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CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: At least forty-eight hours notice of this meeting was sent by way of the Secretary of State to the following newspapers: The Star-Ledger, The Trenton Times, The Trentonian, The Courier-Post, The Atlantic City Press, The Asbury Park Press and the Bergen Record.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Roll-call:

Paul Stridick?

MR. STRIDICK: I'm here.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Lopa Kolluri?

MS. KOLLURI: Here.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Kevin Drennan; I'm here.

Marilyn Davis?

MS. DAVIS: Present.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Ambar Abelar?

MR. ABELAR: Here.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: All right.

And we have here also Patricia Bruck, DAG, and James Carey from the Authority.
Is Tom Gilmour here?

Sorry, before we do that, approval of the June 13th minutes.

Do I have a motion?

MR. ABELAR: So moved.
MR. STRIDICK: Seconded.

On page 13 of 46 or 47, comments that I made it says on line 18, "In trying to get fiscal trust funding, "it is actually "trying to get historic trust funding. It's just a small minor clarification.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Okay.

Any other discussion?

MS. DAVIS: I was absent at the last meeting, should I abstain?

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: June 13 minutes as amended, all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

None.

Motion passed, one abstention.
Tom Gilmour, Asbury Park's request for $150,000 for UEZ Marketing Program VI.

MR. GILMOUR: Good morning.

Greetings from Asbury Park.

This project is Phase VI of our marketing program, this is the sixth year we've done this.
program. There is very little change from last year's program to this year's program. You have a copy of our visitors brochure which is a product of the program that's in place right now. That's the type of things that we utilize our moneys for in this program.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Motion?

MS. DAVIS: So moved.

MR. STRIDICK: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any discussion?

MR. STRIDICK: I just have a couple of questions with regard to the table on page 7. It has nothing to do necessarily with the issue of the application other than the statistics, your crime rate per one hundred thousand residents or inhabitants as opposed to the county.
17 little confusing to me, one versus versus
18 twenty-five.
19 MR. GILMOUR: I think the county's numbers
20 are erroneous, to tell you the truth. It is pretty
21 stale data that we get and that's the best that we
22 have.
23 MR. STRIDICK: On the report it was a
24 little bit different than one.
25 MR. GILMOUR: Again, I just asked the
Police for that information and that's what they gave me.

MR. STRIDICK: Again, it has nothing to do with the application.

MR. GILMOUR: I agree with you, it doesn't make a lot of sense.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other discussion?

MR. ABELAR: Good fireworks.

MR. GILMOUR: I'm glad you liked the fireworks, it was enjoyable.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other discussion?

(No response.)

Hearing none, all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Abstentions?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Hearing none, this motion is passed.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Terrance Malloy on
Bayonne's two requests. The first is $545,000 for Cleaning and Beautification - Phase II.

MR. MALLOY: Good morning. The total project as was mentioned is for $545,000 and it is Phase II but it is really becoming a different project than what we had last year. Last year the project was contracted out for services. To be honest with you, at best we met with mixed results.

The firm that was hired, as I later found out, which is typical of these cleaning firms, they tend to hire employees at minimum wage, they are greatly untrained and typically employees who generally are unemployable.

As a result, we received certain
complaints from certain parts of the community on Broadway.

In fact, to be honest with you, even through we require them to wear easily identified clothing, it was almost an embarrassmentment to have them wear that clothing.

We had instances of public urination involving employees and rather poor supervision.

Although we had so much training out
there, a decision was made that this program would be better served both by expanding it as well as bringing it in-house.

The proposal is to have a six day a week

from 7 A.M. to 3:30 P.M. sidewalk cleaning on Broadway from 55th Street being accomplished by six men actually doing the sweeping, one individual working what is called a meg-vac (phonetic) vehicle which gets in between the different cars and actually underneath the cars through the use of an extended hose from the vehicle, a supervisor, to be honest with you, he has been handpicked for this task; the key to this is providing supervision.

Those are municipal employees, these are not going to be our highest quality employees
picking up litter on Broadway, so supervision is vital and there is what we call a Public Works supervisor being specifically assigned to this.

In addition to the cleaning of Broadway, these employees will also be involved with snow removal in all intersections come winter and there will also be a daily, provided by employees part time, a daily emptying of all garbage cans along that stretch on Broadway.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Motion?
MR. STRIDICK: So moved.
MS. DAVIS: Seconded
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN:
MR. STRIDICK: Will all of the employees be working six days a week, eight hours a day.
MR. MALLOY: No, their schedules will be adjusted so that the six employees will be working five days a week but not six employees every day.
On the sixth day for the supervision, the separate municipal Public Works supervisor will provide the coverage on the sixth day.
MR. STRIDICK: It is eight times forty over six hours a week and in the overall effort days?
MR. MALLOY: That's right.
MR. ABELAR: I understand there was a contract before.

MR. MALLOY: Correct.

MR. ABELAR: What is the legal status of that contract?

MR. MALLOY: That expires at the end of this month.

MR. ABELAR: Under that contract it was the City of Bayonne that was financing this?
MR. MALLOY: No, the contract was funded through UEZ funds.

Going back two years there used to be a much smaller portion of Broadway, a special approval district, that used to provide hand sweeping of the sidewalks on Broadway. That was taken over by the UEZ last year and expanded along the entire length of Broadway. The City contracted it out but used UEZ facilities in terms of letting out contracts. The contract was funded through UEZ funds.

MR. ABELAR: So this is Phase II?

MR. MALLOY: Phase II, correct.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other discussion?

Hearing none, all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.
MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Abstentions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Motion carried.
$200,000 for Bayonne Magazine - Phase III.

MR. MALLOY: These funds are to provide financing for the next two issues of the Bayonne Magazine.

The magazine is, one hundred thousand copies are distributed primarily through Hudson County, in particular in the waterfront hotels, Lite-Rail stops, the cruise ships that come into Bayonne as well as mailings to various trade shows and, frankly, any other entity, we're trying to reach out to the special interests to come into Bayonne in Bayonne.

This is really a marketing tool that we use across-the-board to present Bayonne in a very positive light both to people who perhaps
of Bayonne but not aware of everything
within
Bayonne as well as to outsiders who have
no
knowledge of Bayonne itself.
This goes for a summer as well as a winter
issue. I think as you look at the
magazine it
really is a first rate publication that
does present
Bayonne in its best possible light.
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Motion?
MR. ABELAR: So moved.
MS. KOLLURI: Seconded.
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?

MR. STRIDICK: You mentioned that you recently or over the time have lost 136 members, businesses closing and stuff like that. At your What are you doing to ramp up your membership, or is it more like, is it revolving, businesses may be closing but other business may be coming in the backdoor?

MR. MALLOY: To be honest with you, up until last year it was kind of revolving, it was fluctuating between 210 and 230 total members.

The changes in the program that commenced last July unfortunately have caused a decline, the increased paperwork, the greater difficulty in accessing the tax exempt purchasing aspects of the
program as well as tax compliance issues have driven our membership down and it is now approximately 170.

Also, quite frankly, a lot of the work in the past year from the staff, there has been a lot of paperwork involved in trying to keep our membership numbers up as opposed to recruiting.

We are planning this summer essentially a complete walking tour of our Broadway shopping district to try to bring new members into
program as well as bringing old members who had left the program back into the program.

That walking we have been doing with Council members gives us greater access as to various concerns of owners and managers of stores.

That's been completed in our Downtown District, we are trying to work now with the Midtown District and we are hoping to bring that number back up to 200.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any further discussion?

Hearing none, all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDIC: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Abstentions?

None.
19               Opposed?
20               None.
21              Motion carried. Thank you.
22              Gloucester City's Request for $120,000 for
23              Matching Facade Grant Program-Phase II.
24              Regina Dunphy?
25              MS. DUNPHY: Good morning.
We are looking for $120,000 for matching the grant program. Basically this will provide matching grants of up to ten thousand dollars for our UEZ businesses and up to two thousand dollars for each business. We have done a pilot program which started about a year ago through the UEZ and we did it to see if any businesses were even interested in that, and we got about ten responses back from UEZ businesses and we only chose four businesses who were in like high impact areas or were in desperate need of facades. We gave them exactly the same thing with the matching grant of $10,000.
Two of them have been completed, and the change as you can see from the pictures is very drastic, even in the attachment they weren't totally done. But they are totally done and it is completely different.

Since the time that we went out with the pilot program to ask businesses if they were interested we have had ten responses and since that time another five, so businesses are definitely interested in it.
As you can see from a lot of the pictures, we really need help for our facade.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Motion?

MR. STRIDICK: So moved.

MS. KOLLURI: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?

MR. ABELAR: The matching funds go to whom?

MS. DUNPHY: It can be handled one of two ways: a business after they get approved by us, we have to make sure they are in tax compliance, let's say it's for $10,000, they show us receipts for up to $10,000 that they spent on the project.

We would match it with five thousand. If they spent ten thousand dollars we put ten thousand towards it and we reimburse them ten thousand dollars.
Or it would be, you know, they have already paid five thousand dollars and then we would match it and sometimes pay the vendor directly, it depends on how they do it, but it can't happen until it's fully been approved by us.

MR. ABELAR: It will be a reimbursement?

MS. DUNPHY: It will be a reimbursement, yes.
MS. BRUCK: Or a direct payment to the vendor?

MS. DUNPHY: Or a direct payment to the vendor.

If someone just wanted to paint the outside of their property and let's say it came to three thousand dollars, they say, here is the vendor, this is the invoice for three thousand dollars, here is the check, we paid the vendor fifteen hundred, and we would pay the vendor another fifteen hundred.

MR. ABELAR: All right.

MS. DUNPHY: In the past the way we have done it, a lot of the people did it themselves and we just reimbursed them. If they spent five thousand dollars then we reimbursed them
looking at their receipts that that's spent it on.

MS. KOLLURI: You have certain criteria, but what other aspects do you look at?

MS. DUNPHY: In our first program we actually looked at our high impact areas, you know, the central district, maybe the entryway into town.

This time it is definitely more on need, it is one of two things, we are basically
an invitation out to all of the UEZ businesses, inviting them to participate in the side grant program and it is on a first come first served basis. If they can't show that they can match the funds then obviously it can't go to them. If a new business comes in, let's say we have a brand-new business that wants to come in, it is really going to be on a first come, first served basis. MS.KOLLURI: Were there any that weren't qualified as to the need? MS. DUNPHY: No, there were only four for the first pilot program and they were all in need and could provide the funds. MR. STRIDICK: Do you find the
facades exceeding just the match, in other words, is there a greater reinvestment, are you leveraging greater reinvestment for the match figures?

MS. DUNPHY: In the one instance they went below the $10,000, they spent about $6,000, so we are only reimbursing them three.

Jack's Bar and Grill went way over 24 $10,000. Actually it is a good thing; once they started seeing all of the improvements
make they decided to put more into it.

However, we could only give

them up to
ten.

Even with the Dining Car Depot, the same

thing, they started to see that--they started

wanting to do more.

What I get out of it is that they see that

there is so much more benefit they can get out of

it by doing so much more.

So the ten seemed to be sufficient for

them but they would be inclined to go above and

beyond the ten on their own.

MR. STRIDICK: Also, with the professional

services of $2,000 allotments, how has that been

working out? Because if you spend $6,000, $2,000 is

33 percent.
MS. DUNPHY: For the pilot program we didn't do the architect. However, when I worked in Mount Holly we actually used Margaret Westfield, and what she did then, this is kind of what we were envisioning for Gloucester City, that she would come and take a picture of the property and kind of do like a schematic of what she thought it would look like historically or how it would look better, and then it came with like a break-down, colors, like
pink shutters, light green, blue, whatever, along with the picture.

And then myself and her met with the property owner kind of to see what they wanted to do, and then she would sit down with them. And that's what they would then use to go to the contractors. They liked it because it gave them some idea of what they were going to do.

Some people would say, I think I need new doors, but it kind of gives them an idea of all the different things that they could do. Now, it worked there, but we haven't done it here yet. This is the first time we are doing it.?

MR. STRIDICK: Are they obligated to do everything that's on the shopping list?
17 MS. DUNPHY: No, that's why we are doing it
18 ahead of time, first we wanted to see--
19 within the first pilot program, they haven't done anything yet.
20 They actually would like to meet with her
21 because they want to do some things but they're not
22 really sure and they've looked at what the City said
23 before, and this is going to be like these are some
24 suggestions for you and we are all going to work it
25 out together.
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

(No response.)

Abstentions?

None.

Motion carried, thank you.

Jersey City's two requests, the first is for $431,215 for the Martin Luther King Shoppers Parking LOT.

MS. FARBER: Good morning, everyone.

MS. FARBER: Good morning, everyone.

Jersey City had requested several years ago to do two parking lots in MLK. The
20 Redevelopment Agency has forwarded two projects and
it is coming forward with only one.
22 This is for one shoppers parking lot on
23 Martin Luther King Drive right across the street
24 from a community center that is very active in the
25 Martin Luther King area of Jersey City.
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Okay, motion?

MS. DAVIS: So moved.

MR. ABELAR: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?

MR. STRIDICK: Yes.

Do you have a plan of the lot that this is going on, the twenty thousand square foot lot?

MS. FARBER: I have a plan, there is a plan of the Redevelopment Agency, yes.

MR. STRIDICK: Because 34 spaces is roughly like ten thousand square feet, I was just wondering what is happening with the balance of the twenty thousand square feet. I was wondering maybe it is a triangular lot?

MS. FARBER: It's a rectangle.

To the left there is going to be landscaping and fencing on the
area and also ingress and egress to that
particular
lot.

MR. STRIDICK: The parking lot itself
comes to about ninety-two hundred square
feet.

A couple of questions. Under your
itemized detailed project costs you have
1500 square
yards of concrete which is over 20
thousand square
feet of concrete, six inches thick.

So right there we have exceeded
the area
of the site and yet we are going to have a landscape area and stuff like that.

I was just wondering how do we achieve 20,000 square feet of concrete on a property that is only 20,000 square feet in area?

MS. FARBER: I cannot answer that question. That would be something I will have to check with the engineers.

MR. STRIDICK: The other thing is, foundations for sixteen decorative light poles, that's almost two cars per light pole. That seems extraordinary.

MS. FARBER: It's a very extraordinary area. Martin Luther King Drive is probably one of the worst lit areas in Jersey City. Because of the way this lot is, there is housing to the left of it,
there is actually backyards to the rear of it, this will give lighting to the entire area of where this lot is.

MR. STRIDICK: On the itemized list, it only has the foundations for the lighting, it doesn't have the lights themselves.

MS. FARBER: Redevelopment is paying for the lights.

MR. STRIDICK: We have 4,000 square feet
of sidewalk, again, that's why a plan would be very helpful, we are using over 20,000 square feet of concrete but yet I just want to see how that can happen, and that the lights are being provided by someone else.

Even the ornamental fence of 530 linear feet seems like it kind of surrounds 20,000 square feet, but again, I'm not sure of the geometry of the place.

MS. FARBER: I did not have the site plan but I can get that to Kathleen, that's not a problem. There is one that is available.

MR. STRIDICK: I think in general sometimes site plans would be really helpful, because when we are talking about site acquisition
but I don't know if it is over here or over there or wherever or how does it make sense in the overall scheme of things.

I think a lot of my questions probably would be answered if I looked at from an engineering point of view rather than a narrative.

MS. DAVIS: Are we going to wait for further information?

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: I would consider a motion to table because of some the questions that
Paul raised. I will take a motion.

MS. KOLLURI: So moved.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: This is looking for additional information.

MR. STRIDICK: We have another one out there already.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: All in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

None.

Abstentions?

None.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: We are going to table this item until the next month's agenda pending.
additional information and get that to Kathy.

MS. BRUCK: Before Roberta walks away, what we want is a site plan, is that right, what does she need to bring back?

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: I think if it is okay, some of the questions here we will provide in
written format by the end of the week to
have those questions answered.

But a site plan is definitely
necessary as justification for the fact that we are
looking at thirty-four parking spots that would take
up ten thousand square feet.

Then there is the issue, as
opposed to twenty thousand square feet for the area.

In addition to that, the cement, the
amount of concrete seems to be taking up
what the questions by Paul were--correct
or at least me if I'm wrong-- the amount of concrete based on
the area or the area seems to far exceed the area, but we just
need more information to clarify that.

MS. BRUCK: The Chairman will
we need with respect to that at the next meeting. Do you have any questions?

MS. FARBER: Just the timing issue.

MS. BRUCK: Within a week.

MS. FARBER: I understand that. This will delay the project getting started for Jersey City and with the weather changing that's going to be an issue for the contractor.

MS. BRUCK: What's the time-line on this
project?

MS. FARBER: They were hoping to get started by the 1st of August. It has to go out for a bid, we can't do anything until--

MS. DAVIS: What is the bid time frame, if you submit a bid, how long does it take?

MS. FARBER: It is about a month to get the bids out, to put this all into process, and it is important to get started prior to the bad weather coming in.

MS. DAVIS: Can you do an RI?

MS. FARBER: They can do a request for information but to actually go out for a construction bid and then make sure that it gets done in the proper amount of time for construction, that could be a problem if we are not able to have
it in place, if we are not able to go out for bid

and approve it in the allotted amount of time.

MS. DAVIS: If I'm clear in the questions,

we are not holding up the project, we are seeking more information, you could move forward.

MS. BRUCK: No, actually they can't.

MS. DAVIS: How long has this parking lot been in the current state it's in?

MS. FARBER: It's been in the current state
for quite sometime.

MS. DAVIS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: We voted on the motion to table it.

MS. BRUCK: That's fine. I think we did and I asked the question.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Moving on, the second one is for $205,000 for professional services block front projects.

MS. FARBER: Jersey City has done many block front projects within the City in various parts of the City. They have proven to be extremely successful.

In order for us to continue to perform any projects we need to have professionals to come in to do design work, to do construction work, the
entire process, so this is a request for $205,000 to proceed with two projects for West Side Avenue and Five Corners in Jersey City.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Make a motion.

MS. DAVIS: So moved.

MR. ABELAR: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?

MR. STRIDICK: I have a couple of questions.
Who is producing the construction documents?

MS. FARBER: John Petrocino produces the construction documents and Herb Solomon produces the drawings, he produces the blue-prints. John Petrocino does the construction bids, he is the construction manager.

MR. STRIDICK: Herb Solomon is actually doing the documentation?

MS. FARBER: Yes.

MR. STRIDICK: It calls for the architect but it is changed to the designer.

MS. FARBER: He is the architect designer, he has someone in his firm who is a licensed architect to design--

MR. STRIDICK: So it is a licensed architect?
18              MS. FARBER:  Yes.
19              MR. STRIDICK:  So we are getting building permits on all this work?
20              MS. FARBER:  Absolutely, always.
21              MR. STRIDICK:  In his business registration he is saying he is providing the architectural services but yet he is not a licensed architect.
MS. FARBER: We get all construction permits with the Planning Board. Part of the block front project has to sign off on a property easement grant, so it is all done through every legal possibility that you can imagine.

MR. STRIDICK: What is the scope of work being performed? You say there are ninety-five properties; is that like ninety-five individual packages?

MS. FARBER: Yes, ninety-five individual store locations.

MR. STRIDICK: How many of those advance to construction documentation?

MS. FARBER: Usually about eighty to ninety percent.

MR. STRIDICK: So we have about
eighty-five really over the next year of construction document packages?

MS. FARBER: Um-hm.

MS. KOLLURI: How did you select these two professionals?

MS. FARBER: They have both been working for the Jersey City Economic Development Corporation on various projects since about 1997.

MS. KOLLURI: You did not go to RFP?
MS. FARBER: No. This is a continuation of the work that they have done.

MS. KOLLURI: Not related to these projects?

MS. FARBER: This is a separate project.

MR. STRIDICK: In the past how many packages, is it like eight hundred properties over the last ten years that have been done?

MS. FARBER: It's been, I can't give you the exact number of packages, we have Newark Avenue, Lower Newark Avenue, the Downtown area, we've got Martin Luther King Drive, which is a six block area, you have Montecello Avenue which is going on right now which is is another block. You have got McGinness Square which takes because of
17 the configuration of the square, and that area has
18 been done.
19 And we are looking to do another area on West Side Avenue.
20
21 discussion?
22 Hearing none, all in favor?
23 MR. AMBAR: Aye.
24 MS. DAVIS: Aye.
25 MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

MS. KOLLURI: Opposed.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Abstentions.

None.

MS. BRUCK: The motion is not carried.

MS. DAVIS: We don't have enough votes for it?

MS. BRUCK: You need five votes.

MS. KOLLURI: I think that the fact that we have $205,000, I just have a concern. I have seen that many other projects are put out as competitive projects. There has been a question, I have heard a lot of discussion with regard to the architect designer and I would have gotten some comfort level if an RFP had been done, so that would be my concern.
MS. FARBER: These are both professional services.

MS. KOLLURI: I understand that but this is public funding, but we are talking about this much money.

MR. STRIDICK: I completely concur with you. The reason that I said yes rather than no is because it is not a mandate to have -- I
are going to restructure it and say that
these kind of things need to go out to RFP rather
than just awarding professional service, it is not
in the mandate and that's the only reason.
I still have, you know, some issues with it, but my hands are tied I think just
because I can't say we have to give it out for RFP. If I was
inventing this I would definitely say this has to go
out for RFP.
I completely concur with what you're
saying, but I am just approaching it from a
different point.
MS. BRUCK: If you want to take this back
and discuss whether or not you want to go
to RFP, I don't know whether that would be helpful-
MS. KOLLURI: That would be helpful.

MS. BRUCK: Or if they can show that they are giving competitive weight to those kinds of things and some kind of justification for doing this on this particular job--

MS. KOLLURI: I think that makes a lot of sense, if you can provide a little more justification as to why you didn't call for it on this particular job.

MS. DAVIS: Apparently the way the
is structured is that it is within the parameters of the UEZ law? 

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Yes.

MS. DAVIS: So I don't see why we are taking about opinions. This is not about opinions or personal feelings, this is about a proposal submitted and does it comply with the current UEZ law, if it does, if there is an objection that is in conflict with the law, how do we as a Board deal with that?

MS. BRUCK: Alternatively, there is nothing in the law that says that you have to approve every project just because it falls within the parameters of the statute, you are certainly able to vote against a proposal if you have a perfectly sound reason.
MS. DAVIS: So then as policy making of the Board, then I would like to advance that this should be the case across-the-board and that we should consider this as a policy change of the Board.

MS. BRUCK: That's for another day.

MS. DAVIS: I want to advance that, if we are going to take that position then we should take that position across-the-board.
MS. FARBER: I just want to be clear then.

The Authority is making or is going to be making a new policy at some point in time in the near future that even professional services which are allowed by law --

MS. BRUCK: Potentially, but for the time being what I would suggest is that you follow our advice by resubmitting the application with your justification for using these firms as opposed to going out for public bid, and we will reconsider it at that time. The current policy, you know, may be subject to further discussion.

MS. FARBER: And the pay-to-play list that the City maintains, if there are vendors that are on a pay-to-play list, that they are vendors
City can use, that are pretty much just selected, architects, engineering firms that are there right now?

MS. BRUCK: What is your question?

MR. STRIDICK: A fair and open process applies under State law.

MS. BRUCK: You want to use these firms and the Board members want to know why you have chosen them.

Your question is would you be able to
continue to use them automatically that's not a yes or no. I am just suggesting that whoever you do use you need to justify why you are not putting it out for RFP.

MR. ABELAR: Dealing with the subject of pay to play, it would be good to bring up that issue as well.

MS. BRUCK: It might be appropriate for comment, but this will not be approved unless you supply sufficient justification for not putting it out for bid.

MS. FARBER: The fact that they have been doing work for us for ten years over the course of time?

MS. BRUCK: There might be some competitive rates, so the members want to know why
you have selected and why you maintain these professionals, not just because we have them there.

MR. ABELAR: Let me ask you, do you have a pay-to-play ordinance?

MS. FARBER: Yes.

MR. ABELAR: Can't you include that with whatever criteria you want to include, that will be up to you.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Thank you, we are going
to close the discussion on this and move on.

Lakewood's contract amendment request for $25,000 for Downtown Parking Development, Phase 1-Appraisals (UEZA 07-134), increasing the project from $25,000 to $50,000, Mr. Corby?

MR. CORBY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members.

We are here today to increase the expenditure for appraisals for the Township's effort to locate and expand parking opportunities.

Originally under this project, UEZA 07-134, if I might just point it out?

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Can you bring it up closer so that the Board will be able to see it?

MR. CORBY: This is Clifton Avenue, which
16 is the heart of Lakewood and the commercial shopping
17 area in Lakewood.
18 Here on the corner of 3rd -- excuse me,
19 4th Street is the Strand Theater.
20 We initially began this project by looking
21 at this plot here (indicating) to expand
22 opportunities to do some appraisals. We have begun
23 that process.
24 But in addition to that the Township
25 Committee has -- let me first say that parking in
Lakewood is like the weather, everybody talks about it, but, you know, we still have a problem with it. This is the Municipal Building area, this the Town Square, this is the block across the street. Also with a municipal parking lot here in this area, and down here, this is also a municipal parking lot, as you can see it is surrounded by some businesses. So the opportunity arose after the original approval to look at some of these other areas, parking around the Town Square with some commercial in order to make it a more viable location. So in addition to this, this is
original project proposal, we would like the additional money to look at some properties in these three other blocks. I might just say in conjunction with this the Township is working with New Jersey Transit on another park-and-ride area further up about two blocks up, so this is a coordinated effort, this is the UEZ part of the effort, if you will, to seek out available areas. And we believe we need about another
$25,000 to do that, and I would ask for your approval.

MR. ABELAR: So moved.

MR. STRIDICK: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?

MR. STRIDICK: How many appraisals were in the first part of the package?

MR. CORBY: Actually we were going to look at five properties. We have three, four, five properties, we have let contracts with an original firm for three properties which has already cost us about eighteen thousand, in the area of $18,000.

MR. STRIDICK: Then from your application I believe you are going to three to five additional properties?

MR. CORBY: We will go to three
blocks, obviously we are not going to do it on all of the properties, but there are some which may be available, for instance, on 2nd Street near the existing parking garage there are four properties which would reasonably be available for the Township to expand parking.

MR. STRIDICK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any more questions?

(No response.)
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Then hearing none, all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

None.

Abstentions?

None.

Motion carried.

Thank you, Mr. Corby.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: The next item is Millville's two requests, Don Ayres.

The first is for $162,966 for additional firefighters.

MR. AYRES: Good morning.

I would like to introduce Fire Chief Kirkes (phonetic) who is with us today to answer any
questions you may have regarding this project.

Actually both of these submissions are driven by the same need, and that is fortunately the growth that we are having within the UEZ, we are having within the last couple of years in our interchange area, now an additional eight hundred
thousand square feet of national retailers and restaurant chains, the growth of our downtown with the additional shops opening and restaurants and other venues, what is happening now at our airport, all of these are within the UEZ.

We are now under construction, you probably are getting tired of me talking about New Jersey Motor Sports Park which is about three hundred fifty acres actually actively under construction and we expect opening next spring. Events are being lined up and we are expecting in year one to start out with some two hundred fifty thousand additional visitors, building to about five hundred thousand people a year by year five.
Directly adjacent to that constructing a three hundred fifty acre industrial park, and we're actively talking to users there. And we have on our riverfront development, which is all in the UEZ, about two miles of riverfront, formerly vacant factories and mill sites, we are about to receive responses to an RFP for about a four hundred thousand square foot mixed-use development downtown and we have another two hundred fifty thousand square feet that is going to start
construction complete with private directly north of that.

All of that being said, we have the need for additional UEZ firefighters and UEZ police officers. These will be providing services to these businesses and be proactive with major industries that are coming the Motor Sports Park needing assistance also.

For the firefighters we are asking for two positions that would be UEZ except for emergency situations and that would all be with the existing UEZ firefighter that's already been approved.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Thank you.

I'll take a motion.

MS. KOLLURI: So moved.

MR. ABELAR: Seconded.
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any discussion?

MR. ABELAR: It seems to me that the motor park will require a substantial amount of firefighters.

THE CHIEF: Yes, it does, but we try to be proactive along with that so we want to make sure that everything is in place before the cars go out on the actual track with inspections.

MR. ABELAR: The percentage of municipal
services is quite low, it is only five

year.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other
discussion?

Hearing none, all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed.

None. Abstentions?

None.

Motion carried.

The second item is for $77,506
for an

additional UEZ police officer.

MR. AYRES: We currently have
three UEZ

police officers, one is a walking
patrolman and two

are on motorized patrol.

There is the same justification
tremendous growth that's happening, there
five
thousand acres in our UEZ, these growth
centers at
the interchange, the downtown and the
airport are
separate and we need some more coverage
and this
police officer reflects that need.
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Thank you.
Motion?
MR. STRIDICK: So moved.
MR. ABELAR: Seconded.
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?
Hearing none, all in favor?
MR. ABELAR: Aye.
MS. DAVIS: Aye.
MS. KOLLURI: Aye.
MR. STRIDICK: Aye.
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.
Opposed?
None.
Abstentions?
None.
Motion carried.
Thank you very much.
Next is Mount Holly's request for $210,000 for acquisition of 101 Washington Street, Mr. Kevin Mizikov.

MR. MIZIKOV: As the Chairman stated, our
The project has requested $210,000. $200,000 is for the actual acquisition of the property, with $10,000 in professional services for lawyer and closing fees.

101 Washington Street is located in one of the three primary gateways or intersections to our
downtown business district.
The property has been vastly underutilized since the late nineteen-seventies and has actually been vacant since the early nineteen-nineties.

The construction of the twenty-four thousand square foot building is completely located within UEZ and is also located within the Mount Holly Township designated area in need of redevelopment according to State law.

We have looked to acquire this property as the final piece of that four-acre development and then have an environmental assessment done and turn it over to a developer to redevelop the entire four acre site.

We feel that getting this plot is the last
key piece of actually moving forward with the development since there will be one owner, which will be the UEZ/Town. So we are asking for your consideration of this project today, it will vastly enable us to have new development in town and help increase the ability to help other projects.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Thank you. Make a motion?
MS. DAVIS: so moved.

MR. STRIDICK: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?

Hearing none, all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

None.

Abstentions?

None.

Motion carried. Thank you.

The next item is North Bergen's request for $487,872 for a closed circuit television public security system, Phase II, Barbara Lawton.

MR. PITTFIELD: Barbara Lawton and Kim Nicoliello, the Mayor is here today.
We have come to ask for your consideration for Phase II of our CCTV program. Phase II is basically the refurbishing and retrofitting of the Township's existing PAL building.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Okay, thank you.

Do I have a motion?
MS. DAVIS: So moved.

MR. ABELAR: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?

MR. STRIDICK: I have a question. Do you have a plan, it sounds like my previous request, do you have a plan of the facility and the scope of work?

MR. PITTFIELD: Yes, that was submitted with the application. Would you like to see it?

MR. STRIDICK: When I viewed the map it comes out to about $182 a square foot, and that seems significant for that scope.

I am wondering what is being included.

You are occupying say 75 percent--

MR. PITTFIELD: 80 percent.

MR. STRIDICK: And you are just renovating a building, you're not building a
Mr. Pittfield: It is being retrofitted.

Mr. Stridick: I understand that.

And is it including the CCTIV equipment, or just the physical structure?

Mr. Pittfield: The physical structure. I should point out, there are four or five other buildings that are under consideration, one of which is the building that currently houses our UEZ.
office for which we pay rent. We couldn't get this guy to budge off the million dollar mark, that's what he wanted for the entire building.

MR. STRIDICK: I think it's great that you are using a building that's already in your -- obviously there would never be any rent charge to the UEZ for this purpose.

MR. STRIDICK: I am just questioning the amount.

MR. PITTFIELD: That's not to say that that's exactly what we would spend. The professionals in this regard probably were very conservative, and until actual specs are developed and the project is bid out we will have a better idea.
17 MS. BRUCK: These are estimates?

18 MR. PITTFIELD: Yes.

19 MS. BRUCK: You are going to try to do better?

20 MR. PITTFIELD: Absolutely.

21 CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any further discussion?

22 MR. STRIDICK: Again, I'm new to the Board, but I am not sure what all this constitutes.

23 Will we get an accounting of what is
actually spent on this?

MS KUBE: Any money that they do not spent gets returned to the project account.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: It's a reimbursement process. Once you approve the project they have to submit all receipts.

MS. KUBE: They are asking for $487,000, they may only spend four hundred thousand, that's what they will ask reimbursement for, and that remaining money will be returned to their project account for future projects.

MR. STRIDICK: Again, my point is $182 per square foot for a retrofit, even if you take out the contingencies, $166 per square foot for the building to be retrofitted is high, not a conservative cost at all.
I have only had this plan for a couple of seconds and I am not the architect and I haven't done the programming and I haven't done the specifications, but I would think that building a new building would be done at $186 a square foot, renovating a building, probably in the seventy-five to ninety-five dollar range.

MS. DAVIS: Is that in the New Jersey market?
MR. STRIDICK: I have to remove myself from this because I am not the architect on this but I am just saying as a Board member I question $182 per square foot. I am not talking about property acquisition, I'm talking about building a building, which seems a little high. I have only had these plans for a couple of minutes.

MS. LAWTON: I just want to add one thing.

Prior to -- this has been an ongoing process for a while. Originally the plan was to place it on the third floor of Town Hall, which turned out to be totally unfeasible.

The Town then did a second RFP to look for an architect who was familiar with designing this
type of a center and this firm was selected based on their experience and their cost. So it is possible that we might have found an architect, that there might be an architect who can design this who would give us a lower cost per square foot, but unfortunately we followed the process and put out an RFP and selected this individual based on that.

MR. STRIDICK: I'm not questioning that.

MS. LAWTON: The Township Engineer has
pretty much confirmed--

MR. PITTFIELD: Building materials fluctuate almost hourly right, so I think that's why we have the beefed up contingency in there.

I think as Kathy pointed out, perhaps we should just let the bidding process be and see where the moment the contract is awarded we will make you guys aware of it.

MS. BRUCK: Only one person can talk at a time.

CHAIRMAN STRIDICK: Anything further?

MR. STRIDICK: No.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other discussion?

Hearing none, all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.
MS. KOLLOURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Opposed.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Abstention?

None.

Again, the motion did not carry.

MR. STRIDICK: I don't know what the next step would be to satisfy this.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: The issue here, I mean
just the process, they are going out for RFP and they are going to look for a bid. They would come back--unless they came back to us and not exceed this cost or fall under this cost--MR. CAREY: They can come back and justify the cost.

MR. STRIDICK: I think that might be the point.

Would it be, to move this along, in all fairness, to put it out for bid and then to bring those real bids--MR. PITTFIELD: I can't put it out for bid unless you guys approve it.

MR. STRIDICK: Then we can't do anything about it. I mean I will change my vote.

MSW. BRUCK: Should we take another vote?
Do you want to make another motion to reconsider this project?

MR. STRIDICK: I'm interested - I just have a hard time digesting $182 per square foot, even though that is a ballpark, a guesstimate so far and we need to kind of base it on the guesstimate.

I will make a motion to reconsider it and as a matter of courtesy to bring those bids back to
the Board for review even though we can't do anything about it at that point because we approved it. It is a matter of satisfying the curiosity that we are really hitting $182 a square foot because that's a tremendous amount of money for the scope of this work.

MS. BRUCK: That changes the motion, that's a caveat on the motion, an obligation to report back to the Board.

MR. STRIDICK: Once the bids are received.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Just as a question of process, once they go out for bid, Kathy, when do we get that?

MS. KUBE: We generally don't. This is the first time this has come up.
MS. BRUCK: It would be a follow-up report as to what the final--

MS. KUBE: They can do a follow-up, send me something and I will forward it to the Authority for their information.

MS. DAVIS: Historically when municipalities come before the Board in this type of matter you always want reports to say or to do a follow-up?
MS. BRUCK: They have to analyze the cost and see that it is properly expended before they issue a reimbursement.

MS. DAVIS: The feedback that Staff receives, whether it is a report or otherwise, I'm asking, would it also provide information on the result of the bid, how much the--

MS. BRUCK: That calculation could be made by Staff if they put it together, but it is not a requirement that they report back, it is my understanding, about what the square foot cost was in a given construction project, for example.

MS. DAVIS: But if we are reimbursing you, who are we reimbursing for them?

MS. BRUCK: They are reimbursed for a
specific job done, they will send in that they have spent $6,000 on fireworks, say it is Asbury Park, and we had to pay $4,000 for a booth-- but we are not talking about the same thing. MS. DAVIS: I understand that, MS. BRUCK: Is this a security system, I guess it is under construction and still has to be dry-walled? CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: On page 9 we have an itemized list of what they are, of what
estimate of the costs are. They will be submitting in reimbursements for the project which will then get reimbursed up to the amount we have approved here and Staff will be able to compare it with what they understand from the approved packet that the City was going to be spending it on.

MS. DAVIS: Going forward, can we get that information back not just in this specific case but across-the-board, information back on bids so we know as a Board what was finally approved and why, and make it a policy across-the-board?

MS. BRUCK: I'm not sure we--

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: We will take it into consideration, you have made the statement and it was taken down and it will be considered.
17 We need to finish.
18 We have a motion to reconsider the vote
19 that we have just taken.
20 MR. STRIDICK: With the contingency of
21 following up to this Board once the bids have been received before the award of contract, I mean once the bids are received we know what the bottom line was.
22 MS. BRUCK: This is a caveat,
follow it up.

MR. STRIDICK: Can you put the

motion --

MS. BRUCK: I just want to

understand

what you mean, that they can go forward

with their

project, they just have to report back to

the Board

what the ultimate results were, you want

a square

foot analysis?

MR. STRIDICK: That's the bottom

line.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Let's get to

the

motion, make the motion.

MR. STRIDICK: The motion is to

approve

caveat that

this project and move forward, with the

Board once

the Applicant will report back to this

bids are received as to what the bottom

line of the

accepted bids would be.

MR. PITTFIELD: Sure, that's

easy.
MR. ABELAR: So moved.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Seconded?

MS. DAVIS: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?

None.

All in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.
MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

None.

Abstentions?

None.

Motion carried.

The next item is North Wildwood's request for $202,480 for trash cans and benches, Lou Ferrara.

MR. FERRARA: Thank you for hearing our request this morning.

As we described in the project, the boardwalk is the very heart of our business community in Wildwood. On any given weekend night, we can see up to two hundred fifty thousand to three hundred thousand pedestrians on the boardwalk.
Pedestrians create a tremendous amount of trash, they are all looking for a place to sit, relax and enjoy themselves. I can tell you on any given weekend night our Public Works Departments independently, both Wildwood and North Wildwood, will put up to ten trash bags into a trash can that will be taken out and replaced through the night. That's the amount
amount of trash that pedestrians will generate on any given night during the summer. It is a tremendous job keeping the boardwalk clean, it is a tremendous job keeping the boardwalk intact because of the weather. We are constantly upgrading and that's why we are here today to request funding. The trash cans that we are requesting today are part of a system, we have these trucks that drive up to the cans, pick them up and dump them automatically. They are made of polystyrene, they are very, very durable, they are meant to last for many years to come.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Thank you.

Motion.

MR. STRIDICK: So moved.

MS. DAVIS: seconded.
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any discussion?

MR. STRIDICK: Where do you get the weight?

MR. FERRARA: The weight becomes an issue on dumping. On the City streets we have sixty gallon cans but they are picked up with an automatic system. We have to make them light enough for the...
workers to be able to lift them up.

MR. STRIDICK: It isn't a power lifting system?

MR. FERRARA: It is a lifting system, but it gets pretty heavy, people dump all kinds of stuff in there and we have to be real careful about it.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Thank you. Any other discussion? None. All in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.


None. Abstentions?

None.
21 Motion carried.

22 Number 15, Wildwood City's request for

23 $403,099 for Fox Park Construction Project, Mr.

24 Ferrara?

25 MR. FERRARA: My name is Lou Ferrara, I'm
here on behalf of Wildwood. Wildwood has a piece of property that is referred to as Fox Park. It's about five hundred feet from the entrance to our convention center and in the past year if you take a look at our project proposal, in conjunction with the Duwat (phonetic) Preservation League and made possible by half a million dollars in private grants and a half million dollars in City funding we built a building called The Surfside Restaurant which you have pictures of in your package. That's going to house half of the Duwat Museum, the other half is an open air amphitheater that is absolutely phenomenal. The project has been built and is complete. The biggest part of it was done with private funding.
Adjacent to that there used to be a basketball court that has a concrete surface. We have taken that basketball court out. It is a lit area, and what we would like to do is along with the amphitheater create a new destination, and that destination being this nature trail that you see in front of me.

It has a poured-in-place surface which we have been told by our engineers is the safest, most
effective surface for the Shore. Part of the problem with surfaces other than poured-in-place, other municipalities might use wood chips, but at the Shore we get enormous winds so the chips would be gone in a couple of days. It will bring hundreds of children to that park specifically along with the amphitheater attraction and it's been widely accepted by all of the businesses in the Town because they see it as being one more attraction that the City offers, a free attraction to the visitors to the community. We are a very heavily tourism based community and the more attractions we can offer to the children the more business we are going to do in the community.
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: I'll take a motion.

MR. ABELAR: So moved.

MS. KOLLURI: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?

MR. STRIDICK: How many square feet is the poured surface?

MR. FARRARA: The poured surface is quoted at ten dollars per square foot.

If I can explain, this might make the whole conversation a little simpler, we are guided
by State law when it comes to pouring, so when we go to our engineer or to a manufacturer we ask them to estimate what they think the project would cost based on bidding, the State bidding process. Now, the play-set is a product that is going to be purchased under State contract, in other words the manufacturer has already gone through the State bidding process and been approved to sell this to the municipality. It saves us a tremendous amount of time; you don't have to write the specs, you don't have to put it out for bids, receive bids, take the lowest bidder and in a lot of cases have to accept the bid that is substandard because they only based it on cost.
The surface itself is not under State contract. It is a product that is offered by a few companies throughout the State. The engineers have told us that they are estimating that the surface is going to be about ten dollars per per square, is the forecast. That doesn't mean we are going to pay ten dollars per square foot. All we are saying in the project is we would like to encumber up to ten dollars a square foot to cover what the bidding process will bring.
We will write the specs for it and put the specs out there. Manufacturers will read them and bid on it and we are forced by State law to take the lowest bidder for that description of product. Even though we quote the ten dollars it doesn't mean we will necessarily have to spend that, but we have to cover it in the project to go out to bid. I think that's where some of the confusion is. Just because we quote it in the project doesn't mean we are going to spend it. We are forced by State law to take the lowest possible price for the project, whether it is building, construction. The $185 per square foot, the architects and engineering firms always estimate high, they are looking at every contingency. When
comes to paying for the project it's going to be based on that bid price that's set by State law. We are required to take the lowest possible price. We can't pay more if we wanted to. We have to have a legal and fair open bidding system for any of those products.

MR. STRIDICK: Do you know the area of the square footage?

MR. FERRARA: The square footage is going to cover the concrete slab that the basketball court
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did cover, I don't know the exact -- it is a full size regulation slab for a basketball court, I don't know what the actual size of that area is, but I can do the math, it is ten dollars a square foot, so I can back it up.

MR. STRIDICK: There are two variables. One is that the cost may not go up to ten dollars a square foot. And then the area may not equal a thousand square feet, it might be eight thousand square feet.

MR. FERRARA: And we are always interested in getting the best price; this is our money.

MR. STRIDICK: With regard to the sign over-
justification, what is the nature of them?

I didn't find anything really in the narrative.

MR. FERRARA: If I could I'll explain that.

When we were designing this project we were using private funding and City bonding. We spent about a million dollars on the project. They had planned to put a sign garden in the front of the project which was no more than foundations that had
steel girders bolted to them to hold up these antique decorative signs for the nostalgic hotels.

What we found out is based on the wind shear figures that we got from the engineers they had to be a lot more substantial than they ever guessed they would be to support those signs because it is two hundred yards from the beach, very close to a very high wind situation.

They ran out of money. So the original plans had included a pathway around the sign garden, some fencing around the sign garden, some signage.

None of that was possible, and at the last minute the Mayor asked me if I could include some of that money in that project.

All of those things, again,
under State law, they will not be purchased outright, they will be bid with the rest of the project. Again, it can include fencing for the sign garden, signage, additional concrete pathways, not to exceed $150,000. Basically it is an element of the project to put the finishing touches on the facility so that not only do we keep people safe but protect the
MR. STRIDICK: I had no idea what the scope was.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other discussion?

Hearing none, all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

None.

Abstentions?

None.

Motion carried.

Passaic's contract amendment request for $90,000 for Commercial Redevelopment Project Phase III (UEZA No. 07-27) increasing the project from $1,870,000 to $1,960,000. This is both an extension...
and an increase.

MR. CARTER: Before we start, is it permissible to ask counsel a question?

Some of the previous ones that came through, the motion was carried; does that mean there needs to be five "yes" votes?
MS. BRUCK: There needs to be a majority passing the proposal. The majority is based upon nine potential members of the Authority, so that means five. Unfortunately we have two vacancies and we have one person, a public member--

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Three vacancies.

MS. BRUCK: And one public member is not here today.

MR. CARTER: So all five have to be "yes"?

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Or four with an abstension.

MS. BRUCK: If we have an abstention that's because somebody is undecided or out of the room, that would still be counted as a "yes" vote. If we have a recusal that would be tantamount to a "no".
You need five positive votes to carry the proposal?

Does that answer your question?

MR. CARTER: Thank you.

MS. BRUCK: Do you want to leave now?

MR. CARTER: No, we are ready to go forward.

This is Phase III- of the project.

Originally it was called the Commercial Redevelopment Project which began back in 2004.

We surveyed our commercial areas and found
eleven vacant commercial properties, so they did a Scattered Site Redevelopment Investigation, and this was all done with UEZ funds back then in 2004, and we are quickly following it up with redevelopment plans for those eleven properties. What is happening with these eleven properties since we did these studies and put these into redevelopment areas with the UEZ funds, four of them since 2004 have actually been completed, occupied and the whole bit, and four are currently under construction. That brings it to eight. Two have been sold or transferred to developers and those developers are putting together plans to do those properties. There is one that not much has happened
on, and that's the subject of this contract amendment request.

On Phase II we actually for two of those properties, one which is under construction and one which is in the planning stages, we got about six hundred thousand in funds allocated through the UEZ to acquire those properties, so we are moving ahead very quickly.

Once we did that and moved to acquire the properties, in one case the owner went forward and
started a project itself that is under construction.

In the other case the owner opted to sell privately to a designated developer. Out of the eleven properties, four are done, four under construction, two in planning stages, ten out of the eleven are being done without acquisition by a public entity.

Phase III of this project is very similar to Phase II where we received funding to acquire the eleven properties, and that's the biggest one. That's a property in the center of Passaic.

Instead of taking a new picture of this property we have it prominently on our marketing brochure. This property is right smack in the City of Passaic right smack in the middle of
downtown. It is the most prominent building you will find in the City. It is about eleven stories, eighty thousand square feet, it's been vacant for over a decade.

The City tried to do something with the property in 1995. We commissioned an architectural review so developers would have some idea what they were up to if they wanted to rehabilitate them. It went through the original appraisal and got the approval for that appraisal for
acquisition, but as time went by, now we are poised to continue that process, the appraisal needed to be more current, so we updated the appraisal which came back five percent higher and this reflects that ninety thousand dollar increase. I believe this original project, Phase IIi, plus this amendment should be approved in its original form. The way the process works, now we make the owner an offer for the appraised value; by law we have to enter into bona fide negotiations with that owner. Typically what happens if they are at all interested in selling they would commission their own appraisal, typically those appraisals are a little different, and you negotiate the
That's our next step, and if that fails then we would have to acquire it publicly.

So as it is, what I would suggest is that if anybody is uncomfortable with the format, possibly the way to get around that discomfort would be to condition it upon the additional eighty thousand subject to this amendment shall not be used for condemnation but may be used for interest payments towards acquisition.

In that way if we get to the next step if
our negotiation with the owner fails or if the owner
fails to develop the property themselves, which we
would hope does happen, we would come back and try
to justify it to you.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Motion?
MR. STRIDICK: So moved.
MS. KOLLURI: Seconded.
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?
MR. ABELAR: What was the conditional
proposal you were proposing?
MR. CARTER: Not proposing, I am offering it. If you want to make condemnation the very last	hing, if you want us to pursue every other avenue and come back in case it does not work,
we could do that. I think the way to do that would be to say this additional ninety thousand dollars
this amendment shall not be used for condemnation but may be used for interest payments towards acquisition.

MR. ABELAR: I would go along with your proposal, this is very valuable real estate -- I'm not sure if the City acquired it, it would be the best use.

MR. CARTER: Frankly I think it's our
second worse alternative and the worst alternative is leaving it the way it is.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: On the issue of condemnation, that's something that we don't have definitely a policy on as of now or regulation against use of condemnation, and clearly the Governor has expressed some concerns over the course of the last couple of years on the use of condemnation as a sort of restrictive nature of this.

Is this a residential property?

MR. CARTER: It's a commercial property, it's been vacant for about twelve years. Originally developed as a bank. The last use was a multi-tenant office. The redevelopment plan calls for it to continue to be commercial use.
MS. BRUCK: The understanding is that this is only to acquire for a concentual purchase; is that correct?

MR. CARTER: My offer is kind of a compromise, that this additional ninety thousand would be used for that.

MS. DAVIS: What is the proposed use of this property once it is acquired and redeveloped and so forth?
MR. CARTER: The redevelopment plan, which is kind of like zoning, calls for a commercial use, and just so you know, those things change. For example, if the owner were to come to us and propose a redevelopment of the property that might be different, that would have to go through the municipal approval process. Right now it is commercial use. But I think the City has shown a lot of flexibility in trying to get this property redeveloped.

MS. DAVIS: If you developed this property how do you know you will have somebody in that building; are there businesses, prospective people that you are aware of that you can get?
MR. CARTER: At this point it is premature to be looking for tenants for the property. Most tenants don't want to come in and say I'll sign a lease for three years in the future. MS. DAVIS: I understand that. I mean as to option C, has the City thought that through, assuming it is vacant and it's not developed? MR. CARTER: Yes, we have. In fact you have in your Staff now Phase IV, and Phase IV was
and they just accept our offer and we negotiate a purchase, to do what the architects call weatherize, and they just accept our offer and we negotiate a purchase, to do what the architects call weatherize, to do what the architects call weatherize, stabilize and secure the property, what you have, to do something with it, and then to hire architectural firms that actually do bid specs for the rehabilitation of the property. What we plan to do if it goes this far—I've got to tell you, our hope is, as you can see from ten of the eleven of the other ones that we had, our hope is that the owner will finally do this. The owner of the property is a large real estate developer so he certainly has the resources.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other discussion?

(No response.)
CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: I appreciate your recognition of the concerns.

I will take a vote. All in favor?

MR. ABELAR: I have a question. What we're voting here is money that the City would have to acquire this property and go to the owner and try to make--

MR. CARTER: Which is the next step.
MR. ABELAR: Without this approval you cannot negotiate with the owner?

MR. CARTER: We would have to have another source of revenue to do that.

MS. BRUCK: Typically they would negotiate and enter into some kind of option with the owner.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: If the Board approves this, the approval of the increase, there has already been an approval for the acquisition of this property?

MR. CAREY: I just want to ask, if the vote is to approve this and the Applicant has agreed that they will come back and ask for further Board approval if you need to resort to eminent domain?

MR. CARTER: I offered that as a solution
in case you had a problem with this. I mean we would prefer it be done without that but we are probably going to be back here on this project numerous times.

MS. BRUCK: I am not sure your question was answered. If they went out and got an appraisal and the updated appraisal number was ninety thousand dollars more than anticipated and now you come back with an increase to offer it at face value to the property owner, and if it is not accepted you
1 are going to come back to the Authority and present
2 your alternative for your options beyond that?
3 MR. CARTER: Correct.
4 If we end up negotiating. The numbers
5 will be different anyway, if we come back at that
6 point.
7 MS. BRUCK: With those representations we
8 can vote.
9 CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Unless there is any
10 other discussion, hearing none, all in favor?
11 MR. ABELAR: Aye.
12 MS. DAVIS: Aye.
13 MS. KOLURI: Aye.
14 MR. STRIDICK: Aye.
15 CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.
16 Opposed?
17 None.
18 Abstentions?
Pleasantville has two requests, the first one is for $533,250 for city center property acquisition, Phase II, Roger Tees. MR. TEES: This first project is for funds
to acquire two properties immediately adjacent to a large tract of City owned land that has been targeted for the relocation of City government services and facilities. This is being done in the context of the City Center Redevelopment Plan that is in effect for thirty acres of the Urban Enterprise Zone's downtown business district. These funds will pay for the acquisition of the two properties under agreements of sale with those residential owners as well as sufficient costs required for title surveys and other legal expenses.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Thank you.
I'll take a motion.
MS. DAVIS: so moved.
MR. STRIDICK: Seconded.
Discussion?

Hearing none, all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?
None.

Abstentions?

None.

Motion carried.

The second item is $680,375 for the city center property acquisition Phase III.

MR. TEES: Mr. Chairman, these three properties are within the City Redevelopment Area of the Central Business District. They are all properties necessary to achieve the redevelopment plan. The agreements of sale of all have been negotiated under voluntary sales and in good faith. Again, the acquisition would allow the City through the UEZ to make them part of many other parcels that we acquired or that the City owns to
any developer that may be designated for the redevelopment plan for our community.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: I'll take a motion.

MR. STRIDICK: So moved.

MR. ABELAR: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN STRIDICK: Any discussion?

MR. STRIDICK: Just that the professional services are hovering around 2 to 2.3 percent.

MR. TEES: We based it on RFPs that we put
out as well as our experience having purchased other properties, we don't want to run up the cost of property acquisition, that sets a bad precedent, so we are trying very hard to keep those costs down.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other discussion?

None.

All in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

None.

Abstentions?

None.

Motion carried.

MR. TEES: May I just introduce for
recognition Derrick Benz (phonetic) and Warren Berger. Derrick is with the New Jersey Economic Development Association, commercial lenders; Mr. Berger is the Senior Project Officer of the Real Estate Division of the EDA. Both of these gentlemen have been our partners in the City Center Redevelopment Initiative.
and you will see them again with other projects as we move forward.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Thank you.

Finally, Vineland's two Second Generation Fund requests. First is for $500,000 for economic development loan to BDGS, Inc.

Jim Lelli?

MR. LELLI: The first one is a half a million dollar loan to BDGS Realty. They are a holding company for Vineland's privately owned industrial park, and this loan is to provide the additional building space for one of our existing bakeries that is going to expand. So this loan is a second generation loan. It creates a lot of construction jobs. More importantly, the money will be added...
back to our Second Generation Loan Fund

to be used

over and over again.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: I'll take a
motion.

MS. DAVIS: So moved.

MR. STRIDICK: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?

Hearing none, all in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.
MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

None.

Abstentions?

None.

Motion carried.

The second item is $106,878 for an economic development loan to Bispo Real Estate Holdings, LLC.

MR. LELLI: That is the holding company that is going to house the offices of a new physician specializing in obstetrics and gynecology, and his wife is also a pediatrician.

Vineland's population is growing, a lot of younger kids are coming along so have been having to have some new practitioners in that field.
19     Of course, our new Regional Hospital has
20     been instrumental in attracting new physicians for
21     Vineland, so we are very happy with that.
22     Again, this is a second mortgage loan to a
23     business office and we will be very happy to have
24     this.
25     Again, the money gets to be used over and
over again.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Thank you.

I'll take a motion.

MS. DAVIS: So moved.

MR. STRIDICK: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any discussion?

MR. STRIDICK: I just want to make a note that on page 2, the first paragraph with regard to the physician's license, it's actually the New Jersey Division of Consumer Affairs.

MR. LELLI: Thank you for pointing that out to me, I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any discussion?

MR. ABELAR: How much are you seeking for contributions by the borrower?

MR. LELLI: Thirty-six thousand, which is ten percent of the project. That's our normal
guideline, the borrower has to contribute a minimum of ten percent, the primary owner puts in two-thirds of the remaining balance and the City of Vineland follows up with a second mortgage for the rest of the project.

MR. ABELAR: The owners are guaranteeing it personally?

MR. LELLI: Yes.
MR. STRIDICK: Just to follow up on that, the other $359,000 is actually a mortgage being paid by--

MR. LELLI: That's correct.

Sun Bank is the primary lender with 216. The UEZ is the secondary lender with one hundred and six thousand.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other discussion?

Hearing none, all in favor.

None.

Opposed?

None.

Abstentions?

None.

Motion carried.

Thank you very much.

Moving on to the consent agenda, without objection I will take a motion to consider all items
on the consent agenda with the exception of Plainfield, UEZA, 04-144 which is being withdrawn from the agenda.

MS. DAVIS: So moved.

MS. KOLLURI: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Discussion?

Hearing none, all in favor?
MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

None.

Abstentions?

None.

Motion carried.

I don't believe there is any other business so we can move on to the open public forum.

MR. ABELAR: I would just like to comment that I would like to welcome Mr. Stridick today, he is giving us a new perspective.

And secondly, today we touched briefly on an issue which we may have to study here, which is the pay-to-play law that the State has.
some bearing on all of our discussions as well. We referred to them briefly, that subject. I guess it would have some implications on our discussions.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Any other discussion from the Board or from the public?

Hearing none, I will take a motion to adjourn.
MR. STRIDICK: So moved.

MS. DAVIS: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: All in favor?

MR. ABELAR: Aye.

MS. DAVIS: Aye.

MS. KOLLURI: Aye.

MR. STRIDICK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DRENNAN: Aye.

Opposed?

None.

Abstentions?

None.

The motion is carried.

We are adjourned.
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