was that these services in both the Host Municipalities and in the Neighboring Municipalities operate well and with a high level of service. They utilize appropriate personnel and equipment resources. On the basis of that conclusion, the primary recommendation for the Host Municipalities relates to the local fire departments maintaining their high level of service. The second recommendation is related to the loss of the Fort Monmouth paid Fire Department. It is recommended that there be an enhanced mutual aid protocol established to assist in bridging the gap that may occur without the Fort Monmouth Fire Department back-up response.

Finally, the third recommendation is being made, if and only if, there is a future deficiency in the Volunteers' response for weekday-daytime calls for service. This possible, future shared service is for a regional, weekday, daytime only, paid fire agency, with full time paid employees that could be established to supplement the volunteer services.

**Task 3A, Ambulance/EMS (Emergency Medical Services)** – The primary Task 3A recommendation relates to the formation of a consortium of First Aid Squads to contract out for a weekday, daytime Basic Life Support paid ambulance service to be the primary responder during those hours. The Task 4 recommendation is identical in that it simply recommends that the Neighboring Municipalities become a part of that consortium with or without the inclusion of other surrounding municipalities. It is believed that with a boarder base of participating squads, there would be a strong likelihood that the successful Basic Life Support ambulance service contractor could be required to provide two ambulances during these critical hours with a zero cost for the provision of these services. There were a series of secondary recommendations in the Task 3A report for Ambulance Services and Squads that are generally equally applicable to the Neighboring Municipalities.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **METHODOLOGY**

As is referenced in the introduction to this section, there was a Neighboring Municipality identification process followed by contact being made with each of the selected Neighboring Municipalities. This led to a Kick-Off Meeting that was held on May 20, 2008. Each of the municipalities in attendance was requested to advise Jersey Professional Management of their interest in participating no later than May 26, 2008. They were also requested to supply information and documents for review by Study Team members. The Kick-Off Meeting agenda is attached as a part of this report and identified as Task 4 – Attachment 2.

Although some of the requested documents were not submitted in the time frames established, ultimately four of the original five identified Neighboring Municipalities elected to participate, with the Borough of Sea Bright being added later. A majority of the requested information and documents were supplied over a 4 week period of time, and the JPM Study Team was properly equipped to perform the required analysis as set forth in the FMERPA Request for Proposals for a Shared Emergency Services Consultant.

Since Task 4 involved all of the emergency services functional areas, key members of the Task 1, Task 2 & 2A and Task 3 & 3A Study Teams were utilized to be a part of the Task 4 Team for this large Shared Services Feasibility Study. This guaranteed that individuals with the appropriate emergency service backgrounds were involved in the review, analysis and recommendation phases for the respective operations in each of the Neighboring Municipalities.

As is referenced in the Task 4 Summary, the goal of this task was to determine the extent to which the shared service options that were developed for the Host Municipalities may be applicable to any of the Neighboring Municipalities, and if so, to what extent. This Feasibility Study did not involve the review, analysis and development of shared service options that would be independent of those developed for the Host Municipalities.

The Task 4 review involved contacts being made with many of the key officials in each of the municipalities studied. The JPM Study Team wishes to sincerely acknowledge and appreciate their cooperation and valuable input.

## **OVERVIEW OF FOUR MUNICIPAL COURTS**

### **MONMOUTH BEACH COURT**

#### **Staffing**

- Judge – presides over 24 regular court sessions per year generally with no need for any special court sessions, plus occasional calls outside of court hours
- Court Administrator – full time employee working 32.5 hours per week with full benefits
- Clerk – part time employee working average of 6 hours per month (coincides with court hours to receive payments at the window and to handle limited data entry) plus limited hours during any scheduled leave time taken by the Court Administrator
- Prosecutor is present for all court sessions, but the public defender’s presence is only needed several times per year
- Security attendant is a sworn police officer for all court room sessions

#### **Facilities (Office and Courtroom)**

- Office is one room with two work stations
- Judge has separate office to the rear of the court office
- Prosecutor uses conference room adjoining court offices
- Judge has secure access to courtroom
- Courtroom is very small with seating for only 25-30 persons
- There are no video conferencing capabilities
- There is no acceptance of credit cards

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**MONMOUTH BEACH COURT, CONTINUED**

**Hours of Operation**

- Monday through Friday, 9:00 am to 4:30 pm
- Office is closed during the lunch hour

**Frequency and Length of Court Sessions**

- Court is held two times per month
- An average court session lasts three hours

**Court Activity Statistics**

**(Added or Disposed of During the Year Listed)**

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007 Proj.</b>
<b>Indictable</b>	9/16	12/12	13/13
<b>Disorderly Persons</b>	15/11	14/35	30/30
<b>Borough Ordinances</b>	13/23	55/68	43/43
<b>D.W.I.</b>	12/10	8/16	9/8
<b>Traffic</b>	677/636	889/975	890/895
<b>Parking</b>	300/283	397/388	502/493
<b>Total</b>	1,026/979	1,375/1,494	1,487/1,482

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**MONMOUTH BEACH COURT, CONTINUED**

**Revenue and Expense Data**

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Salary &amp; Wages</b>	\$80,497*	\$ 53,129*	\$ 57,709
<b>Operating Expense</b>	\$ 4,583	\$ 7,370	\$ 6,758
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	\$85,080	\$ 60,499	\$ 64,467
<b>Municipal Revenue</b>	\$42,429	\$ 78,580	\$ 80,714
<b>Total Revenue</b>	\$92,496	\$164,512	\$168,642

\*Long time Court Administrator retired and starting salary of incoming Court Administrator was lower

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **SEA BRIGHT COURT**

### **Staffing**

- Judge – presides over 34 regular court sessions per year plus 2-3 special court sessions per year
- Court Administrator – full time employee working 35 hours per week with full benefits
- Deputy Court Administrator – part time employee working average of 25 hours per week with no benefits
- Sound recording attendant (primary) – part time employee with no benefits whose hours coincide with frequency and length of court sessions
- Sound recording attendant (back up) – only works when primary sound recording attendant is absent
- Security attendant is a sworn police officer

### **Facilities (Office and Courtroom)**

- The Municipal Court offices have been located in a temporary rental trailer for the past nine years. There are two rooms and conditions are cramped. There is no connection to the Borough Hall without going outside. There are no rest room facilities.
- If the Deputy Court Administrator is not working during the lunch hour, the office will close.
- Court office personnel can accept VISA and MasterCard at the window.
- The Judge has no office and must enter the courtroom by leaving through the back door of the court offices, walking through an alleyway to the rear door of the gymnasium and then walking into the courtroom near the bench.
- The courtroom seats 30-40 people and was recently equipped with video conferencing capabilities.

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**SEA BRIGHT COURT, CONTINUED**

- The Prosecutor and Public Defender work out of the gymnasium next to the courtroom.

**Hours of Operation**

- Monday through Friday, 8:30 am to 4:30 pm
- Office is closed during the lunch hour if Deputy is not available to provide office coverage

**Frequency and Length of Court Sessions**

- 34 regular sessions per year with weekly sessions June through September and one to three sessions per month the remainder of year plus special sessions such as DWI sessions as needed
- The average length of a court session is 3.5 hours

**Court Activity Statistics**

	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007 Proj.</u>
<b>Traffic</b>	2,119	1,815	1,869
<b>Criminal</b>	126	141	160
<b>Borough Ordinances</b>	161	151	289
<b>Total</b>	2,406	2,107	2,318

Note: Sea Bright does not maintain their statistics in the same format as is utilized by the other Neighboring Municipalities.

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**SEA BRIGHT COURT, CONTINUED**

**Revenue and Expense Data**

		<b><u>2005</u></b>		<b><u>2006</u></b>		<b><u>2007</u></b>	
<b>Salary &amp; Wages</b>		\$ 94,386		\$ 97,526		\$101,454	
<b>Operating Expense</b>		\$ 16,232		\$ 16,143		\$ 12,146	
<b>Total Expenditures</b>		\$110,618		\$113,669		\$113,600	
<b>Municipal Revenue</b>		\$174,743		\$173,681		\$214,489	
<b>Total Revenue</b>		\$356,221		\$325,484		\$392,389	

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **SHREWSBURY BOROUGH COURT**

### **Staffing**

- Judge – presides over four court sessions per month that average 2.25 hours each.
- Court Administrator – full time employee working 35 hours per week with full benefits
- Deputy Court Administrator – full time employee working 35 hours per week with full benefits
- Court Assistant – part time employee who records all court sessions and works additional hours (average of five per month) as needed
- Court Officer – civilian part time employee whose hours coincide with frequency and length of court sessions and whose duties are to maintain general control over audience and to transfer paperwork between the courtroom and the office
- Security attendant is a sworn police officer

### **Facilities (Office and Courtroom)**

- The municipal building is five years old and was designed to meet all of the recommendations of the Administrative Office of the Courts as were in effect at that time.
- The office is adequately sized and includes private offices for the Judge and Court Administrator.
- There is a rest room for the sole use of the court personnel.
- There is an outside entry that does not require court personnel to walk through the main lobby.
- There is a direct entry from the court offices to the Judge’s bench.
- There is a direct entry from the Police Department to the Judge’s bench
- The courtroom is well designed mirroring a County courtroom and can accommodate 183 persons in the general seating area.

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **SHREWSBURY BOROUGH COURT, CONTINUED**

### **Hours of Operation**

- Monday through Friday, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm
- Operations begins at 8:30 a.m. on court days

### **Frequency and Length of Court Sessions**

- Court is held four times per month (there is generally no court session held on fifth Tuesdays)
- On an average court day, the Judge arrives at 8:30 a.m., takes the bench at 9:00 a.m. and concludes at 11:15 a.m.

### **Court Activity Statistics (Added/Disposed)**

	<b><u>2005</u></b>	<b><u>2006</u></b>	<b><u>2007 Proj.</u></b>
<b>Indictable</b>	85/85	88/88	144/144
<b>Disorderly Persons</b>	69/171	168/158	211/218
<b>Borough Ordinances</b>	284/279	170/161	108/114
<b>D.W.I.</b>	23/27	30/27	29/27
<b>Traffic</b>	3,194/3,410	3,103/3,140	2,343/2,453
<b>Parking</b>	249/280	228/237	196/179
<b>Total</b>	3,904/4,252	3,787/3,811	3,031/3,135

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**SHREWSBURY BOROUGH COURT, CONTINUED**

**Revenue and Expense Data**

	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>
<b>Salary &amp; Wages</b>	\$135,141	\$140,877	\$146,332
<b>Operating Expense</b>	\$ 6,492	\$ 5,339	\$ 6,158
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	\$141,633	\$146,160	\$152,490
<b>Municipal Revenue</b>	\$174,743	\$173,240	\$161,038
<b>Total Revenue</b>	\$420,818	\$400,945	\$368,507

**SHREWSBURY TOWNSHIP**

The Township of Shrewsbury utilizes the services of the Borough of Eatontown Municipal Court. The Township of Shrewsbury pays the Borough of Eatontown \$11,500 annually (2008 and 2009 consideration level). Any fines collected in excess of \$4,500 per year remain with the Borough of Eatontown. This has been a decade's long relationship. All considerations with respect to the Township of Shrewsbury have been fully considered as part of the Task 1 report dealing with the Borough of Eatontown Municipal Court.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **WEST LONG BRANCH COURT**

### **Staffing**

- Judge – presides over two court sessions per month that average five hours each.
- Court Administrator – full time employee working 35 hours per week with full benefits
- Deputy Court Administrator – part time employee with no benefits working 15 hours per week on weeks when there is no court session and 19 hours per week on weeks when there is a court session
- Security attendant is a sworn police officer

### **Facilities (Office and Courtroom)**

- The office is adequately sized (divided into two rooms) but should be updated if it were to remain as the municipal court office (plan exists to move to new facility)
- The Judge’s office (also utilized by the Prosecutor) has direct entry to the bench
- The courtroom is outdated, but has a functional layout with seating for over 100 persons
- Access to the courtroom is poor with the ADA lift not being consistently reliable
- The police department is presently in the same building, but there is no direct access to the courtroom from the police department. Plans have been approved for the police department to move to a new facility next to the municipal building over one mile away.
- There is no internal acceptance of credit cards

### **Hours of Operation**

- Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
- Payment window is closed for lunch hour, generally 12:30 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
- Court Administrator works hours in excess of window hours

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**WEST LONG BRANCH COURT, CONTINUED**

**Frequency and Length of Court Sessions**

- Court is held two times per month
- On an average court day, the court begins at 8:30 a.m. and concludes at 1:30 p.m.

**Court Activity Statistics (Added/Disposed)**

	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007 Proj.</u>
<b>Indictable</b>	*	159/157	140/137
<b>Disorderly Persons</b>	*	354/319	419/395
<b>Borough Ordinances</b>	*	109/169	236/246
<b>D.W.I.</b>	*	40/34	47/42
<b>Traffic</b>	*	2,257/2,111	3,310/3,002
<b>Parking</b>	*	371/347	169/161
<b>Total</b>	*	3,300/3,137	4,321/3,983

\*Data for 2005 was not available in the format utilized beginning in 2006.

**Revenue and Expense Data**

	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>
<b>Salary &amp; Wages</b>	\$ 78,623	\$ 83,712	\$ 74,585
<b>Operating Expense</b>	\$ 8,975	\$ 12,524	\$ 12,224
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	\$ 87,598	\$ 96,236	\$ 86,809
<b>Municipal Revenue</b>	\$165,793	\$185,088	\$239,920
<b>Total Revenue</b>	\$339,040	\$401,328	\$483,107

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **MUNICIPAL COURT OPERATIONS ANALYSIS**

There are four Neighbor Municipalities that have been considered in the analysis that follows since Shrewsbury Township has an interlocal services agreement with the Borough of Eatontown for the handling of all municipal court matters.

There is no significant anticipated impact from the closure of Fort Monmouth on the respective court operations of the Neighboring Municipalities. Similarly, there is no Fort Monmouth model that parallels the operation of the municipal courts.

### **Staffing**

The office staffing of these respective Neighboring Municipal court operations is generally very modest with Monmouth Beach having only one person regularly handling this function. Shrewsbury Borough has two full time persons in the court offices, and Sea Bright and West Long Branch each have the equivalent of 1.5 full time equivalents. These are modest operations when viewed individually, but when one considers the volume of the combined activity weighed against the personnel resources expended, the potential for savings are significant.

The most startling calculation involves the combined salaries of the judges in the Host Municipalities (excepting Tinton Falls) and the Neighboring Municipalities having a combined value that is 10% greater than the salary of a Superior Court Judge. However, their combined hours worked in one year equals less than one-half the number of hours worked by a full time employee.

Similarly, Eatontown's 2007 volume of cases was greater than the combined total of the four Neighboring Municipalities. Eatontown handled this volume with four full time equivalent employees in the office as opposed to the six full time equivalents in the four Neighboring Municipalities. This is a classic economy of scale situation as opposed to any criticism of the staffing arrangements in any of the Neighboring Municipalities.

Prosecutors and Public Defenders are not part of court budgetary operations, and they have not been fully evaluated in this study. However, it is estimated that a finding similar to that involving the analysis of the salaries for Judges would also hold true for Prosecutors and to a more limited degree for Public Defenders.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

#### **Facilities**

With the exception of the Borough of Shrewsbury, all of the Neighboring Municipality office and courtroom facilities were found to be functional, but inadequate and generally deficient with respect to Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) guidelines. Not all court operations have the ability to accept credit cards at the payment window and not all courtrooms are equipped with video conferencing capabilities.

Sea Bright recognizes their deficiencies and has discussed options to address these deficiencies. Space constraints impact upon not only court operations, but also upon other municipal administrative operations, but a definitive approach to addressing this challenge has not yet been identified.

West Long Branch has an agreement in principle with neighboring Ocean Township to physically host their municipal court operations. The court facilities in Ocean Township are presently undergoing complete renovation with completion anticipated prior to the end of 2008. The Township's proposal would involve the West Long Branch Municipal Court offices being located in the Township's Municipal Building, but operating independent from the Township's Municipal Court offices. Both courts would use the same courtroom, but staffing including the Judge, Prosecutors, Public Defender and court administrative personnel would be those of West Long Branch.

#### **Hours of Operation**

With the exception of the Borough of Shrewsbury, all of the Neighboring Municipality court offices have a need to close all or many days during the lunch hour due to limited staffing.

#### **Court Activity Statistics**

As is referenced earlier under the staffing analysis, the combined volume of activity in the four Neighboring Municipalities is less than the volume handled by the Borough of Eatontown Municipal Court office. This volume is largely driven by police and code enforcement activity, but it is relatively consistent from year to year, particularly when the totals for the four Neighboring Municipalities are considered.

#### **Revenue and Expense**

Court personnel are revenue collectors, not revenue generators. Accordingly, when the cost to collect revenue is very close to the municipal revenue generated as is the case with Monmouth Beach and Shrewsbury Borough, it is appropriate to seek out means to modify

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

operations to change this dynamic. It is important to note that the expense figures cited in the earlier Overview Section do not include a myriad of expenses that are outside the municipal court budgets including the following:

- Prosecutor and Public Defender salaries
- Payroll taxes
- General insurances (bonds, liability, worker's compensation, etc.)
- Health insurances (health, dental, life, prescription, and vision insurances)
- Utilities
- Custodial expenses
- Building maintenance
- Debt service associated with the construction of facilities and the acquisition of major equipment

When the above overhead type expenses are factored in, the cost of revenue collection can easily approach or exceed the municipal revenues generated. This is particularly true with the Borough of Shrewsbury.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **MUNICIPAL COURT RECOMMENDATIONS**

The primary recommendation as contained in the Task 1 report involves the establishment of a regional court to be located in Mallette Hall very close to where the municipal boundary between Eatontown and Oceanport is situated within what is now Fort Monmouth lands. This recommendation will not be repeated in the Task 4 section, but instead referenced as set forth in the Task 1 section.

With a base established involving two of the Host Municipalities (Eatontown and Oceanport) plus the Township of Shrewsbury through its existing relationship with the Borough of Eatontown, there is a solid foundation for an even more extensive regional court operation. At first blush, a community such as Sea Bright might believe that such a facility is too distant from their own community, but the following factors weigh in favor of the practicality of this approach:

- The primary clientele of a municipal court is not the residents of the community, but non-residents.
- A regional court would not only have the ability to accept payments by mail and by credit card through the State's system, but it would also have the ability to accept credit cards directly either in-person or through an internet based system.
- For those paying by mail or via the internet, the office location is irrelevant.
- Operating hours would be consistent on all business days.
- Employee absences could be adequately covered.
- The location of the County court facilities in distant Freehold have never been an issue for local residents, so after an initial adjustment period, this same dynamic should hold true for any of the Neighboring Municipalities.
- In large municipalities such as Middletown, Howell and Jackson, the location of the municipal court offices from the furthest home in that community can be as distant as Sea Bright is from Mallette Hall.

Based upon the analysis performed as part of Task 1 and based upon the analysis above, it is recommended that not only the Neighboring Municipalities that were a part of this study, but also other area municipalities join in the establishment of a regional municipal court system. Even though the Borough of West Long Branch is moving forward to address the inadequacies of their physical facilities on a more immediate basis, this would

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

not preclude them from becoming a part of this regional municipal court system in the future.

The savings that are identified in the Task 1 section that would be applicable to the Borough of Oceanport would parallel the savings that could be realized through the creation of a regional municipal court serving a greater number of municipalities. These savings would be different for each participant dependent upon the scope of their present operations, but with Oceanport operating at a lower cost than any of the Neighboring Municipalities; it is safe to conclude that all of the Neighboring Municipalities could realize a significant savings.

Beyond the monetary savings, there are other forms of benefits that could be realized including, but not limited to:

- Avoidance of issues related to non-compliance with AOC guidelines and/or mandates
- Safety through use of fully compliant court facilities
- Specialization of personnel so that a Court Administrator would not have to be handling matters that were more clerical in nature
- Freeing up of space in current municipal facilities to avoid the high cost of constructing new or expanded municipal facilities for other municipal uses

The above recommendation is based upon the premise that the Borough of Eatontown will be successful in acquiring Mallette Hall. Should that not be the case, the current Eatontown Municipal Building facilities are not considered to be suitable to accommodate more than the addition of the Borough of Oceanport to their existing shared municipal court operation with the Township of Shrewsbury.

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

**POLICE DEPARTMENT OVERVIEWS**

**Budgets**

**2007 Budgets**

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>Monmouth Beach</b>	<b>Sea Bright</b>	<b>Shrewsbury Borough</b>	<b>Shrewsbury Township</b>	<b>West Long Branch</b>
Salary & Wage	\$1,041,000	\$ 992,000	\$1,765,000	\$0	\$2,108,000
Other Expense	\$ 40,000	\$ 123,250	\$ 242,000	\$0	\$ 135,575
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,081,000</b>	<b>\$1,115,250</b>	<b>\$2,007,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,243,575</b>

**2008 Budgets**

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>Monmouth Beach</b>	<b>Sea Bright</b>	<b>Shrewsbury Borough</b>	<b>Shrewsbury Township</b>	<b>West Long Branch</b>
Salary & Wage	\$1,101,000	\$1,056,000	\$1,975,000	\$0	\$2,123,200
Other Expense	\$ 40,000	\$ 113,990	\$ 237,000	\$0	\$ 145,400
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,141,000</b>	<b>\$1,169,990</b>	<b>\$2,212,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,268,600</b>

The above includes the cost of dispatch.

**Staffing**

**Sworn Police Staffing**

<b>TITLE</b>	<b>Monmouth Beach</b>	<b>Sea Bright</b>	<b>Shrewsbury Borough</b>	<b>Shrewsbury Township</b>	<b>West Long Branch</b>
Chief	1	1	1	0	1
Captain	0	1	2	0	1
Lieutenant	2	1	1	0	1
Sergeant	1	1	4	0	4
Corporal	0	2	0	0	2
Detective*	0	0	0	0	2
Patrolman	6	5	8	0	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>

\* West Long Branch is not the only police department with detectives, but the other departments have detective as part of another title (example – Detective Lieutenant).

West Long Branch also employs Class II and a Class I Specials who work on an hourly basis. Monmouth Beach employs two Specials during the summer months only. Sea Bright uses eight Special Officers whose primary function is to provide dispatch services, but when not performing those duties, they perform other policing services in the Borough

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**Dispatch**

**Primary Entity Who Dispatches by Type of Call**

<b>Type Call</b>	<b>Monmouth Beach</b>	<b>Sea Bright</b>	<b>Shrewsbury Borough</b>	<b>Shrewsbury Township</b>	<b>West Long Branch</b>
Police	County	Borough	Borough	State Police	Borough
Fire	County	Borough	Borough	Eatontown	County
EMS	County	Borough	Borough	Eatontown	Borough

In all cases, the Monmouth County 9-1-1 Center receives the initial call, but in some cases they directly dispatch those calls and in other cases, they relay the call through the local police department dispatch center as is indicated above. If a call comes directly into the Monmouth Beach Police Department that requires dispatching, the officer on duty will dispatch directly without going through the County. In the case of Shrewsbury Township, the County relays police calls to the State Police and Fire and EMS calls to the Borough of Eatontown. In Sea Bright, the County handles the initial tone out for fire, but all future communications are through the police desk.

**Facilities**

- Monmouth Beach – Small, but functional and appropriate for size of municipality and size of force
- Sea Bright – Small, but functional and appropriate for size of municipality and size of force
- Shrewsbury Borough – Spacious facility that more than adequately supports all of the Police Department operations. The Police Department occupies a full wing of the Municipal Building (only five years old) on three separate floors.
- West Long Branch – The current facility is inadequate, but a contract has been awarded for the construction of a new, 10,000 square foot Police Department building that is anticipated to cost \$3,000,000.

# TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES

## FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA

---

### Vehicles

Type of Vehicle	Monmouth Beach	Sea Bright	Shrewsbury Borough	Shrewsbury Township	West Long Branch
Marked	5	6	8	0	12
Unmarked	1	3	3	0	5
Motorcycle	0	2	0	0	0
Beach Buggy	0	2	0	0	0

### Calls for Service

The average monthly calls for service are indicated below. It is important to note that these figures were averaged over different time periods dependent upon the information that was supplied to the Study Team. Also, the determination as to what is classified as a “call” varies from municipality to municipality. For these reasons, it is important that a very limited consideration be given to the following statistics:

- Monmouth Beach Borough 783
- Sea Bright Borough 1,022
- Shrewsbury Borough 963
- West Long Branch Borough 1,189

### Crime Statistics

Crime statistics in the United States are compiled annually by the Federal Bureau of Investigation through a nationwide cooperative program called the Uniform Crime Report (UCR). In New Jersey, police organizations record crime statistics on monthly UCR reports and submit them to the New Jersey State Police UCR Unit. The State Police forward the information to the FBI, compile statewide statistics, and prepare an annual report titled “Crime in New Jersey – Uniform Crime Report”. This annual report presents a wide range of statistical information relative to crime throughout the state. The report includes a listing of the crime rate (number of crimes per 1000 inhabitants) in every municipality in the state.

Fundamentally, UCR statistics are based on a group of eight crimes called “Index Crimes”. These crimes were selected because they generate a reliable set of criminal statistics common to all jurisdictions. Of the eight index crimes, four are considered

## TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES

### FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA

violent crimes (murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and four are considered non violent crimes (burglary, theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson).

The information below for the 2005 and 2006 calendar years was taken from the N. J. State Police Uniform Crime Report (UCR). Crime statistics for 2007 are expected to be released in late summer.

#### Crime Rate – Number of Crimes per 1000 Population

Municipality	Violent	Non-Violent	Total
Monmouth Beach			
2005	0	11.6	11.6
2006	1.1	8.6	9.7
Sea Bright			
2005	0	23.1	23.1
2006	0.6	8.9	9.5
Shrewsbury Boro			
2005	0.8	25.5	26.3
2006	2.4	18.7	21.1
Shrewsbury Twp.			
2005	1.8	3.7	5.5
2006	0.9	4.6	5.5
West Long Branch			
2005	1.1	35.4	36.5
2006	1.2	32.3	33.6

#### Annual Number of Crimes Reported

Municipality	Violent	Non-Violent	Total
Monmouth Beach			
2005	0	42	42
2006	4	31	35
Sea Bright			
2005	0	42	42
2006	1	16	17
Shrewsbury Boro			
2005	3	95	98
2006	9	70	79
Shrewsbury Twp.			
2005	2	4	6
2006	1	5	6
West Long Branch			
2005	9	292	301
2006	10	268	278

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

#### **Shrewsbury Township**

Although included in the above review, it is important to underscore that the Township of Shrewsbury utilizes the services of the State Police. The State Police formerly operated out of the Allenwood Barracks in nearby Wall Township. However, as a result of the recent closure of the Allenwood Barracks, the State Police Officers now servicing the Township of Shrewsbury operate out of the Hamilton Barracks in Mercer County. This is not to say that the closest responding State Police Officers would be coming from Mercer County, but there is a concern on the part of the Township of Shrewsbury officials with this recent change.

No statistics were made available to Jersey Professional Management, but it is clearly recognized that there is a very low call volume. The Township of Shrewsbury officials report that in the case of an emergency call, police officers from the Boroughs of Shrewsbury, Eatontown and Tinton Falls routinely respond and stay on the scene until a State Police Officer arrives.

There is also a concern on the part of the Township of Shrewsbury officials that the 2007-08 State budget that calls for municipalities receiving police services through the State Police to pay a portion of that cost effective January 1, 2009. Neither the formula nor the amount of the contribution is known presently. It is also unknown whether or not this contribution will steadily climb to a point of a 100% payment. This recent development increases the likelihood that the Township of Shrewsbury could benefit from the recommendations in this section, particularly if they would be able to benefit from a better level of service at a comparable cost. Since the recommendations with respect to the Neighboring Municipalities would not be applicable until Mallette Hall could be converted to municipal uses (2012 or later), any contribution required by the State may at that point equal or exceed the cost of a regional policing arrangement.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **POLICE DEPARTMENT ANALYSIS**

The Boroughs of Monmouth Beach and Sea Bright not only border each other, but they have very similar characteristics in terms of demographics, development patterns and overall geography. Neither of these two Neighboring Municipalities have a land connection to any of the other Host or Neighboring Municipalities. Although they could be part of a regional police department, they would not be the “perfect” fit. However, since field policing is generally based upon the establishment of patrol zones, it is not out of the question that these two communities could be part of a regional police force made up of the Host Municipalities (excluding Tinton Falls) and the other Neighboring Municipalities. Another possible approach would be for these two Boroughs to join their police forces to realize benefits including, but not limited to:

- Joint financing of a new headquarters if one were determined to be needed.
- Likely reduction in staffing through attrition and at the same time more reliable coverage without the use of overtime to cover leave time
- Automatic back-up as opposed to need to involve mutual aid
- Need for fewer vehicles
- Need for fewer positions of rank
- Greater ability to devote resources to specialized functions
- An overall economy of scale

The Task 4 goal is to evaluate the ability to incorporate the emergency services in any of the Neighboring Municipalities into the shared services models developed in the Task 1, 2 and 3 sections of this overall study. With respect to police services, there is no significant impact on either Monmouth Beach or Sea Bright with respect to either the loss of Fort Monmouth’s police force or with respect to the ultimate reuse and redevelopment of the Fort lands. Given this conclusion and the earlier reference to these two communities not being a “perfect” fit with a regional police force serving areas directly surrounding Fort Monmouth, the remaining analysis will focus on the remaining Neighboring Municipalities.

Since the Fort Monmouth Police force does not perform any services outside the boundaries of the Fort, their departure will not have any impact upon Shrewsbury Borough, Shrewsbury Township and West Long Branch Borough. However, the subsequent reuse and redevelopment of the Fort Monmouth lands will have an impact on these three Neighboring Municipalities. The most significant impact will be felt by the Borough of Shrewsbury. A majority of Shrewsbury’s southern border is the northern border of the Fort’s Main Post area. Additionally, Route 35 that would be a main access point to the redeveloped Fort lands runs from the northern end to the southern end of Shrewsbury. Traffic and spin-off residential, retail and office development will impact

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

both Shrewsbury Borough and West Long Branch Borough. It is not anticipated that Shrewsbury Township will experience any appreciable impacts.

From a geographic perspective, a police force serving both Eatontown and Oceanport (primary recommendation in Task 2 report) might fit well into a more regional policing approach that would include the Neighboring Municipalities of Shrewsbury Borough and West Long Branch Borough as well as the Borough of Little Silver (Little Silver was not a part of this review). Shrewsbury Township would also be a good fit into this regional policing approach if they were to voluntarily relinquish their State Police coverage or if the State Police coverage was either eliminated or effectively eliminated through a significant charge being assessed for this service. If such a charge becomes greater than the cost for a more local coverage through an interlocal services agreement, the Township would be well served by this regional policing agency.

The analysis that follows evaluates the Neighboring Municipalities of Shrewsbury and West Long Branch utilizing the information that was a part of the overview section that preceded this section. Contrasts are made between these two municipalities and the Borough of Eatontown with respect to policing operations.

### **Budgets**

The combined 2007 police budgets of the Boroughs of Shrewsbury and West Long Branch total \$4,246,575. This figure is very similar to the 2007 Eatontown Police Department budget that totaled \$4,665,619. Yet the Borough of Eatontown serves a population of 14,381 in 5.86 square miles while the Boroughs of Shrewsbury and West Long Branch combined serve a population of 12,097 in 5.13 square miles.

### **Staffing**

The combined police staffing in the Boroughs of Shrewsbury and West Long Branch of 37 is exactly the same as the sworn police staffing in Eatontown, yet these two Neighboring Municipalities have a smaller area that is served as well as a smaller population base. This comparison is even more dramatic when one considers the non-residential policing responsibilities in Eatontown as compared to those in the Boroughs of Shrewsbury and West Long Branch.

### **Dispatch**

Both Shrewsbury and West Long Branch employ full dispatching staffs as does the Boroughs of Eatontown and Oceanport. This is an exceedingly expensive service when compared to the call volumes, particularly in the Boroughs of Oceanport, Shrewsbury and

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

West Long Branch. This is one of the most striking duplications of services and one of the easiest ways to combine resources to provide a single point of dispatch.

### **Facilities**

The primary factor that could potentially cause the Boroughs of Shrewsbury and West Long Branch to reject any full participation in a regional police force involves the significant investment the Borough of Shrewsbury just made five years ago in the construction of a new police headquarters and the investment the Borough of West Long Branch is presently making in the construction of a new police headquarters. Mallette Hall as a base for a regional policing organization is large enough to accommodate such a use, and it is also well configured to address the facility needs of a regional policing organization.

### **Vehicles**

The Boroughs of Shrewsbury and West Long Branch have a combined total of 28 police vehicle while the Borough of Eatontown has 24 police vehicle. Although there is not a significant difference in these two numbers, the vehicles needed to support a combined regional police force would be less than the combined total of 52 even before factoring in the additional 8 vehicles in the Oceanport Police fleet.

### **Calls for Service**

The combined average monthly police calls for service in the Boroughs of Shrewsbury and West Long Branch is 2,152 compared to Eatontown's average monthly call for service in 2007 of 1,865. It is curious that Eatontown with a higher population and land area would have a lower number of calls for service, but this could be in part a result of different definitions of calls for service utilized by the respective municipalities. As stated earlier, there should be a very limited weight placed on this factor.

### **Crime Statistics**

The diversity in the of types of development in Eatontown would lead one to expect that they would have a higher crime rate than either the Borough of Shrewsbury or the Borough of West Long Branch and this is in fact the case. The average 2005-2006 overall crime rate in Eatontown is 77% higher than the crime rate in Shrewsbury Borough and 20% higher than the crime rate in West Long Branch, but this is accounted for primarily in non-violent crimes. The violent crime rates in all of these communities are low.

## **POLICE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Primary Recommendation**

The Task 2 report recommends that the Tinton Falls Police Department continue to operate as it presently operates. With respect to Tinton Falls, it concluded that the impacts associated with the closure of Fort Monmouth can readily be absorbed by that Police Department. With respect to the remaining two Host Municipalities, it is recommended that the Oceanport Police Department be dissolved and that the Oceanport policing responsibilities be transferred to the Borough of Eatontown through an interlocal services agreement.

With this foundation, the goal of the Task 4 report is to evaluate the extent to which the Task 2 recommendation can be applicable to the inclusion of any of the Neighboring Municipalities studied. On that basis, it is recommended that the Boroughs of Shrewsbury and West Long Branch dissolve their respective police departments and join in the formation of a regional policing agency. This recommendation is based upon the parallel analysis performed in the Task 2 report as it pertained to the Borough of Oceanport. It is the considered opinion of the Task 4 Study Team that the following benefits would be derived from such a regionalized approach:

- Cost savings realized through:
  1. Reduced overall staffing level
  2. Reduced size of fleet
  3. Reduced duplication of services
- Ability to address areas of police specialization through assignment of full time personnel in those areas
- Reduced administrative command staff resulting in a stronger presence on the street
- Enhanced capability to provide a comprehensive training program
- Elimination of redundant operations

It is recognized that there are multiple factors that would play against the regional policing approach. Any initiative involving moving forward in the implementation of

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

this recommendation would have to address factors including, but not limited to the following:

- A strong Home Rule sentiment
- Shrewsbury Borough having a state of the art police facility that is only five years old without any immediately identifiable use of that space should it be abandoned.
- West Long Branch having just awarded a contract for a new Police Department Headquarters that has been designed to serve their needs well into the future.
- Shrewsbury Township enjoying at least through the end of 2008 a free policing service through the State Police and further enjoying the benefits of a no cost response on the part of Tinton Falls, Shrewsbury Borough and Eatontown as a mutual aid gesture.
- A study that is underway to explore the possible merger of the police departments in the Boroughs of Fair Haven, Little Silver and Rumson in which there has been interest expressed for inclusion beyond those three communities.

The timing of implementation should be linked to the completion of a regional police headquarters that would be located at Mallette Hall in the Eatontown portion of Fort Monmouth. Although the current Eatontown Police Headquarters could handle the absorption of the Borough of Oceanport, it is not adequate to absorb any additional municipal police agencies. The exception to this statement involves the ability of Eatontown to take on the responsibility for policing the Township of Shrewsbury should the Township elect to forfeit their State Police coverage.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **SECONDARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Monmouth Beach/Sea Bright Police Merger**

The Boroughs of Monmouth Beach and Sea Bright are similarly situated between the Atlantic Ocean to the east and the Shrewsbury River to the west. They are similar in character in terms of both demographics and types of development. Given these factors, there is a high probability that both communities would be able to benefit from a joint police force. Although the Host Municipality of Oceanport shares has similar characteristics with the Boroughs of Monmouth Beach and Sea Bright, there is no land border between the Borough of Oceanport and the Borough of Monmouth Beach, thus making Oceanport a better candidate for a merger with neighboring Eatontown as is referenced in the Task 2 section.

Since such a merger falls outside the scope of this Shared Emergency Services Study, this possibility is mentioned, but a separate study would have to be performed to fully evaluate the benefits and cost savings. However, if there were to be such a merger, the combined force would still be relatively small by policing standards. Accordingly, there remains potential shared service arrangements with the regional policing concept identified as the Primary Recommendation.

If there were to be a merger of the Police Departments in the Boroughs of Monmouth Beach and Sea Bright, this combined force could potentially contract with the regional force for one or more specialized services. The types of specialized services that would be appropriate for consideration include the following:

- Criminal investigation
- Handling of juvenile matters
- Traffic administration (dealings with NJDOT, drafting of ordinances, traffic counts, etc.
- Grant writing
- Serious accident investigation
- Neighborhood Watch Program administration
- D.A.R.E. officer
- Canine services

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

### **Dispatch**

Three of the four Neighboring Municipality police forces have full dispatch operations. This is an unwarranted expenditure of public dollars that results in minimal local benefit. Although the County of Monmouth is not presently in a position to absorb any significant additional workload through their dispatch center, plans are underway to expand so that additional municipalities could eliminate their local dispatch operations and utilize the services of the County. It is recommended that all of the Neighboring Municipalities take this approach.

If the expanded County 9-1-1 Center does not become a reality in a short to mid term timeframe, a dispatch center operated through the regional policing agency proposed would be a logical alternative. In such an event, it is recommended that the Boroughs of Sea Bright, Shrewsbury and West Long Branch enter into an interlocal services agreement for dispatch services to be provided by the regional policing agency.

### **OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (OEM)**

In the post September 11 era, the requirements to maintain a compliant Office of Emergency Management (OEM) operation are significant. Smaller municipalities such as the ones identified as the Neighboring Municipalities are particularly impacted by these requirements. Each of the Neighboring Municipalities (excepting the Township of Shrewsbury) have dedicated and knowledgeable individuals serving as the local coordinator. However, the demands of this position can be overwhelming if all of the OEM requirements are to be fully met.

The Township of Shrewsbury recently lost their OEM coordinator, and they are struggling to fill those shoes. With their limited geographic size and limited population base, it is difficult to recruit on a permanent basis someone willing to take on this role. Additionally, since all of the other emergency services are outsourced, coordination of these services and coordination of the local public works resources can be a daunting task.

Each of the Neighboring Municipalities has unique challenges that they face with respect to the OEM function, but the Boroughs of Monmouth Beach and Sea Bright in particular, have very serious challenges they face. These municipalities have the characteristics of barrier islands. They have regular and serious flooding problems and can be severely impacted by not only flood waters, but also by high winds coming off of the Atlantic Ocean and the Shrewsbury River.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

The Task 2 section of this overall report analyzes the OEM operations in each of the Host Municipalities. The general conclusion was that emergency management is a local responsibility, not discounting that there are resources available at the County, State, and Federal government levels. There was one shared service opportunity identified that involved the hiring of a joint administrative employee on a part time basis. Below are the specifics of that recommendation:

An experienced emergency management professional may be hired on a part-time basis to support the municipal coordinators by performing the bulk of the OEM administrative tasks. It should be made clear, that this recommendation is not intended to replace or diminish the role of the Municipal Coordinator, but should exist in a support role.

The tasks performed by the OEM administrator may include:

- Secure technical and financial assistance available through Federal and State programs and grants
- Prepare and update the Emergency Operations Plans
- Prepare and administer the budgets
- Organize and manage the local CERT
- Manage registrations and administration of alert warnings systems such as Code Red
- Plan and organize training exercises to test response capabilities
- Assist with development of mutual aid and cooperative assistance agreements
- Facilitate the development and updating of the Local Emergency Management Committee
- Develop and manage a public education program
- Keep the mission and activities of Emergency Management in the public view

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

- Coordinate high risk facilities and critical areas to develop emergency plans

This same recommendation is equally applicable to the Neighboring Municipalities, many of whom may have an even greater need for these support services than the two larger Host Municipalities of Eatontown and Tinton Falls. One potential source of an individual with the qualifications to fill such a position would be from the retired ranks of the Fort Monmouth Fire Department.

## **FIRE DEPARTMENT OVERVIEWS**

### **MONMOUTH BEACH FIRE DEPARTMENT**

#### **Facility**

The Monmouth Beach Fire Department operates from one station (33-1) located at 24 Beach Road near Town Hall.

#### **Personnel**

The table of organization has a Chief, two Assistant Chiefs, a Training Officer and a Safety Officer, a Foreman and two Assistant Foreman. There are 73 members in the fire department.

#### **Equipment**

- Engine 3376 – 2004 Seagrave with a 1500 gpm pump.
- Engine 3375- 1998 Sutphen with a 1500 gpm pump.
- Ladder 3391- 1987 Sutphen 95' Tower ladder.

#### **Dispatch System**

Monmouth Beach participates in the Mid Monmouth Mutual Aid Agreement. Fire Department dispatching is done by Monmouth County Dispatch. Monmouth Beach uses Monmouth Fire 1 (154.430 MHZ.) as their dispatch frequency and Monmouth Fire 2 (154.175 MHZ.) as their tactical frequency. Through the County dispatch system Monmouth Beach has communication with all other Monmouth County Fire Departments.

The fee charged to Monmouth Beach for 9-1-1, Police Fire and EMS dispatch service for 2008 is \$31,648.48.

#### **Fire Alarm Activity**

Monmouth Beach Fire Department responded to a total of 191 calls in 2007. 35 of those were for some type of fire (structural/non-structural). They have averaged 178 calls and 35 fires a year for the 2005-2007 timeframe.

The Fort Monmouth Fire Department responded to Monmouth Beach on two occasions for fires in 2006. There were no other responses during the period from 2004-2007. Specific details of these incidents were not available for review.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **SEA BRIGHT**

### **Facility**

The Sea Bright Fire Department operates from one station (43-1) located at 1099 East Ocean Ave.

### **Personnel**

The Sea Bright Fire Department consists of the Ocean Fire Company and the Hook and Ladder Fire Company. These are separate organizations with their own administrative structure of a President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer and Trustees. Committees are appointed at annual joint meetings as necessary.

There is one set of line officers which include a Chief, Assistant Chief, Captain, 1<sup>st</sup> Lieutenant, 2<sup>nd</sup> Lieutenant, and 3<sup>rd</sup> Lieutenant.

There are 20 active members in the Hook and Ladder Company. The number of members in the Ocean Fire Company was not provided.

### **Equipment**

Engine 43-74 - 1981 American LaFrance 1500 gpm pump  
Engine 43-75 - 2004 Emergency One 1500 gpm pump  
Engine 43-76 - 1982 American LaFrance 1500 gpm pump  
Engine 43-77 - 1982 American LaFrance 2000 gpm pump  
1970 International Flood Truck 1,000 gpm pump

### **Dispatch**

Sea Bright participates in the Mid-Monmouth Mutual Aid Agreement. Monmouth County dispatches Sea Bright fire calls only. Sea Bright handles tactical communications. Sea Bright is dispatched on Monmouth Fire 1 (154.430 MHZ.) and their tactical frequency is Monmouth Fire 2 (154.175 MHZ.).

The fee charged to Sea Bright for 9-1-1 service and fire dispatch service for 2008 was \$3,716.16.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **SEA BRIGHT, CONTINUED**

### **Fire Alarm Activity**

Sea Bright Fire Department was dispatched 187 times in 2007, 16 of those calls were for some type of fire (structural/non-structural). Sea Bright averaged 148 calls per year for the period from 2005-2007. During that period the average number for all fires calls was 15 per year.

In 2007 Fort Monmouth Fire Department responded to Sea Bright 5 times. In 2006 and 2005 they responded once each year. Two of the responses in 2007 were for fires and one was for a haz-mat incident. Specific details of these incidents were not available for review.

## **SHREWSBURY BOROUGH**

### **Facility**

Shrewsbury Hose Company # 1 operates from a single station (45-1) and is located at 783 Broad Street.

### **Personnel**

Fire Company Administration consists of a President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, Sergeant at Arms and a 5 member Board of Trustees.

The Line Officers are a Chief, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Assistant Chiefs, Chief Engineer and 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Assistant Chief Engineers. In addition, there is a Safety Officer and a Captain of Fire Police.

There are 46 active and 8 inactive members.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

### **SHREWSBURY BOROUGH, CONTINUED**

#### **Equipment**

Engine 4576 – 2000 S&S Rescue Pumper with a 2000 gpm pump.

Engine 4577 - 1987 Hahn Pumper with a 1500 gpm pump.

Tower Ladder 45-90 – 92' Tower Ladder with a 1500 gpm pump.

Support Unit – 1989 Braun ambulance (converted)

Command Vehicle – 2004 Ford Expedition

#### **Dispatch**

Shrewsbury Borough participated in the Mid-Monmouth Mutual Aid Agreement.

Fire Department Dispatching is done by the Shrewsbury Borough Police Department. 9-1-1 calls go to Monmouth County Dispatch and are routed to Shrewsbury Borough.

The 9-1-1 service fee was \$ 4,977.60 for 2008.

#### **Fire Alarm Activity**

The Shrewsbury Fire Department responded to 250 calls in 2007. There were 6 calls that were classified as structure fires. In the period from 2005-2007 Shrewsbury averaged 242 calls per year with an average of 5 classified as structure fires.

Fort Monmouth Fire Department responded to Shrewsbury Borough five times in 2007 and 2006. Three of those incidents were for fires and one was a haz-mat incident. There were four responses in 2005 none of which were for fires or haz-mat incidents. There was only one response in 2004 and it was for a fire. Specific details of these incidents were not available for review.

### **SHREWSBURY TOWNSHIP**

The Township of Shrewsbury utilizes the services of the Borough of Eatontown Fire Department and accordingly, all considerations with respect to the Township of Shrewsbury have been fully considered as part of the Task 3 report dealing with the Borough of Eatontown Fire Department.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **WEST LONG BRANCH**

### **Facilities**

The West Long Branch Fire Department operates from two stations. Borough Chemical and Truck Co. 1 (Station 53-1) is located at 379 Monmouth Road. The West Long Branch Fire Co. 2 (Station 53-2) is located at 15 Oceanport Ave.

### **Personnel**

Borough ordinance create and provide for the ranks of Chief and Assistant Chief to be elected annually. The position of Chief is alternated between the two companies. The Assistant Chief cannot be from the same company as the Chief. Each company elects their line officers that consist of a Captain, a 1<sup>st</sup> Lieutenant, and a 2<sup>nd</sup> Lieutenant. The Borough Chemical and Truck Co 1 has approximately 50 members. Fire Company No. 2 has over 60 members.

### **Equipment**

Engine 53-78 - 1997 Freightliner 1250 gpm pump  
Engine 53-75 - 1980 Mack 1000 gpm pump  
Engine 53-90 - 2000 American LaFrance 2000 gpm pump  
Truck 53-91 - 1990 Baker Tower Ladder 75 ft.  
Rescue 53-85 - 1997 Ford F350 Rescue

### **Dispatch System**

West Long Branch participates in the Mid-Monmouth Mutual Aid Agreement.

Fire Department Dispatching is done by Monmouth County Dispatch. West Long Branch uses Monmouth Fire 1 (154.43 MHZ) as their dispatch frequency and Monmouth Fire 2 (154.175 MHZ) as their tactical frequency. Through the County dispatch system, West Long Branch has communication with all Monmouth County Fire Departments.

The fee charged to West Long Branch for 9-1-1 and fire dispatch service for 2008 is \$9,267.36.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **WEST LONG BRANCH, CONTINUED**

### **Fire Alarm Activity**

West Long Branch has not made their 2007 incident report available for review. However, in 2006 they responded to 292 calls. 32 were for some type of fire (structural/non-structural).

The Fort Monmouth Fire Department responded into West Long Branch 12 times in 2007, 10 times in 2006, 3 times in 2005 and 3 times in 2004. Two of the calls in 2006 were HAZMAT related and one call in 2004 was HAZMAT related. Specific details of these incidents were not available for review.

## **NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITY OVERVIEW SUMMARY**

### **Neighboring Municipalities with Fire Departments**

The communities of Monmouth Beach, Sea Bright, Shrewsbury Borough and West Long Branch each have an all-volunteer fire department. These departments are typical of the three host communities in that these departments were formed as the region developed in the late 1800's and the first half of the 1900's. They all have their roots as independent fire companies. Some still retain some of that independence because the fire company still owns the building in which the equipment is housed. Most still use the name that the company was originally formed under such as Shrewsbury Hose Company #1 or Borough Chemical and Truck Co. #1 in West Long Branch.

As was found with the host communities, the neighboring communities utilize the Mid-Monmouth Mutual Aid Agreement. These communities also have designated automatic and immediate response requests for locations within their community where the potential hazard to life and property will likely exceed the resources of the local fire department. These properties are typically schools, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, office buildings, and large multi-family dwellings/apartment buildings, especially high-rise buildings. Each department utilizing the mutual aid response plan form (see attachments for Task 3) lists the mutual aid response for their department. The Chief can also designate automatic and immediate mutual aid. This arrangement dispatches mutual aid to the scene immediately upon receipt of an alarm rather than waiting for confirmation of a fire.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

### **Neighboring Municipalities with Fire Departments, Continued**

The hazard survey of these communities revealed that they are all similar to the three host communities. All of the towns are densely populated (more than 1,000 people per square mile). They are almost fully developed and are crisscrossed by important local, county and state major arterial roadways. The beach communities have the ocean as an additional primary hazard because of the potential for flooding and the need to make water rescues. However, the most noticeable difference is that there are four high rise condominiums in Monmouth Beach. The buildings are between 12 and 17 stories tall. These properties present a serious challenge to any fire department.

### **Shrewsbury Township**

As noted in the Task 3 report, Shrewsbury Township has an interlocal services agreement with the Borough of Eatontown for fire protection and fire prevention services. They do not have a fire department and are completely reliant on Eatontown. The Township is only one tenth of a square mile and has a population of slightly more than one thousand people. The buildings are predominantly residential and no special hazards were observed. The only non-residential structures are the municipal building, the public works garage, a meeting hall and a building with an apartment management office and convenience/liquor store.

It is interesting to note however that Shrewsbury Township, like virtually all of the communities involved in this study, are considered urban areas by standards used for insurance evaluation and fire protection grading because the population density is greater than 1,000 people per square mile. Shrewsbury's population in relation to the total area of the community has a population density that exceeds 10,000 people per square mile. However, despite this anomaly, there is no evidence that fires are the problem they typically are in cities that have similar population densities.

The Eatontown Chief reported that the number of responses in the Township by his department were small. The Study Team's statistical analysis was unable to breakout the total number of calls to Township because they are reported with Eatontown statistics. The fee paid by Shrewsbury to support the Chief's statement that there is a low activity level since Shrewsbury Township only pays \$4,500 annually for fire protection services

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

## **FIRE DEPARTMENT ANALYSIS**

### **Loss of Fort Monmouth Paid Fire Department**

With respect to the four Neighboring Municipalities (Shrewsbury Township was excluded since any activity in the Township is included in the Eatontown Fire Department statistics), the number of responses on the part of the Fort Monmouth Fire Department over the prior four full calendar years is limited. These statistics are fully outlined in the Task 4 – Attachment 3, but are summarized below:

#### **Fort Monmouth Neighboring Municipality Responses**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Fire Response</b>	<b>Haz Mat Response</b>	<b>Gas Related Response</b>	<b>Rescue</b>	<b>Electrical Related Response</b>
<b>2007</b>	8	2	2	0	0
<b>2006</b>	8	2	0	1	1
<b>2005</b>	3	1	1	1	0
<b>2004</b>	2	1	0	0	0

Excluded from the above summary are false alarm responses (7), stand-bys (12), EMS calls (1) and weather related responses (none).

Although the above responses were appreciated by the receiving municipalities, the consensus of the municipal first responders and the conclusion of the Study Team is that there is an ability within the study area for mutual aid to bridge the loss of the paid Fort Monmouth Fire Department. Also, it is recognized that in a true Homeland Security related emergency situation, it would be each of the municipalities having to address their own needs since the Fort personnel have a primary obligation to address the needs of Fort Monmouth and attend to related national security issues.

### **Neighboring Municipality Resources**

#### **Facilities**

All of the facilities are sound structures with adequate space for the storage of equipment and the conduct of training sessions. The facilities in these communities are a key component to satisfying the requirements of the Fire Suppression Rating Schedule (FSRS) manual ISO (International Organization for Standardization) that is used in the review of the fire-fighting capabilities of individual communities. This in turn directly correlates to the favorable homeowner insurance rates enjoyed by the residents in these communities. Other factors related to this ISO rating include how well fire alarms are

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

dispatched, water supply, personnel, training, response history and equipment (age, maintenance and testing). Some of these factors are reviewed below.

#### **Personnel**

As with the Host Municipalities, the primary resource of the Neighboring Municipalities is the large number of dedicated volunteers who give willingly of their time and talents. When one considers that there are over 250 fire volunteers in the four Neighboring Municipalities that have fire departments, this is a remarkable resource that comes with no salaried expense. This figure is even more remarkable when one considers that the combined population base of these four communities is 17,602 and their combined land area is 6.83 square miles.

#### **Equipment**

Volunteer Fire Departments occasionally come under some criticism for the number of vehicles they have. However, this is generally uninformed criticism. There is a direct correlation between the equipment inventory and the ISO rating that influences the rates for homeowner's insurance. Additionally, it is the local department that is generally the first on the scene, and they must have the tools necessary to address life safety issues. Finally, the cost of the equipment when weighed against the value of the volunteer services being provided equates to a bargain for the taxpaying public.

The fire departments within the Neighboring Municipalities are well equipped. Combined, they have eleven pumpers with model years ranging from 1980 to 2004, three ladder trucks and related support vehicles. In addition to this inventory of vehicles, they have an appropriate inventory of support equipment.

#### **Dispatch System**

In all of the Neighboring Municipalities, 9-1-1 calls are received by the County of Monmouth. In Monmouth Beach and West Long Branch, the County handles all remaining fire dispatch services. In Sea Bright, the County handles the initial fire notification (page out of personnel only) and only in Shrewsbury Borough are all communications handled through the Police Dispatch Desk after being relayed by the County. A preferable system would involve all communications being handled from start to finish by the County Communications Center. In the event this County Center could not handle the added workload, a regional communications center would be an appropriate alternative.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

#### **Fire Alarm Activity**

Generally, the call volume and the type of calls are consistent with the size and population of these largely residential communities. While there is a fewer number of volunteers available during weekday, daytime hours; the situation with the fire departments does not parallel the situation with EMS squads given that there are a significantly higher number of fire department volunteers as opposed to the number of EMS volunteers.

### **FIRE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS**

In the Task 3 section of this report, Jersey Professional Management, after a careful and thorough analysis, made four recommendations that are outlined for implementation. The parallel comments with respect to the Neighboring Municipalities follows.

#### **Recommendation #1 – Maintenance of Current Systems**

As with the Host Municipalities, the Neighboring Municipal fire departments have built a solid model for the protection of their respective communities. It is recommended that all of the area fire departments in the mid-Monmouth County Region continue to maintain the high standards and proven systems that have been developed with respect to the provision of fire protection.

The Study Team's interviews of elected officials, chiefs, officers, firefighters, and County officials in conjunction with the review of the levels of protection being provided by each of these community's fire departments led to the conclusion that a solid fire protection model is in place. In the Study Team's analysis of the service provided to the region by the Fort Monmouth Fire Department, it was concluded that the closure of Fort Monmouth will result in the elimination the only fully paid fire department in the immediate area. It was recognized that the Fort's Fire Department is well equipped and well trained. However, this department's services, other than the availability of a paid staff, can and will be replaced through the extensive and the well-coordinated resources that are already in place through the Mid-Monmouth County Mutual Aid System.

A universal observation involved the recognition that the Fort Monmouth Fire Department has a high level of expertise in the provision of special services such as the handling of hazardous materials events and technical rescue operations. These resources are and will continue to be available after the dissolution of the Fort Monmouth Fire Department through the extensive resources available through the Monmouth County Mutual Aid System.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

The Fort Monmouth Fire Department also responds on immediate and automatic basis to some of its neighbors. However, with the number of fire companies in the region, there are adequate resources available to replace the Fort's response without the need to establish a new regional paid fire department. It is recognized that this paid company will generally be able to provide a shorter response time because they are already in quarters and can respond immediately. However, in this review, the Study Team was unable to find any specific documented examples where having the paid staff available to respond impacted upon the outcome of the incident.

It is important to note that the resources that have been available through the Fort Monmouth Fire Department are unique in terms of their benefit to the Coastal Monmouth County municipalities. Municipalities throughout New Jersey that do not have the benefit of these unique resources nevertheless provide high levels of fire protection services through all-volunteer local fire departments.

### **Recommendation #2 – Automatic Mutual Aid**

Within the mid-Monmouth County Region, it is recommended that a practice of immediate and automatic mutual aid, on all alarms, in all communities, and at all times be implemented. Immediate and automatic involves the neighboring communities who have the closest station to the incident being dispatched immediately upon receipt of an alarm. The Study Team found evidence that staffing for emergency response is adequate. During weekday, daytime hours when there is a greater challenge involved in securing appropriate sized crews, the Study Team found that many departments already have immediate and automatic aid agreements in place for selected locations in their communities.

Immediate Automatic Aid is described above. Mutual Aid is the process of giving or receiving out of town assistance when an emergency causes a community to commit all of its resources to mitigating an incident and additional resources are still required for active firefighting or for stand-by purposes. Communities in New Jersey are obligated to provide mutual aid assistance under state statute (N.J.S.A 52:14E-11 et seq.) commonly known as the "Fire Service Resource Emergency Deployment Act." Immediate Automatic Aid is an enhanced level of Mutual Aid.

An emergency may be localized such as one town asking for assistance from neighboring communities for a large fire or it may be regional involving multiple counties, such as a major weather event, a large scale, long duration hazardous materials incident or an interstate event such as Hurricane Katrina and the World Trade Center attack.

Each community by law has a local mutual aid plan and each county has a county plan. Each county has a county fire coordinator whose has the responsibility to respond when

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

requested by the local incident commander and assist with the provision of the necessary resources and technical expertise. The county fire coordinator is charged with the responsibility of notifying state emergency management officials as well as requesting state and regional resources, if necessary.

The current system of mutual aid in the mid-Monmouth Region is a mixture of traditional mutual aid and automatic mutual aid. If future circumstances (such as a lack of adequate daytime turnout) dictate the need for an enhanced mutual aid practice, then efforts need to be made to reach a consensus for a standardized approach using immediate and automatic mutual aid as a regular and routine practice. However, a proactive approach supports putting such a practice in place prior to the development of a pattern of delayed or inadequate responses.

Mutual Aid is to be “mutual” by definition. Therefore, each participant must be prepared to do their share. In order to be effective though, there must be a planned method for rapidly calling for and deploying mutual aid resources. Such a plan should have as few links in the communication chain as possible in order to allow for rapid notification and response of such resources.

### **Recommendation #3 – Use of Common Dispatching Agency**

Closely tied to the recommendation above, the most effective means of communication when dealing with resources from multiple jurisdictions is to have a common dispatch center. Although the resources of the Monmouth County Communications Center are presently stretched thin, it is recommended that at such time that these capabilities are expanded, that all fire calls be received and dispatch by Monmouth County. In the event that there have been no plans established in a reasonable timeframe for such an expansion, then a regional dispatching operation in the Fort Monmouth Region would be a logical alternative to the use of the County.

### **Recommendation #4 – Future Paid Daytime Firefighters**

The earlier recommendations are based upon present conditions as observed by the Study Team. When Fort Monmouth ultimately closes and as local fire department dynamics may change in the future, there will be a need to assess the services being provided on an on-going basis. The most logical problem that could develop in the future relates to a delayed or inadequate weekday, daytime response similar to the dynamic in play presently with EMS squads. Should this situation develop, strong consideration should be given to the hiring of paid weekday, daytime firefighters to supplement the volunteer organizations when staffing is most likely going to be at its lowest level.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

In most organizations, labor costs are the biggest part of the budget. Obviously, volunteer fire protection is relatively inexpensive when compared with a paid department. The expense of having to hire paid firefighters is a costly one, and consequently, it should be a measure of last resort.

The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code 1720 that sets the standard for substantially volunteer departments. This code recommends having four men on the scene of a working structure and being able to safely begin interior attack within 2 minutes after assembling sufficient resources at the scene at least 90% percent of the time. NFPA 1710 sets the standard for paid fire departments calls as a response within one minute of the receipt of an alarm and arrival within four minutes. Interior attack cannot begin unless there are two properly equipped firefighters stationed outside the structure ready to attempt a rescue of two properly equipped firefighters going inside to begin extinguishments. Both standards call for the arrival of a total of five people in order to begin an interior attack. The difference is that there is no recommended arrival time for a volunteer company. Rapid response is a key component to fire protection and should be the determining factor in any future determination involving the establishment of a partially paid fire department.

Any community that not getting an adequate response utilizing either of the first two options outlined above must then consider a paid staff to provide adequate protections for life and property. If this becomes necessary, the Study Team recommends a shared services approach as a method to minimize the impact on any one community. If a regional fire service entity were to be established, the salary and other operating costs associated with that service could then be spread over a greater population and tax base to minimize the impact on any one community. Through an interlocal services agreement, all participating communities would receive the benefit of the paid firefighters.

It is important to underscore that even if such a limited paid service would be necessary in the future, the current volunteer system would still be critical in ensuring that the citizens of each participating community would not be faced with the tax burden that would be associated with multiple all-paid fire departments. Under the present system that is working very well, or under a potential partially paid weekday, daytime model in the future; the dedicated fire volunteers would remain at the heart of an effective fire protection and suppression system in order to operate in a cost effective fashion.

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE OVERVIEWS**

**MONMOUTH BEACH BOROUGH**

**Active Volunteers**

- 3-4 available for daytime (7 am – 5 pm) response
- 6-8 available for evening/night response
- 10-12 total
- Volunteers do not respond to rescue calls other than as EMS responders

**Facilities/Equipment**

- Building and vehicles are Squad owned
- Building is in good condition
- Building of 2,000 square feet has two bays, meeting room, kitchen, office and rest rooms
- Small building addition is in the plans for the future
- 1997 Ford 350 with 17,136 miles in fair condition
- 2007 Ford 450 with 741 miles in excellent condition

**Training**

- EMT - MONOC
- CPR - MONOC
- Rescue – N/A

**Dispatch System**

- 9-1-1 calls received and dispatched by County 9-1-1 Center

**Call Statistics**

- 230 per year total
- 92 (40%) per year daytime (7 am – 5 pm)
- 138 (60%) per year evening/night
- 80 per year mutual aid calls provided to others
- Unknown mutual aid received from others

**Primary Mutual Aid Provider Relationships (high to low)**

- Sea Bright Borough
- Oceanport Borough
- 15 per year with 40% being daytime calls and 60% being evening/night calls

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

#### **Primary Mutual Aid Receiver Relationships (high to low)**

- Sea Bright Borough
- Oceanport Borough
- 7 per year with 90% being daytime calls and 10% being evening/night calls

#### **Municipal Contribution**

- \$15,000 annual municipal contribution
- LOSAP program
- Worker's compensation, vehicle and building insurance

#### **Major Challenges**

- Recruitment
- Daytime call coverage

## **SEA BRIGHT BOROUGH**

#### **Active Volunteers**

- There are 35 active volunteers.
- No data was provided regarding the number of squad members routinely available during daytime hours.
- Volunteers respond to both First Aid and Rescue calls.

#### **Facilities/Equipment**

- 1987 Ford Van with 36,000 miles in fair condition
- 2001 Ford 450 with 25,000 miles in good condition

#### **Training**

- EMT - MONOC
- CPR - Squad
- Rescue - Squad

#### **Dispatch System**

- 9-1-1 calls received by County dispatch
- County dispatch has option to tone out directly or to call to Sea Bright Police Dispatchers. County generally tones out directly.
- Sea Bright Police Dispatchers handle all communications after initial tone out.

#### **Call Statistics**

- 380 per year total

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

- 220 per year daytime (8 am – 4 pm)
- 160 per year evening/night
- 80 per year mutual aid calls provided to others
- Unknown mutual aid received from others

#### **Primary Mutual Aid Provider Relationships (high to low)**

- Highlands Borough
- Monmouth Beach Borough
- Rumson Borough

#### **Primary Mutual Aid Receiver Relationships (high to low)**

- Rumson Borough
- Monmouth Beach Borough
- Highlands Borough

#### **Municipal Contribution**

- \$14,000/year
- Provides building
- Worker's compensation and building insurance

#### **Major Challenges**

- Fund raising
- Building issues (not adequate to house two ambulances)
- Replacement of equipment

## **SHREWSBURY BOROUGH**

#### **Active Volunteers**

- There are 24 active volunteers.
- 8 squad members routinely available during daytime hours
- Volunteers do not respond to rescue calls.

#### **Facilities/Equipment**

- Building has two garage bays, one meeting room, kitchen, rest rooms and storage closet
- 1997 Ford E350 with 16,904 miles with body in excellent condition
- 2006 Ford E350 with 2,580 miles in excellent condition

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

#### **Training**

- EMT – provided by various parties
- CPR – American Heart Association

#### **Dispatch System**

- 9-1-1 calls received from County and relayed to Police Dispatch
- Police dispatch First Aid Squad

#### **Call Statistics**

- 619 per year total
- 71 per year daytime (7 am – 7 pm)
- 532 per year evening/night
- 73 per year mutual aid calls provided to others (57 daytime)
- 9 mutual aid responded to by others

#### **Primary Mutual Aid Provider Relationships (high to low)**

- Eatontown
- Tinton Falls
- Red Bank
- Little Silver
- Lincroft (in Middletown Township)

#### **Primary Mutual Aid Receiver Relationships (high to low)**

- Little Silver
- Tinton Falls
- Eatontown

#### **Municipal Contribution**

- Costs associated with acquisition of ambulances
- Insurances
- Operating budget of \$14,500 in 2008 (not a contribution, but a budget)
- LOSAP program (\$1,150 per year)

#### **Major Challenges**

- Securing funds to satisfy equipment needs
- Recruitment
- Responding to night calls
- Building replacement, expansion and/or major renovation
- Ambulance replacement (3-4 years away)

# **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

## **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

### **WEST LONG BRANCH BOROUGH**

#### **Active Volunteers**

- There are 35 active volunteers.
- 10 squad members routinely available during daytime hours
- Volunteers do not respond to rescue calls.

#### **Facilities/Equipment**

- Three garage bays, two meeting rooms and kitchen
- Natural gas emergency generator for building
- 1997 Ford Mobile Medic with 21,686 miles in fair condition
- 2004 Ford Road Rescue with 8,500 miles in very good condition
- 2005 Dodge Durango with 21,900 miles in very good condition

#### **Training**

- EMT – provided by various parties
- CPR - provided by various parties

#### **Dispatch System**

#### **Call Statistics**

- 643 per year total
- Call breakdown by day vs. evening/night is unknown
- Mutual aid call breakdown is unknown

#### **Primary Mutual Aid Provider Relationships (high to low)**

- Long Branch
- Eatontown
- Oceanport

#### **Primary Mutual Aid Receiver Relationships (high to low)**

- Eatontown
- Long Branch
- Oceanport

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

#### **Municipal Contribution**

- First Aid is considered a Municipal Department since it is funded in part through the budget
- Insurances
- Operating budget of \$14,000 per year
- LOSAP program (\$1,150 per year)
- Municipal fee waiver incentive program for volunteers

#### **Major Challenges**

- Responding to daytime calls

## **ANALYSIS OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES**

### **Volunteers**

As with the Host Municipalities, there is an ever present challenge to recruit and retain volunteers. In interviewing individuals familiar with BLS services performed by volunteers in the Coastal Monmouth area, there is a consensus that the weekday, daytime response has been a problem for years and that this problem is only growing. Understandably, these individuals requested not to be quoted since they do not in any way want to offend the First Aid Squad volunteers who they both respect and admire.

As with any volunteer organization, not all volunteers are able to contribute as much time as others or choose to limit the time they provide to balance out other demands in their lives. Accordingly, the number of active volunteers reported sometimes does not represent the full picture of the likelihood of a crew being able to be assembled on any given day. Only in Sea Bright do the volunteer EMT's also respond for the handling of rescue calls.

### **Facilities**

The respective facilities of the squads in the Neighboring Municipalities vary in size and adequacy. However, since there is no recommendation related to consolidating squads, this is a local issue and not one that relates to any shared emergency services consideration.

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**Dispatch**

Most EMS calls are received by the County 9-1-1 Center. With respect to the Neighboring Municipalities, only the Monmouth Beach First Aid Squad has the County as the sole party who dispatches their calls. In the other Neighboring Municipalities, the local police dispatchers handle the direct dispatching of EMS calls once relayed from the County 9-1-1 Center. The table below illustrates this.

**Entity That Dispatches EMS Calls**

<b>Monmouth Beach</b>	<b>Sea Bright</b>	<b>Shrewsbury Borough</b>	<b>Shrewsbury Township</b>	<b>West Long Branch</b>
County 9-1-1 Center	Borough Police	Borough Police	Eatontown Police	Borough Police

**EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Primary Recommendation**

As is contained in the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) subsection of the Task 3 section, the primary recommendation for the Host Municipalities of the Boroughs of Eatontown and Oceanport is to have the respective First Aid/Ambulance Squads join forces to contract out for a weekday, daytime Basic Life Support (BLS) ambulance service that would be supported by charges to patient insurance companies with the expectation that there would be a zero bid. The details of that recommendation are fully outlined in the earlier EMS section (Task 3A) of this overall Shared Emergency Services Report, and it will not be repeated in this section.

There is a strong degree of confidence that the Host Municipality EMS recommendation would be very successful. This level of confidence is only bolstered with the inclusion of selected Neighboring Municipalities. The effectiveness of such an approach has a direct connection to travel times and geographic proximity of participating municipalities. The following municipalities are well situated to join with the Borough of Eatontown’s Volunteer Ambulance Corps and the Borough of Oceanport’s First Aid and Rescue Squad:

- Borough of Shrewsbury
- Township of Shrewsbury (served by Eatontown Volunteer Ambulance Corps)

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

- Borough of West Long Branch
- Borough of Little Silver (not part of this study, but nevertheless geographically well situated to be a partner in the Task 3A model)

The Borough of Monmouth Beach First Aid Squad service area could be included in the above model, but its lack of any land mass connection with any of the above named squad service areas makes its inclusion marginal. A more effective approach would be to have the formation of a second consortium of First Aid/Ambulance Squads formed that could either act independent of the consortium identified above or ideally as a part of the same consortium. This second geographic area would have to be large enough to justify the receipt of a zero bid. Municipalities (not all part of this study) that would be geographically well situated for inclusion in this second service area would be:

- Borough of Monmouth Beach
- Borough of Sea Bright
- Borough of Rumson
- Borough of Fair Haven
- Borough of Highlands

If most or all of the nine municipalities identified above were to put out a joint request for proposals, it is considered likely that there could be a requirement that any party submitting a proposal would be required to provide two basic life support (BLS) ambulances Monday through Friday from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. In the Township of Jackson (Ocean County), the Township lets a contract for BLS services. Their former contract called for the provision of two BLS ambulances and they enjoyed a zero cost contract. The present Jackson Township contract calls for the provision of three BLS ambulances and they continue to enjoy a zero cost contract. The availability of two BLS ambulances staffed by paid crews would minimize the need for mutual aid being sought from local volunteer squads or neighboring paid crews.

## **TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**

### **FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

### **Secondary Recommendations**

Most of the remaining recommendations as are contained in the EMS subsection of the Task 3 section of this overall report are applicable to other EMS/First Aid/Ambulance Squads in District 16 of the New Jersey First Aid Council, with all of the above named municipalities/squads being in District 16. The one exception relates to the recommendation of working to secure EMS vehicles and equipment from Fort Monmouth upon dissolution of the Fort's Fire Department that provides emergency medical services. If any items in this inventory were to become surplus property, these items should rightfully be transferred to the Host Municipalities. However, this would necessarily benefit the Neighboring Municipalities through the existing mutual aid agreements in place.

Task 4 – Neighboring Municipalities Shared Services  
Final Report  
Respectfully Submitted,

**JERSEY PROFESSIONAL MANAGEMENT**

David R. Kochel  
Senior Manager  
Task 4 Team Leader  
July 7, 2008

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

Attachment #1

**JERSEY PROFESSIONAL MANAGEMENT**  
**FMERPA SHARED EMERGENCY SERVICES STUDY**  
**AGENDA – NEIGHBORING TOWNS**  
**TUESDAY, MAY 20, 2008 – 4:00 PM**

- I. Introduction to Jersey Professional Management
  - A. Company Background
  - B. Introduction of Team Members
    - 1. Dan Mason, President
    - 2. Fred Jahn, Senior Vice President
    - 3. Dave Kochel, Senior Manager and Team Leader
- II. FMERPA and the Shared Emergency Services Study
  - A. What is FMERPA?
  - B. Scope of the Shared Emergency Services Study
    - 1. Study Tasks
      - a. Courts
      - b. Police
      - c. Fire
      - d. First Aid
      - e. Emergency Management
    - 2. Host Town Focus
    - 3. Neighboring Town Involvement
    - 4. Limitations – Not a departmental or performance review
- III. Introduction of Municipal Representatives
  - A. Little Silver
  - B. Monmouth Beach
  - C. Shrewsbury Borough
  - D. Shrewsbury Township
  - E. West Long Branch
- IV. Study Methodology
  - A. General Meeting
  - B. Individual Municipal Meetings
  - C. Research and Analysis – Importance of full cooperation
  - D. Submission of Report on Tight Timetable
- V. Discussion Points
  - A. Reliance on Fort Monmouth Emergency services
  - B. Existing and Pending Shared Emergency Services
- VI. Review of Document Requests/Contact Forms
- VII. Questions and Answers
- VIII. Scheduling of Follow-up Meetings

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**TASK #4 ATTACHMENT 1**  
**SELECTION OF ADJOINING**  
**MUNICIPALITIES FOR INCLUSION IN FMERPA**  
**SHARED SERVICES STUDY**

The RFP for the FMERPA provides that up to five additional municipalities are to be included in the study that will concentrate on the host municipalities of Eatontown Borough, Oceanport Borough and Tinton Falls Borough. The following communities (shown in order of the northernmost municipality followed by bordering municipalities in a clockwise direction) share common borders with the three host communities:

1. Middletown Township
2. Red Bank Borough
3. Shrewsbury Township
4. Shrewsbury Borough
5. Little Silver Borough
6. Monmouth Beach Borough
7. Long Branch City
8. West Long Branch Borough
9. Ocean Township
10. Neptune Township
11. Wall Township
12. Colts Neck Township

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

Of the above municipalities, those that could benefit the most from a shared services relationship can be presumed to be those having smaller populations and being closer geographically to Fort Monmouth properties. An additional factor involves those communities that currently have some significant shared services relationship with the three host communities. The following municipalities are the likely potential partners in this study:

MUNICIPALITY	LAND AREA (Square Miles)	POPULATION (2000 Census)	POPULATION (2007 Estimate)	HOUSEHOLDS (2000 Census)	HOUSEHOLDS (2007 Estimate)
Colts Neck Township	31.70	11,179	11,956	3,513	3,763
Little Silver Borough	2.80	6,170	6,224	2,232	2,252
Monmouth Beach Borough	1.10	3,595	3,655	1,633	1,661
Shrewsbury Borough	2.30	3,590	3,825	1,207	1,288
Shrewsbury Township	0.09	1,098	1,098	521	521
West Long Branch Borough	2.83	8,258	8,272	2,448	2,453

Source: Monmouth County Planning Board

In terms of demographics, Colts Neck Township stands out as being the most dissimilar to the other communities. The inclusion of Monmouth Beach Borough is also questionable since their common border with Oceanport Borough is across the Shrewsbury River as opposed to being connected via a roadway system.

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**Fort Monmouth Fire Department Responses in Neighboring Municipalities**

**Year: 2007**

<u>District</u>	<u>False Alarm</u>	<u>Fire</u>	<u>Stand By</u>	<u>Haz Mat</u>	<u>Gas Related</u>	<u>Rescue</u>	<u>Electrical</u>	<u>EMS</u>	<u>Weather Related</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sea Bright	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
West Long Branch	2	6	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	12
Shrewsbury Bor.	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Monmouth Beach	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	3	8	6	2	2	0	0	1	0	22

**Year: 2006**

<u>District</u>	<u>False Alarm</u>	<u>Fire</u>	<u>Stand By</u>	<u>Haz Mat</u>	<u>Gas Related</u>	<u>Rescue</u>	<u>Electrical</u>	<u>EMS</u>	<u>Weather Related</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sea Bright	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
West Long Branch	2	3	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	10
Shrewsbury Bor.	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Monmouth Beach	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	3	8	3	2	0	1	1	0	0	18

**Year: 2005**

<u>District</u>	<u>False Alarm</u>	<u>Fire</u>	<u>Stand By</u>	<u>Haz Mat</u>	<u>Gas Related</u>	<u>Rescue</u>	<u>Electrical</u>	<u>EMS</u>	<u>Weather Related</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sea Bright	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
West Long Branch	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Shrewsbury Bor.	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Monmouth Beach	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	1	3	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	9

**TASK 4 – NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES**  
**FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT PREPARED FOR FMERPA**

---

**Year: 2004**

<u>District</u>	<u>False Alarm</u>	<u>Fire</u>	<u>Stand By</u>	<u>Haz Mat</u>	<u>Gas Related</u>	<u>Rescue</u>	<u>Electrical</u>	<u>EMS</u>	<u>Weather Related</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sea Bright	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Long Branch	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Shrewsbury	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Monmouth Beach	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4