

## **FORT MONMOUTH ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION PLANNING AUTHORITY**

Minutes filed by Kathryn Verrochi as Assistant Secretary on Behalf of the Authority Members of actions taken at the Open Session of the Twenty Eighth meeting of the Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Planning Authority, held at the Tinton Falls Municipal Building, Tinton Falls, New Jersey 07724 at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, August 20, 2008.

### **Present:**

Chairperson and Public Member Dr. Robert Lucky  
Vice Chairperson and Public Member Virginia Bauer  
Monmouth County Freeholder Director Lillian Burry  
Oceanport Mayor Michael Mahon  
Tinton Falls Mayor Peter Maclearie  
Public Member Laurie Cannon  
Public Member Rosemarie Estephan  
Garrison Commander COL Stephen Christian

Absent: Eatontown Mayor Gerald Tarantolo had previously advised the Authority.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lucky who led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance. The Open Session was convened at 7:10 p.m. in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

Chair Lucky presented the Agenda for approval. Vice Chair Bauer moved for the approval of the agenda, Freeholder Director Burry seconded the motion and the agenda was unanimously approved.

### **Elected Officials Comments:**

Chair Lucky asked for remarks from U.S. Senator Frank Lautenberg or U.S. Senator Robert Menendez, U.S. Representative Frank Pallone or U.S. Representative Rush Holt or other Members of the Congressional Delegation or their staff members. None were offered, but Chair Lucky noted the attendance of a staff member of U.S. Senator Robert Menendez and of U.S. Representative Pallone.

### **Approval of Minutes:**

The Minutes of the June 24, 2008 Open Session were moved by Freeholder Director Burry, seconded by Mayor Mahon, and unanimously approved.

The Minutes of the June 24, 2008 Executive Session was moved by Vice Chair Bauer, seconded by Mayor Maclearie, and unanimously approved.

The Minutes of the July 2, 2008 Open Session (no Executive Session was held) were moved by Mayor Mahon, seconded by Vice Chair Bauer, and unanimously approved.

The Minutes of the July 16, 2008 Open Session (no Executive Session was held) were moved by Mayor Maclearie, seconded by Vice Chair Bauer, and unanimously approved.

### **Public Comments on Agenda Items:**

1. James T. Raleigh, Colts Neck, expressed concern with the Advisory Committee Chair Reports and the Municipal Comments Report and how they'll be reflected in the plan; stated the public and the municipalities need more time; and questioned the historic sites and natural resources in the plan.
2. Phil Welch, Jr., Lincroft, praised the August 15 Public Hearing observing few public and Authority Member attendees; commended Public Member Estephan and Public Member Cannon for attending all of the hearings; and read the August 15 statement. (Exhibit A)

3. Linda Zucaro, Tinton Falls, inquired about the procedure used for including housing numbers from the Social Services Advisory Committee Report into the Homeless Assistance Submission.

Chair Lucky said generally speaking the Advisory Committees are advisory. Their input is considered along with many other factors, however, the Advisory Committees do not make decisions.

4. Tom Mahedy, Wall, handed out a prayer card, dedicated to Mary and all women of the world, to the Board that was read at the August 15 Hearing. (Exhibit B) He commented on the Authority Member attendance; asked for a delay on the vote for the plan; said the first priority of the McKinney-Vento law is people without homes and noted the coffin on his car and the collateral damage of the FMERPA plan of death which included the Veterans Hospital, Howard Commons, undercounted homeless, warfare and warfare economy, toxic dumps, democracy, healing, social political justice and public health.
5. Clare Ward, Shrewsbury, asked how the public comments would be incorporated into the plan and why there was no consideration for the impact on the outside communities. She stated that the Authority Members should have included surrounding communities; that she is not in favor of the Railroad and is concerned with property values.

Chair Lucky said the public comments have been included in the plan/submission; the Authority Members are interested in the surrounding communities and the three (3) Mayors on the Board also have an individual responsibility to their constituents.

Vice Chair Bauer said the economic impact will be reflective of all surrounding communities, the county and the State.

Freeholder Director Burry said, as the County representative on the Board, all towns in the county are being represented and all stakeholders are involved and invited into the process. She noted the county involvement with the Shared Emergency Services and the County Engineers' involvement with Transportation.

### **Chair's Report:**

Chair Lucky stated the Authority Members would vote on the plan at the meeting next Wednesday, August 27. He reiterated that the plan is a generic land use plan and is a living document with a twenty (20) year development. He said there will be many adaptations as economics, market conditions and community needs change. The next step for this body or a subsequent body is to work on disposition and how to acquire the land from the federal government.

### **Executive Director's Report:**

ED Cosentino provided an update of activities since the last meeting:

#### Calendar of Events

#### July

- 21 - Public Hearing in Tinton Falls
- 23 - BRAC Meeting
  - Public Hearing in Oceanport
- 24 - Emergency Services Advisory Committee Meeting
- 28 - Meeting with Odis Jones and Gina Behnfeldt/EDA
- 29 - Public Hearing in Eatontown
- 30 - FMERPA Special Public Meeting

#### August

- 4 - Inflow & Infiltration Meeting
- 5 - EDA Tour of Fort Monmouth
  - Social Services Advisory Committee Meeting
- 6 - Environmental Advisory Committee Meeting
- 7 - Emergency Services Advisory Committee Meeting
- 11 - Inflow & Infiltration Meeting
- 12 - Meeting with ERA Work Group in Trenton
- 13 - RAB Meeting
- 15 - FMERPA Public Hearing: HAS Presentation

18 - COAH Meeting

19 - Draft Final of Economic Revitalization Study received

Upcoming Meetings

August 21 - Emergency Services Advisory Committee Meeting

August 27 - FMERPA Special Public Meeting - 7:00 p.m. - Monmouth Regional High School

September 4 - Commercial Industry Advisory Committee Meeting (Location TBD)

- Emergency Services Advisory Committee Meeting

September 16 - Social Services Advisory Committee Meeting

First week in September: Meetings with Veterans Administration and Health Care Provider (TBD)

ED Cosentino impressed upon the public that the process does not stop with the vote of the plan. He clarified that the vote is to submit the plan which will serve as a framework document with which to go forward during the next several years leading toward implementation.

DD Harrison gave the following update regarding the status of the Homeless Assistance Submission (HAS):

As of August 14 there were four updates to the draft HAS which was posted to the website on July 15. Draft 5 included the 4 Legally Binding Agreements being submitted.

As of 5:00 p.m. this evening we have received no comments on the HAS via our website. There was a “click to submit your comments” on the home page.

On Friday, August 15 we held our LRA Application Public Hearing. The hearing convened at 10:08 a.m. There were 54 persons signed in but we believe that more people were in attendance than signed in and some people came in late. First-up after the reading of applicable notices and legal requirements for the hearing was a brief presentation of the Reuse and Redevelopment Plan, based on the presentations presented at the three municipal hearings. This was followed by a presentation on the Homeless Assistance Submission.

Following that presentation the floor was open for public comment and questions. There were many very eloquent presentations and reading of letters regarding the need and importance of affordable housing and many calls for 1,500 units of affordable housing to be provided on the Fort Monmouth Property. The majority of the comments related to affordable housing. There were calls to reject or delay the submittal of the plan so that further consideration of affordable housing and of the comments and pleas made at the hearing. Twenty seven persons took the microphone for comments and many returned to the microphone for a second, third and even fourth turn. There were only two comments and questions regarding the Homeless Assistance Submission. These dealt with the question as to why the HAS only accommodated 50 of the SSAC recommended 100 units of permanent supportive housing. The answer was that the number being accommodated is 56 and that the SSAC recommendation was just that and it did not take into account other input such as we heard at the other public hearings, the limitations in the plan regarding infrastructure and community impacts. To address Linda’s question about the number of emergency shelter persons accommodated. She said 130 were recommended by the SSAC. I can identify these 130 and they are accommodated as follows: County Shelter – 40 single adults; Family Promise – 10 families average 3 persons = 30 persons; 180, Turning Lives Around, Inc. – 60 women and children. There were also a few comments expressing a lack of confidence in the documented number of homeless persons and the unmet needs reflected in the Monmouth County Continuum of Care Exhibit 1 documents.

The Hearing lasted 3 ½ hours and adjourned at 1:38 p.m. when there were no further comments or questions to be heard.

The transcript of the hearing will be submitted as an exhibit to the HAS along with the transcripts for the 3 public hearings.

ED Cosentino said as referenced earlier, the three (3) municipalities had forty-five (45) days to respond to the plan with comments. FMERPA received the comments from the municipalities and the county on August 14. Considerable time was spent reviewing and addressing each and every one of the comments. All comments and responses will be made available to the public.

Tim Delorm, Principal, EDAW, said comments from the three (3) municipalities will be incorporated into the plan and noted EDAW is in the process of developing 3D artist renderings showing the scale and quality of the development with three (3) birds-eye perspectives and three (3) at-grade renderings depicting the town centers.

### **Advisory Committee Chairs Reports:**

Chair Lucky invited comments from the Authority Members in addition to their Chair updates. They were as follows:

- Freeholder Director Burry, Veterans Affairs, said Open Space and Recreation met with the three (3) municipalities once again to tune up the original submission which was endorsed by the Department of Interior; regarding the Veteran's Hospital, a meeting is being scheduled in September with State and federal VA and private medical providers to discuss a favorable solution to saving the hospital.

- Public Member Cannon, Environmental, the committee met and discussed each parcel of land in detail; are concerned with the 24 underground storage tanks that still exist and whether or not to remove them; and will the Army agree to remove the tanks or the DEP require them to. She noted that the Army has been very upfront and informative. Other parcels have made improvements and are looking for a No Further Action (NFA) from DEP. The minutes are on the FMERPA web.

ED Cosentino added that Shaw and the RAB voluntarily informed FMERPA about the tanks and identified their location as they are part of an ongoing discussion with the DEP and the Army to ensure if they should be removed.

- Public Member Estephan, Social Services, the committee discussed the HAS report, the NOIs and those that met the requirements and qualifications; since then the SSAC report was made public. The concerns of the three (3) constituent perspectives on affordable housing and the homeless were discussed as the committee wants to work on educating the public on shelters, affordable housing and the constructive, contributing members of the community who need them.

- Vice Chair Bauer, Commercial Industry, a meeting was held with ERA and the Governor's work team on August 12 to discuss the economic study; the next meeting is currently scheduled for September 4 at FMERPA where ERA will address the economic study with committee members.

- Mayor Maclearie, Infrastructure, no formal meeting since last month; the spin-off committee I&I (Inflow and Infiltration) met and ED Cosentino will provide an update.

ED Cosentino noted they held three (3) meetings, toured Fort Monmouth, and are close to creating the framework for an RFP to go out to consultants. He commended the community engineers for their cooperation as they have helped formulate the type of work required for the study; and said the infrastructure evaluation goes beyond the sewer system and that the Infrastructure committee will meet post RFP submittal.

- Mayor Mahon, Historical, no formal meeting since last month. He addressed Mr. Raleigh's comments regarding the Fort Monmouth Museum noting the Museum tour with DD Harrison and the curator a few months ago and that a team of the Oceanport Council and the Oceanport architect also visited the facility and Barker Circle. A review is being undertaken of reuse of the structure, how it will be financially supported, the artifacts, which at this point, are to be relocated to another facility, and the digitized historic photographs. The building is not part of the plan but remains in the plan as historic use, municipal ownership. Addressing Mr. Welch's comments regarding Board attendance at the hearings, the Mayor noted the four (4) Oceanport Council meetings, the Special Public Meeting on July 23 followed by a public Oceanport Planning Board meeting and a public Oceanport Council meeting that followed the hearing. He also mentioned that regarding HAS he attended two (2) small meetings, two (2) Executive Session Oceanport Council meetings where input and reaction to the SSAC report recommendations was discussed. He stated that his municipality is working hard and stated in the last five (5) days he attended two (2) meetings with FMERPA staff and two (2) meetings regarding COAH.

### **Shared Emergency Services Update:**

PM Canterbury provided the following update.

- 07Aug08 ESAC WG on Court Services Conduct

- Minimal Court Services members/participants were in attendance; the County was present and provided

valuable input.

- County rep stated that she would be reaching out to all Court Administrators for their written input on or about 18Sep08 and provide to FMERPA Project Manager soon thereafter. Court Services will be re-addressed at the 16Oct08 ESAC WG

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Associated Task Number(s)</u>
07Aug08	Court Services	1&4
21Aug08	Police	2&4
04Sep08	OEM	2&4
18Sep08	Fire	3&4
02Oct08	First Aid/EMS	3&4
16Oct08	Go-Backs & Last Discussion w/ JPM	1-4

- 14Aug08 Little Silver Inclusion in Final Recommendation and Final Report under Task 4 has been received and is in each of the FMERPA Boards Members package. On 14Aug08 a copy of this report was provided to Little Silver Police Chief per Mayor Castleman.

- 21Aug08 is the Police Services ESAC WG – an update of that meeting will be provided to the FMERPA Board on 27Aug08.

- 23Aug08 – presenting Shared Emergency Services Feasibility Study to Oceanport Council.

- 28Aug08 providing copy of Shared Emergency Services Feasibility Study to Governor's Office with cover letter stating that the ESAC will be providing the ESAC shared services recommendation post 16Oct08. This is after all the WG meetings have concluded and additional ESAC meetings have gathered, consolidated, and reviewed, input from all members, participants, and stakeholders.

Mayor Maclearie questioned the Court Services portion of the SES Report noting he was not part of the committee nor was it ever discussed with him. He stated tonight's meeting is in their courtroom, nothing needs to be changed and probably they would not be at 100% capacity with all three (3) municipalities sharing the facility. He expressed exception to the report focusing on moving everything to Eatontown as his new facility is used at 20% capacity. PM Canterbury will meet with the Mayor regarding his concerns.

Mayor Mahon thanked PM Canterbury and ED Cosentino for participating in the Oceanport town meeting this Saturday at the Monmouth Park Race Track. Shared Emergency Services (SES) is one of the topics and PM Canterbury will present to the Oceanport community and Council. He also thanked Jack Donnelly for providing a liaison with the Local Unit Alignment Reorganization and Consolidation Commission (LUARCC) from the State to present the Oceanport community with options and opportunities.

### **Municipal Comments Report:**

ED Cosentino stated that FMERPA compiled all comments received and charted them in sequence of the plan for the report. The updated version is attached. (Exhibit C)

He acknowledged the County comments which addressed the Scope of County interest including the Fitness Center, the Central park, the Marina, the Parade Ground, the Bowling Center, the Recreation Center and the Neighborhood open space; the Property disposition; the Design consideration including the Landscape and the Circulation; and General comments.

Mayor Mahon questioned the street typology from one community to another. He inquired about adding a third lane to the Avenue of Memories and the circulation change when entering the historic district. ED Cosentino said where appropriate the left lane will be added.

Mayor Maclearie mentioned there wasn't a parking lot in the Tinton Falls town center and suggested head-on parking or parallel parking. He also reiterated that regarding COAH, he will not vote for the plan unless the COAH details are in writing. He stated the FMERPA position in the report is not the Board's and restated the three (3) Mayors concerns for school projections, COAH and local control. He said the three (3) municipalities want responsibility for the implementation process and asked that the locals have a majority of the vote in the implementation instead of the minority.

ED Cosentino stated the implementation LRA will address these issues more thoroughly and would have an overarching role that would incorporate the input of the communities. The communities therefore would be intimately involved in all aspects affecting them, but would not have autonomy in these decisions.

**Public Comments Not on Agenda:**

1. Clare Ward, Shrewsbury, referenced a map of Fort Monmouth and the Earle NADS, Government and Freight Rail Routes (Exhibit D) and expressed concern if the CSX/Conrail Line becomes a passenger line and travels through the naval weapons bunkers. She asked that the rail line be removed from the plan map.
2. W. Leo Christofili, Tinton Falls, expressed concern with the tax structure on the Borough, the County and the State level; asked if the County is considering buying the Fort acreage in Tinton Falls and if the process of de-annexation has legal legs in Oceanport?  
Mayor Maclearie said neither the Borough nor the County is buying the acreage. Freeholder Director Burry stated that County, which works in concert with the municipalities, has an NOI for property to receive gratis. Mayor Mahon said Oceanport has researched the possible realignment of the municipal boundaries. If it is an option to be considered, they have the research in hand, however, there has been no discussion on when or how to use the information.
3. James T. Raleigh, Colts Neck, expressed concern with the land-use plan, the widening of Route 537, off-site improvements, new storm water regulations and potential run-off problems, and the economic study. He asked for the real cost to the government of putting the land into the County for commercial development.
4. Tom Mahedy, Wall, discussed remediation of environmental solutions; asked if the Social Services, the Environmental and the Veteran's Advisory Committees had found the plan acceptable, and urged the Board to vote no on the plan; asked for private well testing for the three (3) host communities; and opposes FEMA and Monmouth University receiving housing if they are teaching war-related industries.

Chair Lucky noted that the Authority's next meeting is scheduled for August 27, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. at the Monmouth Regional High School, Tinton Falls.

Since there were no further comments or business, a motion to adjourn was made by Freeholder Director Burry, seconded by Vice Chair Bauer and unanimously adopted at 9:30 p.m.

### 3. Call to Action

- The provision for housing which is affordable at Fort Monmouth in the current Redevelopment Plan, especially in the next 5-10 years, is far from adequate to meet the needs of households here.
- The implied message to those in desperate need of safe, decent, affordable housing is: You may be important part of our economy in terms of jobs and shopping, but we can't find space for you to live here.
- I hope and pray that we haven't become so "successful" and self-absorbed that we've forgotten the words inscribed on that statue in the bay not far away:  
*"Give me your tired, your poor,  
 Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,  
 The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.  
 Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me,  
 I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"*  
*Excerpt from "The New Colossus" by Emma Lazarus*  
 Inscribed inside the Statue of Liberty – "our national symbol of freedom and opportunity"
- Monmouth County has become a golden destination, a jewel in the midst of the state of NJ. Unfortunately, in the process we've lost sight of the need to provide homes here for all who need it.
- The redevelopment of Fort Monmouth provides a unique opportunity to demonstrate anew that we are still a land of freedom and opportunity open to all.
- **I urge all FMERPA members to withhold approval of the Final Draft Redevelopment Plan until it is upgraded to include the 1,500 affordable units needed over the next 5-10 years.**
- FMERPA members include both elected and appointed officials, representing various points of view from Monmouth County. I ask each one of you to consider carefully everything you have heard today and over the past 20 months and not to approve the plan for the Fort until it reflects the highest and best response to the needs of all residents in the county.
- Furthermore, I urge the FMERPA staff to continue working diligently with their master planner EDAW and all of its consultants to develop creative, practical solutions to any issues that might temporarily stand in the way of making this plan the very best one possible.
- Finally, I urge those participants representing Governor Corzine to make sure that the Governor understands that the Monmouth Advocacy Team and all of its affiliated organizations are NOT satisfied with the Redevelopment Plan as it currently stands. We have heard the Governor's repeated calls for 100,000 affordable housing units in the state by 2014. We witnessed his signing last month of the landmark A-500 housing bill. We have been told numerous times that he looks over and approves every set of minutes from this Authority. If so, then he should be well aware of our rallying cries for 1,500 affordable units.
- It's not too late to take steps to rectify this situation without resorting to serious political and legal action. However, the time and our patience are growing short. Please heed our call for changes to this plan before it's too late!
- We all want a plan that we can implement knowing that it is absolutely the best that it can be for the residents of Monmouth County and a beacon of hope to the rest of New Jersey.

# LITANY OF MARY OF NAZARETH



Glory to you, God our Creator . . .  
Breathe into us new life, new meaning.  
Glory to you, God our Savior . . .  
Lead us in the way of peace and justice.  
Glory to you, healing Spirit . . .  
Transform us to empower others.

Mary, wellspring of peace . . . Be our guide.  
Model of strength  
Model of gentleness  
Model of trust  
Model of courage  
Model of patience  
Model of risk  
Model of openness  
Model of perseverance

Mother of the liberator . . . Pray for us.  
Mother of the homeless  
Mother of the dying  
Mother of the nonviolent  
Widowed mother  
Unwed mother  
Mother of a political prisoner  
Mother of the condemned  
Mother of the executed criminal

Oppressed woman. . . Lead us to life.  
Liberator of the oppressed  
Marginalized woman  
Comforter of the afflicted  
Cause of our joy  
Sign of contradiction  
Breaker of bondage  
Political refugee  
Seeker of sanctuary  
First disciple  
Sharer in Christ's passion  
Seeker of God's will  
Witness to Christ's resurrection

Woman of mercy . . . Empower us.  
Woman of faith  
Woman of contemplation  
Woman of vision  
Woman of wisdom and understanding  
Woman of grace and truth  
Woman, pregnant with hope  
Woman centered in God

### Closing Prayer

Mary, Queen of Peace,  
we entrust our lives to you.  
Shelter us from war, hatred,  
and oppression.

Teach us  
to live in peace,  
to educate ourselves for peace.  
Inspire us to act justly,  
to revere all God has made.  
Root peace firmly in our hearts  
and in our world.

Amen.



532 West Eighth Street  
Erie, PA 16502  
Tel: 814/453-4955  
Fax: 814/452-4784  
www.paxchristiusa.org

Item No. 539-079  
50 cents each, \$10/100, \$80/1000  
Plus shipping and handling

Municipality Comments  
On the  
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

- 1.0 Introduction: No comments received  
General Comments
- 2.0 Planning Methodology and Community Outreach Process
- 3.0 Land Use and Circulation Plan
- 4.0 Key Area Site Plans and Sustainability
- 5.0 Infrastructure Plan
- 6.0 Environmental Remediation Guidelines
- 7.0 Historic Preservation Guidelines: no comments received
- 8.0 Economic Implications and Community Impacts
- 9.0 Zoning/Land Use Impacts
- 10.0 Next Steps: Implementing the Vision
- 11.0 Existing Fort Monmouth Buildings Index: no comments received

Municipality Comments  
 On the  
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

General Comments		
Municipality	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	<p>1. The Reuse Plan fails to provide a viable means by which to replace 5,000 jobs directly lost by the closure of Fort Monmouth and the additional 15,000 jobs indirectly related to the operation of Fort Monmouth that will also be lost.</p>	<p>1. The Economic Revitalization Study conducted by Economics Research Associates ("ERA") addresses a specific strategy to identify target industry clusters and the methodology to attract them. The work includes a series of principles which guide the business recruitment initiatives which cover short-term, mid-term, and long-term tactical actions for each of the strategic initiatives. This will be made public after final review by the Economic Work Groups.</p>
Oceanport	<p>2. The Reuse Plan does not incorporate the construction of thoroughbred horse training and stabling facility as previously recommended by the Mayor and Council, although such a facility is consistent with sound planning and land use, provides for Open Space and would complement a 1.1 billion dollars a year equine industry located at Monmouth Park Racetrack in the Borough in addition to providing approximately 300 permanent jobs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The final Reuse Plan should include construction of a much needed thoroughbred horse training and stabling facility on the Oceanport lands located at Fort Monmouth consistent with both the need for a thoroughbred horse training and stabling facility as articulated by the New Jersey Racing Commission and the findings and conclusions articulated in Resolution #R-08-97 adopted by the Government Body of the Borough of Oceanport on June 19, 2008.</li> <li>• The construction of a thoroughbred horse training and stabling facility on part of the Oceanport lands located within Fort Monmouth is consistent with sound planning and land use principles in that it provides much needed open space for the Borough of Oceanport, the County of Monmouth, and the State of New Jersey..</li> <li>• The EDC recommends that all elected officials do whatever is necessary to bring about the training facility in order to mitigate housing on Fort land.</li> </ul>	<p>2. No comment.</p>

Municipality Comments  
 On the  
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

General Comments		
Municipality	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	3. Who pays for the upkeep and services when the fence comes down? Where is Oceanport going to get the money initially to pay for the needed services? There should be some time period where the Government continues to monitor and maintain the property.	3. Fences will not come down until property disposition of specific parcels is complete. In the interim it remains Federal property and therefore maintenance is their responsibility.
Oceanport	4. Land worth Projections: The EDC is concerned with the Army's valuation assessment done on the Fort property 3 years ago. These numbers are out of date with the current market and are no longer realistic.	4. Acknowledged.

Municipality Comments  
 On the  
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

<b>Planning Methodology and Community Outreach Process</b>			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	2.0	Density Transect is generally consistent with Vision Plan.	Acknowledged.
Oceanport	2.0	Proposed Mass Transit is generally consistent with Vision Plan.	Acknowledged.
Oceanport	2.0	Preliminary Traffic Improvement is not consistent with Vision Plan-intersection improvements at Eatontown Blvd ( at Monmouth Road & Main St) are not indicated.	Intersection not studied; future investigation.
Oceanport	2.0	Blue/Green Belt is generally consistent with Vision Plan.	Acknowledged.
Oceanport	2.0	Bike and Pedestrian Path is not inconsistent with Vision Plan.	Acknowledged.
Oceanport	2.0	Blur Boundary/Extend Land Use ins not entirely consistent with Vision Plan-Residential uses along Main Street and extension of use/streets from Eatontown neighborhood not included in Vision Plan.	Extension of streets has been changed on the Concept Plan.
Oceanport	2.0	Building Reuse Plan not entirely consistent with Vision Plan; however; Barker Circle buildings are indicated to be used for Oceanport Municipal Complex and housing, consistent with subsequent understandings.	Acknowledged.

Municipality Comments  
On the  
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Land Use and Circulation Plan			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	3.0	<p>Oceanport Reuse Area: No mention of homeless accommodations!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 400 apartments (multi/mixed use in 400 area and along Oceanport Ave.) is somewhat inconsistent with Vision Plan. Reuse of historic district structures for residential is consistent with Vision Plan.</li> </ul>	The entirety of the homeless accommodation plan is contained in the Homeless Application Submittal ("HAS"), which is available on our website.
Oceanport	3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 159 Single Family Detached dwellings along Main St are not consistent with Vision Plan</li> </ul>	FMERPA's plan can accommodate changes and EDAW has revised the text to provide for a combination of townhouses and small lot cottage detached homes.
Oceanport	3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barker Circle buildings shown as MF housing – not consistent, but in line with discussions</li> <li>• Mixed-Use/Multi-Use is consistent with Vision Plan.</li> <li>• Office/R&amp;D is consistent in its location, but less intense than Vision Plan.</li> <li>• Open Space/Recreation is consistent with Vision Plan.</li> </ul>	Acknowledged.
Oceanport	3.0	Reuse and Redevelopment Program has conflicting and incomplete information and should be clear regarding dwelling units, dwelling types, and non residential floor area	We disagree; it must retain flexibility. EDAW has completed and coordinated the program table.
Oceanport	3.0	Building Reuse index should be reviewed for accuracy, completeness and consistency with the Redevelopment and Reuse program (3-9) — confusing and incomplete	EDAW reviewed and corrected.
Tinton Falls	3.0	Consistent with their Master Plan with Town Center concept and mix of retail and commercial; maximum of 4 stories	Acknowledged.
Tinton Falls	3.0	Limit access points onto Tinton Ave.	Limited to three existing gates opened and realignment of Pearl Harbor Road, no net increase in curb cuts on Tinton Avenue.
Tinton Falls	3.0	Realign High School access w/ Pearl Harbor	Agreed as shown in plan
Tinton Falls	3.0	Request early conveyance for implementation of plan	We concur in this possibility

Municipality Comments  
On the  
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Land Use and Circulation Plan			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Tinton Falls	3.0	Request approval of PBC for municipal and county uses	We support
Eatontown	3.0	Plan is reasonable and consistent w/ Eatontown's Master Plan	Acknowledged
Eatontown	3.0	Accept the plan for Golf course and hotel	
Eatontown	3.0	Streets off Broad Street (Villa, Irving, Park) should be retained as limited access; perhaps making pedestrian and bike only	Plan has been revised to eliminate
Eatontown	3.0	Reinstate Nicodemus Avenue	Plan has been revised to reopen Nicodemus gate
Eatontown	3.0	Create rail line access to serve redevelopment area	To be determined
Eatontown	3.0	Open space should be permanently dedicated to Towns/County	We concur to County
Eatontown	3.0	Retain geothermal fields and add to service in other buildings	As planned
Eatontown	3.0	Create third lane along Avenue of Memories; Widen Rt. 35 along Frontage of Fort	For subsequent site planning
Eatontown	3.0	Create Exit 107 from GSP to project; Widen Tinton Ave. from Golf course side only	107 not feasible; concur w/ Tinton Avenue
Eatontown	3.0	Jitney should stay on primary streets such as Broad, Main, and Stevenson	Agree and plan has been modified. Final route will be developed w/ community input
Eatontown	3.0	Set up College Satellite	Plan includes educational facilities
Eatontown	3.0	More pedestrian and bicycle path ways; show connector walkway from downtown to Mallette Hall	Agree these connections are needed and will be developed collaboratively with the Municipality as the plan progresses

Municipality Comments  
 On the  
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

<b>Land Use and Circulation Plan (cont'd)</b>			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Eatontown	3.0	Greenway connector from downtown to Wampum Park to Howard Commons	Off site is municipal planning
Eatontown	3.0	Street typology proposed does not meet NJ RSIS standards; compliance w/ Eatontown	Sections being revised, report text states to be RSIS compliant
Eatontown	3.0	Erroneously shows Throckmorton Ave. as Broad St. – correct error	Changed Typo
Eatontown	3.0	Eatontown should have retail on Rte. 35 side; medical/low density business along Avenue of Memories	Retail stores will face interior quad, final configuration will be established by redeveloper
Eatontown	3.0	Borough Hall should be placed in Mallette Hall	We concur
Eatontown	3.0	Citizens petition to eliminate the use of four local streets as access to the Fort	Concept Plan revised to eliminate through streets

Municipality Comments  
 On the  
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

<b>Key Area Site Plans and Sustainability</b>			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	4.0	The Reuse Plan provides for single family lots where none are permitted in accordance with the Borough Master Plan for that zone.	Borough Master Plan Zoning is not applicable on Fort. There is no municipal zoning on Fort Monmouth – unclear meaning. EDAW has revised the text to allow flexibility in housing type in this area during plan development
Tinton Falls	4.0	Parking at proposed recreation and open space areas	Intentionally limited to streets and small municipal lot in the southeast corner of the park
Tinton Falls	4.0	Heyer Gruel asking for confirmation of the numbers	Confirmed

<b>Infrastructure Plan</b>			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	5.0	Infrastructure: Assumes all JCPL facilities (electric) is overhead – all new lines should be buried. Huge cost implications to pro forma of developer/economic feasibility	We acknowledge requirement and its cost implications; clearly a point of negotiation with the Army
Eatontown	5.0	Overhead wiring is not acceptable for new construction must be buried. Locations for new substations not shown	See above comment.

Municipality Comments  
 On the  
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

<b>Environmental Remediation Guidelines</b>			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	6.0	Every and all effort should be made to mandate the Federal Government be primarily and fully responsible for the full land complete remediation of any and all environmental problems or issues and the full cost of same that stem from the Fort Monmouth property irrespective of any role or participation by the third parties on behalf of the Department of the Army or the Federal Government	Agreed. This is FMERPA's position
Oceanport	6.0	Environmental Issues: The EDC wants the environmental issues cleaned up and monitored by the Federal Government from "cradle to grave".	
Oceanport	6.0	The Final Reuse plan should utilize environmentally friendly "green" principles and procedures wherever and whenever possible in the redevelopment and reuse of the Fort property.	LEED principles are part of our guidelines
Eatontown	6.0	No contaminated site should be turned over to town; all cleanup completed or issuance of NFA before release of Open Space; No future cost to taxpayers of Eatontown	Agreed, this is FMERPA's position

Municipality Comments  
On the  
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

<b>Economic Implications and Community Impacts</b>			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	8.0	Tax Incentives: The EDC strongly recommends that the State consider giving tax abatements to companies who move into Fort Monmouth in order to mitigate the housing and increases the business aspect of reuse.	Economic Revitalization Study addresses this
Oceanport	8.0	Approval process: The EDC recommends that the approvals for building in Oceanport lie in Oceanport.	Each community will be involved in the process
Oceanport	8.0	The financial projection reflect a negative (\$7000.00) tax impact annually after 10 years but a \$64,000 surplus annually after twenty years. The plan does not explain the key financial and economic assumptions used to support these conclusions. These numbers appeared flawed as the do not account for the financial burdens of infrastructure repair and maintenance, the cost of a new school and any tax incentives or PILOTS that would likely have to be granted to attract business to the Fort Monmouth properties.	We acknowledge the initial tax impact of (\$7,000.00) per annum, but that can be mitigated by control of what is disposed of (property) by the Federal Government, and when. There is no impact until the parcels are disposed of, and the Developer Agreements are struck.
Oceanport	8.0	Tax Incentives: The EDC strongly recommends that the State consider giving tax abatements to companies who move into Fort Monmouth in order to mitigate the housing and increases the business aspect of reuse.	The Economic Revitalization Study addresses the issue of incentives
Oceanport	8.0	Approval process: The EDC recommends that the approvals for building in Oceanport lie in Oceanport.	Local input and participation is integral to redevelopment
Oceanport	8.0	The Board does not accept as accurate and EDAW and FMERPA should further re-evaluate the data and background calculations that formulate the basis behind the assumptions of anticipated revenue generation found in its Final Plan and allow for the independent revenue and analysis by the Borough to the extent possible.	A full review has been conducted and we believe the data and assumptions are reasonable and can be attained
Oceanport	8.0	The Board does not accept as accurate and EDAW and FMERPA should further re-evaluate the accuracy of the revenue generators and revenue generation data in the EDAW proposed model and financials calculations.	See above
Oceanport	8.0	The Board does not accept as accurate and EDAW and FMERPA should further re-evaluate the accuracy of the calculations and data behind the projected tax impact conclusions found in the EDAW and Final Reuse and Development of Fort Monmouth Plan	A complete review has been conducted and we feel confident that our conclusions can be attained

Municipality Comments  
 On the  
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

<b>Economic Implications and Community Impacts</b>			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	8.0	Fiscal Impacts: these are not favorable to Oceanport, even in the most favorable scenarios. The worst case should be evaluated. The removal of the SFD dwellings may make a big difference. Does not address affordable housing obligations/costs.	COAH Obligations are being addressed and a commit letter has been requested
Eatontown	8.0	Lacks economic incentives to stimulate growth; needed for incubator space in Eatontown	Contained in Economic Revitalization Study
Eatontown	8.0	Should consider shorter time frame for recovery	Acknowledged and desired
Eatontown	8.0	Reserves comment on revenue sharing	Post Plan submittal Topic

Municipality Comments  
On the  
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

<b>Zoning/Land Use Plans</b>			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	9.0	Zoning: The EDC strongly suggests that final zoning for the Fort lie with Oceanport and not FMERPA	Zoning will be reviewed with each municipality
Oceanport	9.0	The Final Reuse Plan should make every reasonable effort to insure that no building shall be higher than three stories in height.	That can be addressed as part of Future Zoning/Site Plan reviews
Oceanport	9.0	The Final Reuse Plan should create and implement traffic flows and road designs that provide for an east west flow of traffic through the Fort property towards Route 35.	Addressed in Plan
Oceanport	9.0 10.0	The Final Plan should include every reasonable mechanism not inconsistent with the FMERPA enabling legislation to allow for local input, participation, and control with respect to future planning and zoning decisions and approvals necessitated or required by the implementation of the Final Plan.	Local input and participation is integral to the Plan
Oceanport	9.0	The Reuse Plan has an adverse impact on the Borough as it related to Affordable Housing obligations and the regulatory requirements of the Council on Affordable Housing and recently enacted legislation.	COAH obligations are not yet established, but we do not expect this statement to be true
Oceanport	9.0	Does not adequately address affordable housing obligations/costs.	See above
Oceanport	9.0	The Final Re-use Plan should specifically acknowledge and insure that replacement jobs created for any lost employment jobs are considered solely replacement employment that does not generate additional COAH obligations under any COAH job creation guidelines or formulas.	This is exactly our position with COAH and is in writing
Oceanport	9.0	Barkers Circle: Can we reuse the existing apartments to get credit for our COAH obligations?	Being requested
Oceanport	9.0	COAH and Affordable Housing issues: Why is Oceanport getting the lion's share of affordable housing obligations? Can they be split among the 3 towns?	Any COAH obligation would be applied across the entire development on the appropriate formula
Oceanport	9.0	The Reuse Plan places an unfair burden on the Borough placing within it a disproportionate share of Homeless accommodations as it relates to the certified county need.	Statement is incorrect, as it pertains to burden
Oceanport	9.0	Why the homeless shelters are only mentioned in Oceanport? Shouldn't these be distributed among the 3 towns	The homeless obligation is shared proportionately among the three towns.

Municipality Comments  
On the  
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

<b>Zoning/Land Use Plans</b>			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Tinton Falls	9.0	Wants local control and implementation of plan through municipal oversight	Each town will be involved in decision making
Tinton Falls	9.0	Must have written confirmation on COAH's treatment of Growth Share component; must be tied to jobs lost both at the Fort and Support (Contractor)	This is the position we have taken w/ COAH and await response
Tinton Falls	9.0	Design criteria on residential to ensure minimal impact on local schools	Will be established going forward
Tinton Falls	9.0	Ensure that there is adequate housing stock which is "Work Force Affordable" above COAH requirements	We agree; design criteria
Tinton Falls	9.0	Local Control emphasized to avoid over burdening of schools	We have met w/ school boards and planned accordingly
Eatontown	9.0	Clarification of the type of housing units at Howard Commons necessary	Specifics to be issued
Eatontown	9.0	Retain "dead end" streets without making them through streets after fence comes down	Addressed in revision of the Concept Plan
Eatontown	9.0	Reliability of COAH numbers within the three community's, as well as, for the redevelopment area; need "special region" guidelines in writing	Have requested same
Eatontown	9.0	Planning and Zoning Boards should retain jurisdiction for development applications	Local input and review integral
Eatontown	9.0	Upscale restaurants should have liquor licenses available – need more	Municipal issue
Eatontown	9.0	Number of school age children challenged as not being realistic; insufficient data	Data has been reviewed and confirmed
Eatontown	9.0	New dwelling units should be owner occupied; too many apartments in Eatontown now	Acknowledged and text changed in the Final Report
Eatontown	9.0	Make corrections in the table which shows the count f various dwelling units for each town	Reviewed and corrections made
Eatontown	9.0	Incubator concept challenged; not much success in New Jersey	Acknowledged, but we believe we have a special situation.

Municipality Comments  
 On the  
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan  
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

<b>Next Steps: Implementing the Vision</b>			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	10.0	The Reuse Plan has incorporated by reference Ratable Sharing Models and Shared Service proposals that are beyond the scope and authority of FMERPA and will have a negative impact on the Quality of Life and financial stability of the Borough.	Revenue sharing should be discussed post Plan submission. Shared services study formulated to give towns options supported by data at no expense to towns- not mandated.
Eatontown	10.0	If HUD makes changes to homeless requirement, town wants review of new demand	We acknowledge.
Eatontown	10.0	Insist that all buildings except those planned for retention should be knocked down	Federal Government decision.

