

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF
COMMISSIONERS OF THE TOWNSHIP OF HADDON, IN THE
COUNTY OF CAMDEN, NEW JERSEY, HELD AUGUST 25, 2026
IN THE MUNICIPAL BUILDING AT 7 PM**

A regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners of the Township of Haddon was convened in the Municipal Building, 135 Haddon Avenue, Westmont, NJ on Tuesday, August 25, 2026 at 7:00 PM.

Flag Salute

Mayor Teague announced that Chapter 231, Public Law 1975 requires adequate notice of this meeting be provided. This was done by placing Annual Notice in the Courier-Post and Retrospect Newspapers and by posting on the bulletin boards of the Municipal Building.

ROLL CALL:	Mayor Teague	Present
	Commissioner Mulroy	Present
	Commissioner Linhart	Present

Chief Tim Hak, Lee Palo, Greg Fusco, PE, Jim Stevenson, Kate Burns and Stuart Platt, Esq. were present.

RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL:

Commissioner Mulroy moved, seconded by Commissioner Linhart to approve Resolution #2026-104, with all members voting in the affirmative:

#2026-104 - Promotion of Police Officers to Rank of Sergeant in the Haddon Township Police Department

Mayor Teague welcomed everybody to the meeting, especially Mayor Burns from Audubon Park, who shares in and participates with our Police Department. There are 3 promotions this evening, first is Sergeant William Moore, joining Sergeant Moore is his wife, Katie, and their three children, Dylan, Mackenzi and Brooke. Holding the Bible will be his wife, Katie.

Mayor Teague moved on to Sergeant Falkenberg, joining him will be his mother Kathleen, his father, David, his sister, Kali, his Step-father, Jay and his Grandfather, Ralph. Holding the Bible will be his Grandfather, Ralph.

Also being promoted, Sergeant Dominic Grassi, joining him will be his fiancé, Rachel, who will be holding the Bible.

Commissioner Mulroy administered the Oath of Office to the above-Sergeants in the order they appear.

MINUTES:

Commissioner Mulroy moved, seconded by Commissioner Linhart that the Minutes of the Closed Meeting held on Tuesday, July 14, 2026 and the Minutes of the Regular Meeting held on Tuesday, July 28, 2026 be approved, with all members voting in the affirmative.

Commissioner Mulroy moved, seconded by Commissioner Linhart that the Minutes of the Special Meeting held on Tuesday, July 14, 2026, be tabled, with all members voting in the affirmative.

ORDINANCES: None

RESOLUTIONS:

The following Resolutions are approved by consent agenda, Resolution #2026-105 through Resolution #2026-108, with a motion by Commissioner Mulroy, seconded by Commissioner Linhart, with all members affirmatively concurring.

#2026-105 - Bill Resolution (Payment of Claims)

#2026-106 - Authorizing a Chapter 159 Revenue for Alcohol Ed Rehab Enforcement -DWI

#2026-107 – Authorizing Refund of Utility Overpayment

#2026-108 – Award of the 2026 Road Improvements Program, Phase 1

OTHER BUSINESS:

Motion made by Commissioner Mulroy to approve the following Raffle License Applications listed below, seconded by Mayor Teague, with both members voting in the affirmative. Commissioner Linhart abstained.

- #RA2026-17 – St. Joseph the Worker Parish for 50/50 for December 4, 2026
- #RA2026-18 – Haddon Township Athletic Association for On Premise Merchandise Draw for September 19, 2026
- #RA2026-19 – Haddon Township Athletic Association for On Premise 50/50 for September 19, 2026
- #RA2026-20 – Haddon Township Rowing Club for Off Premise Merchandise Draw for November 18, 2026
- #RA2026-21 – Haddon Township Rowing Club for Off Premise Merchandise Draw for December 4, 2026
- #RA2026-22 – PTA Strawbridge School for On Premise Merchandise Draw for October 10, 2026
- #RA2026-23 – PTA Strawbridge School for On Premise 50/50 for October 10, 2026

REPORTS FOR JULY 2026:

The following reports for July 2026 were presented and ordered filed:

Budget Status Report

Revenue Report

COMMUNICATIONS:

PUBLIC COMMENT

There being no further business on the agenda, Commissioner Mulroy made a motion to open the meeting for public comment, seconded by Commissioner Linhart, with all members affirmatively concurring:

Julia D’Amico, 402 Westmont Avenue - Ms. D'Amico stated that she has lived in Haddon Township since 2019 and works as a board-certified music therapist in hospice and as a labor and community organizer. She expressed concern regarding Axon automatic license plate reader (ALPR) cameras and said she had been unable to locate when their installation was approved. She cited reported incidents in other jurisdictions involving erroneous ALPR identifications, alleged misuse of camera data, and concerns that collected data could be searched without a warrant or accessed for immigration enforcement. She asked the Board to consider not renewing contracts with Axon or other ALPR or mass-surveillance technologies and closed with a Benjamin Franklin quotation concerning liberty and safety.

Tom Galpine - Mr. Galpine stated that he has lived in the Township for approximately 35 years and has a law-enforcement background. He declined to provide a full street address. He argued that ALPR use violates constitutional privacy protections and raised concerns about camera quantity and cost, possible future fees, facial-recognition capabilities, vehicle tracking, data profiling, speeding enforcement, and expansion of government surveillance. He questioned the cameras' necessity and purpose, referenced protests or controversy in

other jurisdictions, and urged the Township to protect residents' privacy and discontinue the technology.

Eric Schmid, 906 Belmont Avenue - Mr. Schmid stated that he is raising a two-year-old in the Township. He opposed warrantless or unlimited surveillance, questioned the motives of a company providing equipment at no current cost, and asked the Board to reconsider and roll back the camera program.

Marc August, 909 Merrick Avenue - Mr. August asked where the Township draws the line between safety and community trust. He expressed concern about alleged surveillance abuses, private-company control of data, the inability of residents to opt out, future platform changes, possible vendor lock-in, and future costs. He asked the Board to consider long-term ramifications and said he wanted his daughters to feel safe because of their community rather than because of continuous surveillance.

Emily Lavell, 14 Cooper Street - Ms. Lavelle stated that, except for her twenties, she has been a Haddon Township resident and is now raising her family in town. She asked how the contract was approved, how camera locations and directional placement were selected, and specifically why one camera appeared to face Strawbridge Elementary School.

Michelle Messer, 10 Emerald Avenue - Ms. Messer stated that she has lived in the Township for approximately 25 years and has long been active in the community. She echoed concerns about surveillance and asked what problem the cameras were intended to solve; who authorized their receipt and installation; whether the matter was subject to public consideration; who can access the data; whether county, state, federal, or other agencies receive it; and what the Township intends to use it for. She asked the Board to explain the process that led to installation and to address trust and community impacts.

Betsy Campbell, 909 Merrick Avenue - Ms. Campbell stated that she moved to the Township approximately three years ago and plans to raise her family here. Although she acknowledged the Police Chief's statement that the department follows New Jersey Attorney General guidelines and does not provide images to federal immigration authorities, she remained concerned about platform capabilities, future feature changes, vendor-controlled settings, network access, security vulnerabilities, erroneous identifications, and a stated three-year retention period. If the technology remains, she requested deletion of data unrelated to criminal investigations within 30 days, an independent security assessment, Board approval before new platform features are used, and no external data sharing. She stated her preference that the contract be cancelled and that the Township invest in privacy-oriented safety alternatives.

Daniel "Mac" McLaughlin, Audubon – Mr. McLaughlin stated that he was born and raised in Haddon Township, lives in Audubon, and returns to the Township regularly. He expressed concern about blanket surveillance and asked whether Axon's practices differ from those he attributed to Flock, including data retention, third-party access, and mapping of vehicle travel patterns. He argued that private corporations are accountable to shareholders and profit, questioned the meaning of third-party access and long-term retention, and asked the Township to scrutinize the actual contracts for provisions that may not serve residents' interests.

Kevin (did not provide last name or address) - The speaker opened with Latin and made comments on several matters. Regarding ALPRs, he opposed the cameras on constitutional grounds and asserted that a person accused of exposing himself was apprehended because of camera technology rather than traditional police work. He alleged that, during personal audits, he observed police mobile data terminals left open and Township fleet vehicles with expired documentation. He also raised roadway and infrastructure concerns on East Cedar Avenue, including potholes near the White Horse Pike and Heather Avenue ends, numerous patches, buckling pavement, a sinking driveway apron, damaged curbs, school-area traffic, and speeding. He requested inspection, a plan of action, and visible speed enforcement. He further criticized the handling of public-record requests concerning Pride events and police and fire expenditures, discussed an earlier inquiry about a burn permit and alleged

surveillance, and made allegations concerning police conduct, compensation, and prior settlements.

Commissioner Mulroy stated that, if the alleged uses described by speakers - including facial recognition, sharing with ICE or private vendors, or tracking speed - were occurring, he would not support them. He asked the Police Chief to explain the Township's use of license plate readers under New Jersey Attorney General direction.

Response to publics' questions regarding ALPR cameras:

The Police Chief stated that the Township uses Axon rather than Flock, although the underlying ALPR technology is similar. He said the Township does not share ALPR data with ICE; the Police Department owns or controls its data; Axon cannot access the Township's data; and use is governed and audited under New Jersey requirements.

Stuart Platt, Esq. discussed constitutional protections and stated that there is generally no expectation of privacy for vehicles visible on public streets, while access to and use of collected data remains subject to legal requirements and the Fourth Amendment. It was stated that the cameras are not unlawful per se when used consistently with Attorney General guidelines.

The Chief described the captured information as an image of a vehicle and license plate, together with the location, date, and time observed. He said the system does not identify vehicle occupants and does not use facial recognition.

The Chief stated that officers cannot search the system without a lawful law-enforcement purpose and must document access, including a case number and the reason for the search. He said the system cannot be searched by a person's name and does not itself provide personal residence information.

The stated retention period was three years under Attorney General guidance. Officials stated that the data is not sold to private businesses or shared for marketing purposes, is not provided to federal immigration authorities, and is not generally given to out-of-state law enforcement absent appropriate legal process. The physical storage location was not disclosed; officials described the information as confidential.

Commissioner Linhart asked about possible overlap with Homeland Security or federal lookout criteria and about risks to naturalized citizens. The Chief stated that there is no immigration-status indicator in the system and identified alerts such as stolen vehicles, NCIC entries, missing children, and Amber or Silver Alerts. Chief Hak referenced New Jersey's Immigrant Trust Directive and state privacy protections.

The Chief stated that ALPRs save investigative time and increase the likelihood of solving crimes. He explained that investigators formerly had to locate and review a sequence of private or public cameras to trace a vehicle; ALPR information can shorten that process when officers already have a lawful basis and relevant details.

Examples discussed included hit-and-run investigations, missing persons, burglaries, package thefts, retail theft, vehicle theft, attempted homicide, homicide, and incidents involving children. The Chief did not discuss confidential details of any specific investigation.

The Chief explained that useful searches generally require a partial license plate, a vehicle description, a distinguishing feature, a location, or a relevant time window. He gave an example of comparing vehicles observed near multiple similar offenses.

The Chief stated that officers receive real-time alerts when a stolen vehicle enters the Township, allowing officers to respond to the area, potentially deter additional crimes, recover vehicles more quickly, and reduce investigative time and cost.

Chief Hak stated that ALPR technology has been used in Haddon Township for many years, possibly more than a decade, and that prior capital or operating budgets included an ALPR line item. The Chief stated that the Township previously used Flock and moved to Axon for financial reasons and to test another vendor already used by the Department. Axon also provides body cameras, Tasers, and evidence storage.

The current Axon ALPR arrangement was described as a no-cost trial with less than approximately one year remaining, although the exact end date was not provided. The Chief stated that the change from Flock to Axon had been planned before earlier public correspondence and was not prompted by the issues raised in that correspondence.

Stuart Platt, Esq. asked whether installation of the newer cameras had been specifically voted upon in public. The Chief referred to prior budget approvals, but officials acknowledged that the precise process should be researched. Stuart Platt, Esq. directed that the Township obtain accurate information concerning how the current cameras were approved.

Commissioner Linhart referred to an email received in January from a computer engineer raising liability concerns and asked about a reported statement that cameras would be removed. The Chief explained that the Township was then transitioning from Flock to Axon.

Commissioner Linhart asked whether the Township could operate without the technology if it was later found unconstitutional or presented an unacceptable liability. Commissioner Mulroy responded that the Department would comply with any such determination but emphasized the technology's public-safety value.

The Chief stated that he understood residents' concerns, that misuse elsewhere is inappropriate, and that the Township's system is audited and used for public-safety purposes. He referred attendees to ALPR frequently asked questions posted on the Police Department's website.

Commissioner Mulroy cited an NJ.com figure that 523 of approximately 530 New Jersey law-enforcement agencies use automated license plate readers. Commissioner Linhart replied, residents continued to question long-term technology risks and the weight given to potential benefits.

There being no further public comments, Commissioner Mulroy moved to close the meeting for public comment, seconded by Commissioner Linhart, with all members voting in the affirmative.

Commissioner Mulroy moved to take a short recess at 8:36 PM, seconded by Commissioner Linhart, with all members affirmatively concurring.

Commissioner Mulroy to return to the regular order of business at 8:45 PM, seconded by Commissioner Linhart, with all members affirmatively concurring.

RESOLUTIONS FOR APPROVAL THIS EVENING:

Stuart Platt, Esq. asks for a motion to amend the agenda to include Resolution #2026-110. Commissioner Mulroy moved, seconded by Commissioner Linhart to Amend the agenda to include Resolution #2026-110 for Closed Session to discuss Personnel.

Resolution #2026-110 – Providing for a Meeting Not Open to the Public in Accordance with the Provisions of New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-12 for Personnel

Stuart Platt, Esq. reports the purpose of the resolution is to go into a closed session to discuss a personnel matter regarding our Tax Assessor, Martin Blaskey. Stuart Platt, Esq. mentions that Martin Blaskey, Haddon Township Tax Assessor received a Rice Notice 48 hours prior to this meeting to discuss personnel matter with potential disciplinary action.

The Rice Notice allows the employee to either have discussion in a closed discussion for a personnel matter or a personnel matter discussion in public. Mr. Blaskey sent an email today requesting the personnel matter be discussed publicly. Stuart Platt, Esq. asks Mr. Blaskey to confirm that he chose to have the matter discussed in public. Mr. Blaskey responds in the affirmative.

Mr. Platt states the matter comes before us concerning the Township's Revaluation that was approved by the County Tax Assessor to be done in 2025. What we have on the table tonight are some very serious personnel allegations regarding our Tax Assessor. Just so you understand, our Tax Assessor is a Statutory Employee and he does have rights so we were going to address as we would if we were in a closed session. Mr. Platt stated he will present the information regarding this matter. Commissioner Linhart stated, since he is the Director of Revenue and Finance, is there a reason he was not presented with this issue prior to tonight. Mr. Platt responds personnel falls under the Mayor and your oversight may come into play here with these discussions as well. The Revaluation is called by the County Tax Board. What happens is the Township Revaluation Company does the Revaluation for the entire town. We hired a company called PPA (Professional Property Appraisers) they effectively did a Revaluation of people's tax assessments in the Township to bring the Township's tax assessments to 100% of fair market value. We've had a number of appeals to the Revaluation and one particular case concerns Kimco Properties which is the Target and other commercial buildings in the shopping center. It's Block 13.03, Lot 1, the street address is 650 to 690 West Cuthbert Blvd.

The way the Revaluation process works generally is the Revaluation company goes out and inspects everybody's homes, they give evaluation and it's a recommendation to the Tax Assessor. It is ultimately the Tax Assessor's obligation, under state law, to put the tax assessment into the tax rolls; it is the Tax Assessor's duty; it is the Tax Assessor's job. The Tax Assessor takes an oath, like all other statutory employees to do that correctly and fairly and to abide by the legal process of assessing properties in the State of New Jersey. The original assessment placed on the property, after the Revaluation by Mr. Blaskey was \$36,860,000.00 for assessment of land and improvements. This was the total assessment. This particular company, Kimco, that owns the property, they are a frequent flier, they file tax appeals all the time. This particular tax appeal goes back several years, 2023, 2024, 2025 & 2026. And the approved settlement of this tax appeal, the circumstances involving the ultimate approval of that settlement are why we are here tonight. We have received information that the actual assessed value, the Revaluation company was actually recommending was \$31,065,000.00. Mr. Blaskey put an assessed value of approximately \$37,000,000.00. There was a discussion held with Mr. Blaskey and Mr. Blaskey told this governing body he put this property on the tax rolls at the Revaluation Company's reval. assessment and that's just not true.

We have paperwork here as part of our discussions that shows Mr. Blaskey increased the assessment by \$6,000,000.00. Secondly, we understand that some information that we received, is that Mr. Blaskey had indicated that he put that almost \$37,000,000.00 amount assessment on this property because "he wanted to leave some room for negotiation". As a matter of law, when you assess property fairly in the State of New Jersey, as a Tax Assessor is required to do, you have to assess it based upon a fair market value. The idea that you increase the assessment of a property \$6,000,000.00 for negotiation purposes is problematic. In addition to that, Mr. Blaskey recommended this governing body, accept a reduction in assessment to \$28,000,000.00 in 2025. It is almost a \$9,000,000.00 reduction. The way the assessment works is assessment times the tax rate equals the actual taxes. He recommended the assessment be reduced even further for 2026 to \$27,000,000.00, almost a \$10,000,000.00 reduction. What came about in that process is, the taxpayer obtained an appraisal, at no time did Mr. Blaskey reach out to the Revaluation company, to analyze the appraisal or seek to get an appraisal on his own. That process would require him to say look, if I say the property is worth \$37,000,000.00 which is 100% of fair market value, and they are saying it is worth \$28,000,000.00. There is a problem there. Why wouldn't you get an appraisal? Why would you not confer with the Revaluation company? This taxpayer is one of the largest in town. That did not happen. As a result, as everyone knows, when you get your assessed values on the books, we budget as a municipality the operations of the

town based upon tax revenue. The Township as a municipality approved its budget based upon \$37,000,000.00 and Mr. Blaskey recommended approval for \$28,000,000.00 when in fact the Revaluation company said was only worth \$31,000,000.00.

Part of our budget is based upon the revenue stream that comes from taxpayer dollars and that is based upon the amount of taxes people have paid. The way NJ works, we are the collection agency for all the other government agencies, school board, county, and fire districts so we have to collect all the money, but when you have a tax appeal settlement or you lose in tax court, we the Township have to pay everything back. It's very inequitable but that is how the laws have been written in NJ for a very long time. Even though we are only 20% of the bill, we have to pay back 100% of the credit. Again, burdens the taxpayers.

There are at least 3 allegations we have to face here, (1) we have an assessor that put an inflated number in the books; (2) Assessor when asked where did he get his assessment, he said he got it from the Revaluation company, which is not true; and (3) we have an assessor that has to meet the statutory mandated obligation of the State Statute. We have at least a level of neglect of duty, we have conduct unbecoming, we have dishonesty that is involved, and we have a number of other issues, not fulfilling your oath of office and not meeting your statutory criteria that has caused the township to be in a situation that is extremely untenable. This governing body has to decide whether they want to take further action based upon the information we have thus far, to at least conduct an investigation. That's why we usually do it in a closed session, Mr. Blaskey chose to have it done openly. That is the reason why we are here on these issues.

Commissioner Linhart asks, where do we stand with the agreement? Mr. Platt responds, that is settled based upon Mr. Blaskey's recommendations. Mr. Platt further points out this is not about the tax appeal settlement per se, this is about what the Tax Assessor's role.

Commissioner Linhart points out the value of property doesn't dictate the budget. Mr. Platt responds, if you don't think taxes help fund our budget, I don't know what more I can tell you.

Mr. Platt informs the governing body it is up to them on how to proceed. Mayor Teague asks if the entire Revaluation process is tainted now? Mr. Platt replied, I don't know the answer to your question. One way to find out, you have to get the revaluation company's recommendation and compare it to all other properties in Haddon Township. Mayor Teague said, additional monies were put on other properties, and those residents did not have the wherewithal to appeal it, they could be paying more than their fair share. Mr. Platt responded, if that were true, then yes that conclusion would be correct.

Mr. Platt stated where this will lead, and I know because I have been here a number of years that this government is very transparent in what it does and I think we owe it to all the residents to check into this will take a lot of money, a lot of time and a lot of effort, to go through all the tax parcels and get all these recommendations and compare it to what is on the books. It could turn out that none of this is true. Mr. Platt states, everyone is innocent until proven guilty but this is the process we begin when we have an issue, it's a serious issue we need to bring to the governing bodies attention to see what action that want to take this evening to conduct a full investigation of this matter.

Mayor Teague states, my opinion given the information that has been discussed, to investigate just this particular issue, not so much everything else, see what arises from this, and then make a decision at another date.

Commissioner Linhart asks Mr. Platt how much? Mr. Platt responds; I cannot give you number. Mr. Blaskey cannot refuse to participate in the investigation. He further states we have to develop facts based upon these investigations. I don't come here easily. I don't do this every day. In my 30+ years of practice, no one has ever asked that this these types of decisions be discussed publicly, but that was Mr. Blaskey's decision.

Commissioner Mulroy asked Mr. Platt if he read the Revaluation Contract the Township signed with this company? Mr. Platt responded yes. Pursuant to that contract, do they have a legal obligation to defend their assessment in tax court? Mr. Platt, county tax court, typically residential, twofold answer, yes for county tax appeals, and for state court, they will provide consultation at an hourly rate. To my knowledge, other than incidentally and coincidentally, the Revaluation company was never asked to come in and evaluate the Kimco appraisal and we did not get a competing appraisal to see if the number Mr. Blaskey put on the books was correct.

Commissioner Linhart responded that he is of the thought that this should be tabled.

Commissioner Mulroy responded, I think we do ourselves more harm. We cannot ignore this. All the solicitor is saying right now is to move forward with the investigation which may clear our Tax Assessor. Frankly, the allegations are out there now, they are public. You can't put the genie back in the bottle, you have to move forward to see if those allegations have any validity at all. The only thing we discussed tonight is Kimco, so perhaps that is the starting point to try and reduce costs.

Commissioner Mulroy moved to authorize an investigation regarding the circumstances and events surrounding the Kimco tax appeal by labor counsel, seconded by Mayor Teague, with both members affirmatively concurring.

ROLL CALL:	Mayor Teague	Aye
	Commissioner Mulroy	Aye
	Commissioner Linhart	Abstain

Prior to vote, a discussion was held on the motion. Commissioner Linhart asks why was he circumvented on this process. Mr. Platt stated you weren't. Commissioner Linhart asked where are these accusations coming from? Mayor Teague responded, we told you where they are coming from. We have a document that states Revaluation company assessed property at \$31,000,000.00 and a settlement document, that it was assessed at \$36,000,000.00. Almost \$37,000,000.00 for 2025 and maintains same assessment the following year.

Commissioner Linhart recommended a third party do the investigation. Mr. Platt responded we do have labor counsel that can perform the investigation.

Mr. Platt advises this is a personnel matter regarding Mr. Blaskey, each and every one of you, are not to discuss publicly any further. Take a vote this evening. Let investigation happen naturally. Take action based upon investigation.

Commissioner Mulroy asks, if we go with labor counsel, is there already an agreed upon hourly rate to do something like this? Mr. Platt responds, there is an hourly rate to perform labor functions, I don't know if there is a special one to perform investigations, typically it is within the parameters of their hourly rate.

Mayor Teague mentions that we were told at the last meeting that those numbers were from Professional Property Appraisers. Stuart Platt, Esq. to Commissioner Linhart, since you said you have oversight of the tax assessor, do you feel that you should recuse yourself for either lack of oversight or some conflict of interest you may have? Discussion held on the definition of recusing versus definition on abstaining.

Stuart Platt, Esq. mentions another closed resolution on the agenda for potential litigation. He asks if the governing body wants to do this tonight or at another time.

RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL:

The following Resolution #2026-109 was approved with a motion by Commissioner Mulroy, seconded by Commissioner Linhart, with all members voting in the affirmative:

Resolution #2026-109 - Providing for a Meeting Not Open to the Public in Accordance with the Provisions of the New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-12 due to potential litigation

The governing body entered into the closed session at 9:20 PM.

Commissioner Mulroy moved, seconded by Mayor Teague to return to the regular order of business at 9:54 PM, with all members affirmatively concurring.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Commissioner Mulroy moved, seconded by Commissioner Linhart, that the meeting be adjourned at 9:55 PM, with all members voting in the affirmative.

August 25, 2026

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Dawn M. Pennock, Municipal Clerk

Randall W. Teague, Mayor

James Mulroy, Commissioner

Ryan Linhart, Commissioner