BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT

MAYOR & COUNCIL

AGENDA ● MARCH 7, 2019

Workshop | **Maple Place School** | **7:00 PM**

2 Maple Place, Oceanport, NJ 07757

I. Meeting Called to Order

II. Statement of Compliance with Open Public Meetings Act:

This meeting complies with the Open Public Meetings Act by notification on January 9, 2019 of this location, date and time to the Asbury Park Press and the LINK News and by the posting of same on the municipal bulletin board and Borough Web Site.

III. Flag Salute

IV. Invocation

V. Roll Call

VI. RESOLUTIONS:

1. Resolution authorizing payment of BILL LIST 03-07-2019 #2019-072
2. Resolution concerning Fort Monmouth Reuse Plan Amendment #14 #2019-073
3. Resolution awarding contract to Maser Consulting - Asbestos & Demo at new municipal complex #2019-074

VII. Administrator's Report

VIII. Clerk's Report

1. Resignation of Fire Subcode Official

March 21, 2019 Meeting Items

2. Resolution authorizing Tax Sale Redemption #18-00015
3. Resolution authorizing aerial mosquito control operations
4. Resolution approving certified LOSAP lists for 2018
5. Resolution authorizing permits for Facility Use - Spring 2019
6. Resolution awarding contract for Milton Avenue Drainage Project
7. Resolution authorizing renewal of agreement with Sea Bright for Court Facilities
8. Resolution appointing a Safety Coordinator
9. Approval of Fire Department Membership, Domenic Ranieri
10. Workshop Minutes, February 7, 2019
11. Executive Session Minutes, February 7, 2019
12. Regular Minutes, February 21, 2019

IX. Discussion Items

1. Nursing Home Transportation Ordinance, Councilman Solan

X. Mayor's Report

XI. Petitions from the Public

XII. Adjournment

BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT

MAYOR & COUNCIL

MINUTES ● MARCH 7, 2019

Workshop **Maple Place School** **7:00 PM**

2 Maple Place, Oceanport, NJ 07757

I. Meeting Called to Order: Mayor Coffey called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

II. Statement of Compliance with Open Public Meetings Act: Mayor Coffey stated "Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by notice to the Asbury Park Press and The Link News on January 9, 2019, and by the posting of same on the municipal bulletin board and Borough Web Site."

III. Flag Salute: Mayor Coffey led the audience and members of the Council in the flag salute.

IV. Invocation: Borough Chaplain Stacy Deerin gave the invocation.

V. Roll Call:

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Jay Coffey	Mayor	Present	
William Deerin	Councilman	Present	
Richard Gallo	Councilman	Present	
Joseph A. Irace	Councilman	Present	
Michael O'Brien	Councilman	Present	8:02 PM
Robert Proto	Councilman	Present	
Stephen Solan	Council President	Present	
Donna M. Phelps	Borough Administrator, Deputy Clerk	Present	
Scott Arnette	Board Attorney	Present	

VI. RESOLUTIONS:

1. Resolution authorizing payment of BILL LIST 03-07-2019

RESULT:	**ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Joseph A. Irace, Councilman
SECONDER:	Stephen Solan, Council President
AYES:	Deerin, Gallo, Irace, Proto, Solan
ABSENT:	O'Brien

2. Resolution concerning Fort Monmouth Reuse Plan Amendment #14

Councilman Irace read a statement concerning the proposed plan amendment as follows:

"As we are faced with yet another FMERA Fort Monmouth Plan Amendment, the propaganda machine lead by Bruce Steadman continues to pump out false narratives and half-truths. Mr. Steadman's comments to the media that Oceanport knew about Amendment 13 back in September 2018, when they met with an Oceanport ad-hoc committee of who knows who, allows FMERA to wash their hands of any further obligation to notify Oceanport's elected representatives. Perhaps I should refresh Mr. Steadman's memory. In December 2018, Mayor Coffey, Councilman Proto, our Administrator Donna Phelps and I met with FMERA to discuss Fort Monmouth redevelopment in Oceanport. This was some three months after Mr. Steadman claims Oceanport knew about any proposed plan changes by New Jersey City University. Yet, at our December meeting, there was no mention at all. I can't help but feel that Mr. Steadman and others at FMERA

deliberately misled and failed to disclose any of this to your elected representatives. I have a guess as to why. Perhaps, Mr. Steadman feels that the less we know, the better the chances that things sail through without any objections. Why else would he fail to disclose this information to your elected officials? "

Now, on the back of a misguided Amendment 13, which as of this moment still has not been changed, although just about 10 minutes ago, I received a text message which shows some changes to this Amendment, but I haven't looked at them yet, we are handed another amendment which will permanently change the landscape of Oceanport, and not for the better. The Oceanport Planning Board did a fantastic job in showing everything that is wrong with this plan. In fact, I believe it's 16 pages long. This group of volunteers did a great job in defending Oceanport and trying to maintain our quality of life while keeping our town a great place to live."

I don't want to belabor the points made by the Planning Board, but I want to reiterate the concerns of past municipal Councils who have insisted on inclusionary affordable housing rather than putting all 37 affordable, rental apartments in two separate buildings, not included in this development. This is not our vision of the future of Oceanport."

Also, in comparison with another townhouse development we have had in town, Kimberly Woods, we see how dense and misguided this Amendment 14 is. I'm sure most of you have seen Kimberly Woods. Did you know that there are 120 units there at a density of 5.5 per acre? Amendment 14 is asking for 13 units per acre. That is high density in any definition and not in keeping in character or any other neighborhoods in Oceanport. Did you know Kimberly Woods is 30 feet high? That's 5 feet below our Borough height limit of 35 feet and well below the Amendment 14 plan which calls for a staggering 44 feet of height. The developer of Amendment 14 is proud to call this a new urban planning development, but I would like to remind him and FMERA that we are not an urban city but rather a suburban borough and we'd like to stay that way! "

Currently, Oceanport is comprised of mainly single-family homes, with a few townhomes and even less rental apartments. Why is it that every development, every single one proposed by FMERA, consists of high-density townhomes and rental apartments? Not one single family home has been proposed despite that being the lion's share of what we have currently in Oceanport. Again, one wonders why nothing being proposed by FMERA fits in with the character of Oceanport."

I urge this Council to once again take a strong stance against this ill-advised plan and in the strongest terms possible voice your opposition to FMERA control over Oceanport's future, -- our future. And I ask all our residents to show up at the FMERA meeting on March 20th and tell Bruce Steadman and the FMERA Board to follow Oceanport's planning and zoning laws and keep Oceanport, Oceanport. After what happened after Amendment 13, our voices were heard, your voices were heard, and we're hearing changes are coming. So, we need you again on March 20th at the FMERA meeting."

Councilman Proto read a statement concerning the proposed plan amendment as follows:

"As Joe said tonight, we will be discussing Plan Amendment 14, right on the heels of Amendment 13. And it certainly seems that FMERA is on a mission to cram as much high density and urban construction as they can into the Oceanport section of Ft. Monmouth. Urban and density are terms you will be hearing a lot of in the near future. Plan Amendment 14 calls for 148 for sale townhouses and 37 affordable rental units to be crammed into a 15-acre parcel. It is yet another example of Bruce Steadman's utter disdain for our zoning laws and contempt for Oceanport's right to local control over our own development. Plan Amendment 14 allows the developer to build their townhouses 44 ft high. Like Joe said, our ordinance permits a height of 35 ft. It allows for 3 stories of living space. Our zoning allows for 2 stories. Setbacks are virtually non-existing. Density is increased by 40% over the allowable amount. And most egregious, the affordable units are being lumped into 2 buildings and segregated from the for-sale units. In addition to the aforementioned, the developer is seeking a PILOT or tax break from the Borough.

The Planning Board approved a 15-page resolution outlining their objections and concerns that include infrastructure, height, density, parking, traffic, impact on municipal services, setbacks, the affordable component, stormwater management, and environmental concerns. The full resolution is part of the agenda for those who want to read it in greater detail. Our Planner and Engineer have also expressed the same objections and concerns as the Planning Board in their reports. At a recent meeting between Bruce Steadman, Somerset Development, the Mayor, our BA Donna, and myself, I expressed my concerns about the size and scope of this project. I also expressed my concerns that the power of the Planning and Zoning Board was being usurped by FMERA. I was told in no uncertain terms by Bruce Steadman that he didn't care and this was the project he was going with.

There is a process at the Planning Board if someone needs to go outside of our restrictions. It's the process of applying for a variance. In this process, the applicant must demonstrate a hardship, and the Board needs to exercise good judgment when granting a variance. In the case of Somerset Development, their only hardship is they want to sell the units for the highest possible price. And in all honesty, I have no issue with that. They are in business to maximize their profits. But our roles, as elected officials, is to make sure that does not come at the expense of our town.

The counterarguments in favor of this project will most likely be (1) it's over at the Fort, nobody will see it; (2) the more they sell the houses for, the higher ratables for the town; (3) the Fort will be Oceanport the city, we will be Oceanport the suburb. I have heard these arguments, I don't agree with them. We cannot stop the development at the Fort, but maybe we can stop the overdevelopment of it. If not, at least we should try. And that's what we've been doing. If anyone sitting up here in good conscience can support what we've seen from FMERA in Plans 13 and 14, then I honestly don't see the need for either a Planning or Zoning Board from this point forward.

While we continue to fight for our town, FMERA can plan all the bus tours they want. FMERA is charged with replacing the jobs lost at Ft. Monmouth. This development, when finished, will create just one full or part time job. Just one. And that's not me saying it, that's coming from FMERA. In my opinion, Bruce Steadman and FMERA are not interested in doing what's best for Oceanport. They are interested in getting as much money as they can for their parcels, and they are interested in their own job security. And that's it. And if you don't' believe that, I suggest when you go on the bus tour, you tell Bruce Steadman to drive you to the nearest bridge he has for sale."

Council President Solan reported that similar comments were submitted by the Borough's emergency services. The Police Department expressed concerns about increase in call volume, amount of time officers will remain or investigate, and the fact that there was no traffic study performed. First responders expressed concerns about access to Parkers Creek for any possible rescue or drafting. He noted the Plan Amendments seemed to be prepared haphazardly and without forethought. He relayed concerns from the School Board regarding the number of bedrooms in units and impact on the school system. He explained that all of the 148 market rate units in the RPM development are 3 bedrooms.

Councilman Deerin stated he feels that Oceanport will be "Mayberry" and the Fort area will be "Mt. Pilot" and will be 2 separate kind of towns.

Councilman Gallo added that First Aid has problems responding to 2 story condos and 3 stories would be a burden. He noted that after the recent fire in Sea Bright, you don't lose just one apartment, you lose all of them. There are too many in one spot. He stated the townhouses are being built, but he has heard nothing about sewer or electric services.

Mayor Coffey stated that everyone did their homework and provided valuable input on Amendment He read a letter from KKF University Enterprises, the contract purchaser for Squire Hall, into the

record, which requested FMERA to remove residential halls, parking garages, art centers and athletic facilities, both buildings and fields, from the definition of ancillary uses for an institution of higher learning, and the express removal of a 5 story residence hall, no form of student housing or dormitories will be permitted, a 5 story academic lab building and visual arts center, a 5 story athletic center, 2 story performing arts center, a 5 story parking garage, practice athletic fields and ancillary support fields and field houses from Amendment 13. Removal of the request to increase the floor area ratio, clarification that the existing bulk and area standards of the green tech campus district which are not specifically modified by the Amendment shall remain in full force and effect. Councilman Proto added that these changes are the result of the developer listening to the borough's issues, but expressed concern that the developer may request the return of these items at a later time. There was discussion regarding changing legislation to require developers to appear before the Borough's Planning Board rather than FMERA for approvals.

RESULT:	**ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Joseph A. Irace, Councilman
SECONDER:	William Deerin, Councilman
AYES:	Deerin, Gallo, Irace, Proto, Solan
ABSENT:	O'Brien

3. Resolution awarding contract to Maser Consulting - Asbestos & Demo at new municipal complex

   Councilman Irace commented that the Engineer's report showed that the asbestos levels were higher than the original estimate. However, the increase will not affect the $11 million budget for the municipal complex.

RESULT:	**ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Robert Proto, Councilman
SECONDER:	Richard Gallo, Councilman
AYES:	Deerin, Gallo, Irace, Proto, Solan
ABSENT:	O'Brien

VII. **Administrator's Report:** Ms. Phelps reported that the Borough's Fire Subcode Official has submitted his resignation. The Building Subcode Official also has his fire subcode license and will be assisting temporarily in that capacity; the Construction Official has requested to advertise for his replacement and for part-time, hourly, as-needed back up inspectors for building, fire, plumbing and electric to avoid this situation in the future and to prepare for future development in the Borough.

RESULT:	**ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Joseph Irace, Councilman
SECONDER:	Robert Proto, Councilman
AYES:	Deerin, Gallo, Irace, Proto, Solan
ABSENT:	O'Brien

Council President Solan had asked Ms. Phelps to investigate extra duty rates after receiving a letter from the PBA. Extra duty rates have not increased since February 2015. Council President Solan advised that when officers work for utilities, the rate is included in the cost of work. The

Borough's policy is not in line with neighboring municipalities. Therefore, at the next regular meeting, the Governing Body will consider an $8 per hour increase, with the exception of extra duty at Monmouth Park, which will increase $1 an hour to $60. An administrative fee charged to utilities and roadwork companies will be increased to $12.

Ms. Phelps reported that the Borough continues to investigate the purchase of recycling containers, with the intent not to use taxpayers' money. However, the initial County grant is insufficient to purchase containers for all residents. Ms. Phelps contacted various organizations to secure additional funding. She also spoke with William White, Borough Engineer, and asked him to conduct research for any available grants. With regard to recycling, she and the Construction Official, John Johnson, met with representatives from Wall Township and Manasquan regarding the Borough's tonnage grant. They received valuable information that will help increase Oceanport's income. She and Mr. Johnson will continue to monitor the tonnage to maximize the Borough's revenue. In addition, Ms. Phelps advised that effective April 1st, the County will increase its tipping fees from $71 to $74.50 per ton, which will have an impact on the bids for the garbage/recycling contract for this year.

Ms. Phelps reported that thanks to the work of Kim Parent and Tina DeAngelis, the Adopt-A-Drain proposal from the Girl Scouts is moving along. The Girl Scouts would like to paint their log somewhere near the storm drains. The Borough's Clean Community Fund will cover the minimal cost of this project.

Ms. Phelps thanked the DPW for their efforts keeping roads clear Sunday night through Monday morning with the snowstorm. Ms. Phelps also met with DPW Supt. Max Lopez to discuss projects to get the parks ready for the spring sports season. Ms. Phleps also spoke with Joanne Hunt, Recreation Director, regarding spring sports. And Ms. Phelps will ask the Borough Clerk to prepare a Resolution to authorize an RFP to find management for the pool. She will have further discussions with Katie LaPorta, CFO, and Bill White, Borough Engineer to identify specifications for the RFP.

Katie LaPorta advised that there will be a resolution at the next meeting to extend the temporary budget for 2 months. In addition, there is a potential for an appropriation reserve transfer resolution.

Councilman Irace reported that he, Ms. Phelps, Ms. LaPorta and Councilman Proto had 2 meetings on the budget. The process is moving along, and he thanked Ms. Phelps and Ms. LaPorta for their work on the budget.

VIII. Clerk's Report:

1. Resignation of Fire Subcode Official

March 21, 2019 Meeting Items:

2. Resolution authorizing Tax Sale Redemption #18-00015
3. Resolution authorizing aerial mosquito control operations
4. Resolution approving certified LOSAP lists for 2018
5. Resolution authorizing permits for Facility Use - Spring 2019
6. Resolution awarding contract for Milton Avenue Drainage Project
7. Resolution authorizing renewal of agreement with Sea Bright for Court Facilities
8. Resolution appointing a Safety Coordinator

9. Approval of Fire Department Membership, Domenic Ranieri
10. Workshop Minutes, February 7, 2019
11. Executive Session Minutes, February 7, 2019
12. Regular Minutes, February 21, 2019

IX. Discussion Items:

1. Nursing Home Transportation Ordinance, Councilman Solan

   Councilman Solan reported that 2 phone calls have not been returned. He also drove by the facility and there were no vehicles on site. Therefore, a fine will be issued.

X. Mayor's Report:

Mayor Coffey reported that the First Aid Squad will celebrate its 70th anniversary on Monday, March 18 at 8 pm. The Maple Place Boys Basketball Team lost in the finals in overtime against Tinton Falls. It was extremely well attended. FMERA will conduct a bus tour of Ft. Monmouth on March 16th. The Mayor received information from the Building Dept. requesting a proclamation to declare May as Building Safety Month. May is also Pediatric Brain Tumor Awareness Month.

XI. Petitions from the Public:

Mayor Coffey opened the meeting for petitions from the public.

Chris Baggot, 200 Comanche Dr., asked about trees, sidewalks and the right of way. He pointed out that in the event of a presidential disaster declaration, if trees are the responsibility of the homeowner, they are not reimbursable by FEMA. If the trees are the responsibility of the municipality, they are reimbursable by FEMA.

Hugh Sharkey, Oceanport, mentioned that at the last meeting he had raised questions about concealment of information by Council Members. He met with Council President Solan and laid out his concerns. He discussed Johnson v Borough of Oceanport, which was a lawsuit regarding an OPRA request for emails. Mr. Johnson alleged there was concealment of information. Mr. Sharkey distributed a flow chart to the Governing Body and discussed the responsibilities of Borough officials and professionals. Mayor Coffey replied that certain items discussed in Executive Session are not shared with the public. Mr. Sharkey asked how the Mayor could decide not to share information from the Borough Attorney and Council. Mayor Coffey replied that how the process worked and worked exactly how it should work for comments on Amendment #13. Mr. Sharkey discussed an issue in 2006-2007 where the Borough Clerk lost all the Borough emails when her computer was replaced and did not share that information with the then Governing Body. The Clerk filed a certification and sworn testimony. He contended the Clerk did not follow proper OPRA procedures. He stated a Judge ruled there was no OPRA violation of an intentional withholding of information because she lost the information accidently. The problem was the Clerk did not disclose it. Mr. Sharkey continued to relay the history of the Johnson v Oceanport lawsuit. Mr. Sharkey discussed the response he received from the Clerk in 2011 and the actions taken by the previous Borough Clerk and Borough Attorney. Mr. Sharkey discussed a grievance filed against him by the Borough Clerk and continued the timeline of the lawsuit.

Jeff Oakes, 60 Pemberton Ave., asked about the $600,000 for asbestos abatement on Ft. Monmouth property. Mr. Oakes commented that on industrial projects, the amount of asbestos removal is usually known beforehand. He stated asbestos is not the only component of projects, there are other environmental concerns such as ground contaminants. Mr. Oakes discussed the frustration of the Governing Body with regard to FMERA and planning decisions. Mr. Oakes also stated that a cannabis medical growth facility could provide up to 150 new jobs. He stated the problems at Ft. Monmouth are political, they are not based on ideal on the image of Oceanport.

FMERA and the State have other ideas and the borough is causing its own grief. He expressed concern that the Borough did not form a committee to get the public's opinion on cannabis. Mr. Oakes submitted an OPRA request for communication between the Council and Mayor and Mayor of Point Pleasant, which came back zero. He also submitted an OPRA request regarding grant information regarding Responsible Approach to Marijuana Policy and Sensible Approach to Marijuana. Mr. Oakes discussed the 600-page report from SAM. He asked the governing Body to remove medical cannabis from their resolution if the State approves medical cannabis. Councilman Irace stated the Borough did not enact a law to prohibit medical cannabis, it passed a zoning ordinance.

Councilman Proto made a statement that he took exception with Mayor Coffey's earlier statement regarding FMERA Amendment #13 that the process worked. He noted that he disagreed with the Mayor's assertion.

XII. Adjournment: As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:09 PM on a motion by Councilman Irace, seconded by Council President Solan and approved by Council.

Respectfully submitted,

DONNA M. PHELPS
DEPUTY BOROUGH CLERK

RESOLUTION OF THE BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT
AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF BILL LIST FOR MARCH 7, 2019

Resolution #2019-72
03/7/19

WHEREAS, the Governing Body has considered the payment of said bills as set forth on the bill list at its public meeting of March 7, 2019.

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Mayor and Council that the bills be paid as on the attached bill list dated March 7, 2019 totaling $1,459,640.07.

CERTIFICATION OF FUNDS

I, Catherine D. LaPorta, Chief Financial Officer, of the Borough of Oceanport, do hereby certify that funds are available for the purpose stated herein.

Catherine D. LaPorta, CFO

RESULT:	**ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Joseph A. Irace, Councilman
SECONDER:	Stephen Solan, Council President
AYES:	Deerin, Gallo, Irace, Proto, Solan
ABSENT:	O'Brien

I certify that the foregoing Resolution #2019-72 was adopted by the Oceanport Governing Body at the Regular Meeting held March 7, 2019

JEANNE SMITH, RMC
BOROUGH CLERK

BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT
BILL LIST

7-Mar-19

PAYEE	AMOUNT	
PAYROLL ACCOUNT	$117,136.86 $186.27	4TH PAY DCRP
CHASE - 2005 BOND INTEREST	$4,125.00	
GRANT FUND	$0.00	
CAPITAL TRUST TOTAL	$59,960.87	
DOG REGISTRY TOTAL	$0.00	
OPEN SPACE TRUST TOTAL	$2,665.00	
SUI	$0.00	
UCC TRUST	$0.00	
TRUST OTHER TOTAL	$2,195.00	
ESCROW TRUST TOTAL	$4,490.11	
2018 VOUCHERS PAID THIS MEETING	$8,360.08	
2019 VOUCHERS PAID THIS MEETING	$1,260,520.88	
TOTAL	**$1,459,640.07**	

I CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE ITEMS ARE TRUE AND CORRECT AS PRESENTED
TO THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL FOR PAYMENT

Donna M. Phelps

Report Printed *2019-02-28 18:37:30* **BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT**

List of Bills - (All Funds)

Vendor		Description	Payment	Check Total
		Current Fund		
1009 - **ADP, INC**	PO 2955	PAYROLL SERVICES - 2/6/19	287.26	**287.26**
1032 - **BOB JENSEN PLUMBING, INC**	PO 2875	KITCHEN SINK PROBLEM - PD	100.00	**100.00**
1047 - **CENTRAL JERSEY HEALTH INSURANC**	PO 2903	HEALTH/DENTAL INSURANCE - 2/19	74,190.00	
	PO 2942	HEALTH/DENTAL INSURANCE - 3/19	72,198.00	**146,388.00**
1060 - **COMCAST BUSINESS COMMUNICATION**	PO 2887	BORO HALL INTERNET/TELEPHONE 2/14/1	560.43	**560.43**
1062 - **CONSTELLATION NEW ENERGY, INC**	PO 2878	STREET LIGHTING 12/19/19 - 1/18/19	861.04	**861.04**
1443 - **CORELOGIC**	PO 2884	1262 TURF DRIVE - REFUND,R#2018-142	2,880.91	**2,880.91**
1075 - **DELL MARKETING L.P.**	PO 2295	New PC for records clerk & Monitors	1,734.59	
	PO 2404	DELL TONER BUNDLE	223.99	**1,958.58**
1446 - **DIRECT ENERGY BUSINES**	PO 2885	21 MAIN ST - HOOK & LADDER 12/15/18	341.99	
	PO 2927	2 PEMBERTON 1/17/19 - 2/13/19	439.26	
	PO 2926	433 MYRTLE -1/17/19 - 2/13/19	399.86	**1,181.11**
1453 - **DONNA PHELPS**	PO 2493	Samsung Galaxy Tab ! Tablet Covers	179.36	**179.36**
1553 - **DOXTECH SOLUTIONS**	PO 2698	Temp indicator strips for drug test	74.25	**74.25**
1083 - **DSHC ENTERPRISES LLC**	PO 2681	REDEMPTION BLOCK 39; LOT 6 Resolut	33,833.63	**33,833.63**
1084 - **DYNAMIC TESTING SERVICE LLC**	PO 2833	BREATH & URINE SCREENING- 01/22/19	160.00	**160.00**
1570 - **ENVIRONMENTAL DUCT CLEANING SYSTEM**	PO 2739	OLD WHARF - CLEANING DUCTS	650.00	**650.00**
1099 - **EUROFINS QC INC**	PO 2821	WATER TESTING - 01/28/2019	230.00	**230.00**
1122 - **GENERAL CODE PUBLISHERS, INC**	PO 2459	Borough Code eCode360	2,395.00	**2,395.00**
1506 - **GRANICUS, LLC**	PO 2766	MINUTE TRACK - 1/01/19 - 1/31/19	415.00	
	PO 2850	MINUTE TRACK - 02/01/19-02/28/19	415.00	**830.00**
1153 - **JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT**	PO 2896	JCPL #015 - 1/3/19 - 1/31/19	1,477.01	
	PO 2895	JCPL #009 - 1/4/19 - 2/1/19	900.38	**2,377.39**
1434 - **Jersey Printing Associates, Inc.**	PO 2843	Printing of 2019 Calendar	1,845.00	**1,845.00**
1158 - **JOHN'S AUTO & TRUCK REPAIR LLC**	PO 2848	FRONT END LOADER REPAIR	125.00	**125.00**
1159 - **JOSEPH FAZZIO - WALL LLC**	PO 2851	REPAIR OF CLAW BUCKET	523.97	
	PO 2845	REPAIR OF FRONT END LOADER	133.38	**657.35**
1499 - **KEVIN E KENNEDY, ESQ**	PO 2882	PLANNING BOARD - MTG FILE 1/19	500.00	
	PO 2880	KELLY/BUCKLEY VS OP UNITED PLANNING	390.00	**890.00**
1188 - **LEE'S GARAGE, INC.**	PO 2463	Replace windshield on Chiefs Car	385.97	**385.97**
1195 - **MASER CONSULTING, P.A.**	PO 2937	GENERAL ENGINEERING SERVICE	5,100.00	**5,100.00**
1220 - **MONMOUTH COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS**	PO 2744	SALT - TRUCK 26607 MG 1/29/19	476.62	
	PO 2743	SALT - TRUCK 26608 MG - 1/29/19	476.62	
	PO 2742	SALT - TRUCK MG 57853 1/29/19	728.43	
	PO 2856	SALT FOR 4 TRUCKS - 01/30/2019	1,673.17	**3,354.84**
1233 - **MONMOUTH MUNICIPAL JUDGES**	PO 2893	ANNUAL DUES FOR MUNICIPALITY FOR 20	160.00	**160.00**
1241 - **NAPA AUTO PARTS (#15456)**	PO 2847	POWER STEERING FLUID	36.98	**36.98**
1245 - **NJ AMERICAN WATER CO**	PO 2902	OLD WHARF PARK #1 01/12-02/11	42.16	
	PO 2901	PAP FIRE HOUSE - 1/12/19 - 2/11/19	154.55	
	PO 2900	LIBRARY WATER 2019 - 1/12/19 - 2/11	16.85	
	PO 2899	OLD WHARF PARK - 1/12/19 - 2/11/19	16.85	
	PO 2889	OLD WHARF PARK 1/12/19 - 2/11/19	48.68	
	PO 2888	136 HYDTS FIREH 12/27/18 - 1/24/19	6,224.28	
	PO 2948	OLD WHARF PARK - 262 ARNOLD 12/12/1	13.48	**6,516.85**
1251 - **NJ NATURAL GAS CO**	PO 2943	282 HILDRETH (PD) 1/17/19 - 2/14/19	794.74	**794.74**
1251 - **NJ NATURAL GAS CO**	PO 2953	FIRST AID - 1/16/19 - 2/13/19	314.00	
	PO 2952	PAP FIRE HOUSE 1/16/19 - 2/13/19	428.99	
	PO 2951	315 E MAIN - OLD WHARF - 1/16/19 -	241.30	
	PO 2950	TOHICON LIBRARY - 1/15/19 -2/12/19	195.96	
	PO 2947	901 MURPHY - 1/17/19 - 2/14/19	1,342.69	
	PO 2946	918 MURPHY 1/17/19 - 2/14/19	26.37	
	PO 2945	977 MURPHY (NEW PD) 1/17/19 - 2/14	26.37	
	PO 2944	900 MURPHY DRIVE (DPW) 1/17/19 - 2/	787.26	**3,362.94**
1261 - **OCEANPORT BOARD OF EDUCATION**	PO 2940	MARCH 2019 TAX REMITTANCE	794,999.67	**794,999.67**
1520 - **PASHMAN STEIN WALDER HAYDEN, PC**	PO 2939	AFFORDABLE HOUSING COUNCIL 1/19	1,628.00	**1,628.00**
1314 - **SEABOARD FIRE & SAFETY**	PO 2876	FIRE EXTINGUISHERS - POLICE DEPT	188.00	**188.00**
1315 - **SEABOARD WELDING SUPPLY, INC.**	PO 2858	OXYGEN & CYLINDER CHARGES 12/31/18	20.75	
	PO 2857	CYLINDER RENTAL- 01/31/19	20.75	**41.50**
1318 - **SEMCORE RENTAL CENTER II**	PO 2333	RENTAL FOR DRILL & BIT	130.00	**130.00**
1323 - **SHORE REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL**	PO 2941	MARCH 2019 TAX REMITTANCE	249,771.00	**249,771.00**
1327 - **SLATTERY PEST CONTROL**	PO 2806	TREAT AT BORO HALL	50.00	**50.00**
1334 - **STAVOLA ASPHALT COMPANY, INC**	PO 2853	DPW - COLD PATCH 01/25/2019	295.50	**295.50**
1341 - **TARGETED TECHNOLOGIES LLC**	PO 2692	Replacement for computer tower	299.00	
	PO 2873	NEW TABLET SET UP	150.00	
	PO 2905	MAIL ARCHIVING - 3/19	228.00	
	PO 2892	MSP AGREEMENT -3/19	2,602.00	**3,279.00**
1348 - **THE HOME DEPOT**	PO 2923	3 CO DETECTORS FOR POLICE DEPT	80.91	
	PO 2954	COLD PATCH - POTHOLE REPAIR 2/15/19	34.41	**115.32**
1349 - **THE LINK NEWS, INC**	PO 2867	PLANNING BOARD - CONTRACT AWARDS 1	12.83	

List of Bills - (All Funds)

Vendor		Description		Payment	Check Total
	PO 2866	PLANNING BOARD - MTG NOTICES 1/10/	35.93	
	PO 2865	ADM ADVERTISING - CONTRACT AWARDS 1	31.65	
	PO 2864	ADM ADVERTISING - PENDING ORD #995	82.13	**162.54**
1387 - **VERIZON**	PO 2898	FIRE ALARM - OLD WHARF 2/8/19 - 3/7	43.80	**43.80**
Capital Fund				
1195 - **MASER CONSULTING, P.A.**	PO 2936	CERT AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY & PHOTOMMET	13,662.50	
	PO 2935	DEAL AVE BULKHEAD REPLACEMENT	7,463.00	
	PO 2934	MILTON AVE IMPROVEMENTS	1,500.00	
	PO 2933	MYRTLE AVE DRAINAGE & SIDEWALK IMP	1,567.50	
	PO 2929	MAIN ST PHASE 2	1,047.87	**25,240.87**
1347 - **THE GOLDSTEIN PARTNERSHIP**	PO 2949	ARCHITECT SERVICE 12/01/18 - 2/28/1	34,720.00	**34,720.00**
OPEN SPACE TRUST				
1195 - **MASER CONSULTING, P.A.**	PO 2938	EVERGREEN PARK - ENGINEERING	2,665.00	**2,665.00**
OTHER TRUST				
1434 - **Jersey Printing Associates, Inc.**	PO 2843	Printing of 2019 Calendar	1,845.00	**1,845.00**
1234 - **MONMOUTH WIRE & COMPUTER**	PO 2877	RECYCLING - ELECTRONICS - DPW	350.00	**350.00**
DEVELOPERS ESCROW TRUST				
1573 - **Kelly Builders**	PO 2879	KELLY BUILDERS ESCROW REFUND	145.00	**145.00**
1499 - **KEVIN E KENNEDY, ESQ**	PO 2883	RESOLUTION PREPARATION	330.00	**330.00**
1195 - **MASER CONSULTING, P.A.**	PO 2266	60 WERAH - CATALOG #7764520291	122.25	
	PO 2932	Planning Board Review - 11 Hiawatha	123.75	
	PO 2931	PLOT PLAN 61 WERAH PLACE	125.00	
	PO 2930	FT MONMOUTH FITNESS CTR	330.00	**701.00**
1340 - **T&M ASSOCIATES**	PO 2928	RPM NORTH POST - 1/17/19 - 2/7/19	3,279.48	**3,279.48**
1349 - **THE LINK NEWS, INC**	PO 2792	PB Notice of Decision - 93 Main St.	8.55	
	PO 2791	Notice of Decision - 11 Hiawatha Av	8.55	
	PO 2790	Notice of Decision - 86 Sea Girt Av	8.55	
	PO 2741	NOTICE OF DECISION - 1262 TURF, Cat	8.98	**34.63**
TOTAL				**1,338,191.94**

Summary By Account

ACCOUNT	DESCRIPTION	CURRENT YR	APPROP. YEAR	NON-BUDGETARY	CREDIT
01-101-01-000-011	CASH OPERATING			0.00	1,268,880.96
01-113-04-000-026	TAX SALE PREMIUMS			25,100.00	
01-201-20-100-200	ADMINISTRATIVE & EXECUTIVE OE	4,083.78			
01-201-20-130-200	FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION OE	313.25			
01-201-20-155-200	LEGAL SERVICES OE	2,018.00			
01-201-20-165-200	BOROUGH ENGINEER OE	5,100.00			
01-201-21-180-200	PLANNING BOARD OE	548.76			
01-201-23-210-202	HEALTH	138,383.00			
01-201-23-210-203	DENTAL	8,005.00			
01-201-25-240-200	POLICE OE	373.25			
01-201-25-255-200	FIRE HYDRANT SERVICE OE	6,224.28			
01-201-25-260-200	FIRST AID ORGANIZATION OE	753.26			
01-201-26-300-200	STREETS & ROADS OTHER EXPENSES	20.75			
01-201-26-300-271	REPAIRS	125.00			
01-201-26-300-273	SUPPLIES	728.74			
01-201-26-300-277	BITUMINOUS CONCRETE	295.50			
01-201-26-300-282	SALT & SAND	1,673.17			
01-201-26-310-200	PUBLIC BUILDINGS & GROUNDS OE	918.91			
01-201-26-310-252	REPAIRS & EQUIPMENT	150.00			
01-201-27-335-200	WATERWAYS COMMITTEE OE	230.00			
01-201-31-430-201	ELECTRICITY	1,729.34			
01-201-31-430-203	TELEPHONE/INTERNET	604.23			
01-201-31-430-204	WATER/SEWER	292.57			
01-201-31-430-205	NATURAL GAS	2,950.79			
01-201-31-430-207	STREET LIGHTING	1,509.09			
01-201-43-490-200	MUNICIPAL COURT OE	160.00			
01-203-20-100-200	(2018) ADMINISTRATIVE & EXECUTIVE OE		2,395.00		
01-203-20-130-200	(2018) FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION OE		255.98		
01-203-22-195-200	(2018) CONSTRUCTION CODE OE		121.38		
01-203-25-240-200	(2018) POLICE OE		2,120.56		
01-203-26-300-200	(2018) STREETS & ROADS OTHER EXPENSES		150.75		
01-203-26-300-282	(2018) SALT & SAND		1,681.67		

Summary By Account

ACCOUNT	DESCRIPTION	CURRENT YR	APPROP. YEAR	NON-BUDGETARY	CREDIT
01-203-31-430-205	(2018) NATURAL GAS		1,634.74		
01-205-55-000-004	TAX OVERPAYMENTS			2,880.91	
01-206-55-000-046	REGIONAL SCHOOL TAX			249,771.00	
01-207-55-000-045	LOCAL SCHOOL TAX			794,999.67	
01-214-55-000-003	DUE 3RD PARTY LIEN HOLDERS			8,733.63	
01-500-70-100-025	APPROP.RES-CLEAN COMM.			1,845.00	
TOTALS FOR	**Current Fund**	**177,190.67**	**8,360.08**	**1,083,330.21**	**1,268,880.96**
04-101-01-100-011	CAPITAL CASH - TD			0.00	59,960.87
04-215-55-474-000	MUNICIPAL COMPLEX ORD #970			34,720.00	
04-215-55-988-A00	ROADS, DRAINAGE, TRAFFIC SIGNAL, BULKHEA			25,240.87	
TOTALS FOR	**Capital Fund**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**59,960.87**	**59,960.87**
06-101-01-100-011	OPEN SPACE CASH - TD			0.00	2,665.00
06-270-00-500-020	RESERVE FOR OPEN SPACE			2,665.00	
TOTALS FOR	**OPEN SPACE TRUST**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**2,665.00**	**2,665.00**
60-101-01-100-101	CASH-OTHER TRUST - TD			0.00	2,195.00
60-270-55-600-206	RES FOR RECYCLING			2,195.00	
TOTALS FOR	**OTHER TRUST**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**2,195.00**	**2,195.00**
61-101-01-100-101	CASH-DEV.ESCROW/TD			0.00	4,490.11
61-270-55-600-205	RES.FOR DEV.ESCROW			4,490.11	
TOTALS FOR	**DEVELOPERS ESCROW TRUST**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**4,490.11**	**4,490.11**

Total to be paid from Fund 01 Current Fund	1,268,880.96
Total to be paid from Fund 04 Capital Fund	59,960.87
Total to be paid from Fund 06 OPEN SPACE TRUST	2,665.00
Total to be paid from Fund 60 OTHER TRUST	2,195.00
Total to be paid from Fund 61 DEVELOPERS ESCROW TRUST	4,490.11
	1,338,191.94

Report Printed *2019-02-28 18:43:07* **BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT** Click here to save CSV (Excel) Version

Pending Payments (*Not Finalized*) - (..) ALL FUNDS

From 02/07/2019 to 02/28/2019 With a Line Amount > 10000

DATE	ENTRY #	PO#	CHECK #	ACCOUNT	VENDOR/EXPLANATION	DEBIT	CREDIT	ACCOUNT
2/27/2019		2903		01-201-23-210-202	HEALTH	70,136.00		
				01-201-23-210-203	DENTAL	4,054.00		
					CENTRAL JERSEY HEALTH INSURANC		74,190.00	01-101-01-000-011
2/28/2019		2681		01-214-55-000-003	LIEN #18-00002	8,733.63		
				01-113-04-000-026	PREMIUM	25,100.00		
					DSHC ENTERPRISES LLC		33,833.63	01-101-01-000-011
2/28/2019		2942		01-201-23-210-202	HEALTH	68,247.00		
				01-201-23-210-203	DENTAL	3,951.00		
					CENTRAL JERSEY HEALTH INSURANC		72,198.00	01-101-01-000-011
2/28/2019		2941		01-206-55-000-046	MARCH 2019-CURRENT	249,771.00		
					SHORE REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL		249,771.00	01-101-01-000-011
2/28/2019		2940		01-207-55-000-045		794,999.67		
					OCEANPORT BOARD OF EDUCATION		794,999.67	01-101-01-000-011
2/28/2019		2936		04-215-55-988-A04	CERT AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY & PHOTOMMETRIC MAPP	13,662.50		
					MASER CONSULTING, P.A.		13,662.50	04-101-01-100-011
2/28/2019		2949		04-215-55-474-006	ARCHITECT SERVICES - NEW MUNICIPAL COMPLEX	34,720.00		
					THE GOLDSTEIN PARTNERSHIP		34,720.00	04-101-01-100-011

FEBRUARY SUMMARY BY ACCOUNT:

ACCOUNT	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	APR RESERVE	CURRENT	NON-BUDGETARY	PENDING CR
01-101-01-000-011	CASH OPERATING				1,224,992.30
04-101-01-100-011	CAPITAL CASH - TD				48,382.50
01-113-04-000-026	TAX SALE PREMIUMS			25,100.00	
01-201-23-210-202	HEALTH		138,383.00		
01-201-23-210-203	DENTAL		8,005.00		
01-206-55-000-046	REGIONAL SCHOOL TAX			249,771.00	
01-207-55-000-045	LOCAL SCHOOL TAX			794,999.67	
01-214-55-000-003	DUE 3RD PARTY LIEN HOLDERS			8,733.63	
04-215-55-474-006	ARTHITECTURAL SERVICES			34,720.00	
04-215-55-988-A04	CHECK VALVES			13,662.50	
FEBRUARY TOTALS (FOR RANGE):			146,388.00	1,126,986.80	1,273,374.80

SUMMARY BY ACCOUNT FOR RANGE:

ACCOUNT	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	APR RESERVE	CURRENT	NON-BUDGETARY	DISBURSED
01-101-01-000-011	CASH OPERATING				1,224,992.30
04-101-01-100-011	CAPITAL CASH - TD				48,382.50
01-113-04-000-026	TAX SALE PREMIUMS			25,100.00	
01-201-23-210-202	HEALTH		138,383.00		
01-201-23-210-203	DENTAL		8,005.00		
01-206-55-000-046	REGIONAL SCHOOL TAX			249,771.00	
01-207-55-000-045	LOCAL SCHOOL TAX			794,999.67	
01-214-55-000-003	DUE 3RD PARTY LIEN HOLDERS			8,733.63	
04-215-55-474-006	ARTHITECTURAL SERVICES			34,720.00	
04-215-55-988-A04	CHECK VALVES			13,662.50	
TOTALS (FOR RANGE):			146,388.00	1,126,986.80	1,273,374.80

RESOLUTION OF THE BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT THE FORT MONMOUTH REUSE PLAN AMENDMENT #14 AND THE MUNICIPAL 45 DAY REVIEW PERIOD AND FORMULATION OF THE BOROUGH RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS TO THE FORT MONMOUTH ECONOMIC REVITILIZATION AUTHORITY

Resolution #2019-73
03/7/19

WHEREAS, the decision to close Fort Monmouth was made per Federal BRAC legislation in September of 2005 and the Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority (FMERA) was created by the State of New Jersey (C52:27I et. seq.) to implement comprehensive conversion and revitalization of the Fort Monmouth Property; and

WHEREAS, the Fort Monmouth Redevelopment and Reuse Plan was adopted September 3, 2008 and as subsequently amended; and

WHEREAS, the statute provides for a 45-day municipal review period for comment and recommendations on amendments to the Fort Monmouth Reuse Plan by each of the three host communities. On February 5, 2019 the Borough Clerk received a request to review the Reuse Plan Amendment #14 for which review period shall end March 21, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the Borough of Oceanport has solicited comment on the Reuse Plan Amendment #14 from the Borough Planner, Borough Engineer, Environmental Commission, Planning Board, Police Department, First Aid, Fire Department, Office of Emergency Management and others in order to review the Amendment and consider its impact on the Borough and its residents.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Oceanport that the municipality has performed its statutory duties as a host municipality concerning the review of the proposed Fort Monmouth Redevelopment and Reuse Plan Amendment #14 and strongly opposes the amendment as currently proposed and offers the following and attached comments and recommendations:

1. The Borough is supportive of a residential use, if appropriately designed for the area.
2. Strong consideration should be made concerning the intensity and density of the proposed development and its appropriateness for the site and its existing infrastructure.
3. Additional studies including but not limited to circulation/traffic, open space, environmental and parking should be provided or performed to support and substantiate the intensity of use proposed.
4. While the Borough recognizes the responsibility of FMERA to implement the goals and objectives of the Fort Monmouth Reuse Plan, the Borough emphatically disagrees with the amendment's conclusion that the proposed alternative use "would not adversely impact any of the "Transportation Circulation Improvements Goals" established in the Reuse Plan without the substantiation of supporting studies for traffic and the like.
5. The Borough questions the amendment's conclusion that the proposed alternative development is consistent with the goals for open space and public access. Public access to Parkers Creek is a vital element of the area but the amendment does not contain any provisions for connectivity by the public to the riverfront as well as connectivity with adjacent developments planned for the Officer Housing parcel.
6. The Borough ardently disagrees with the amendment's conclusion of "Relationship to objectives and Principles of the Reuse Plan" that the proposed alternative development "…is consistent with State, County, and Municipal planning policies…" when the proposed development is clearly inconsistent with the Borough's Master Plan Goals and Objectives and the Borough's Zoning. It is the Borough's position that the proposed alternative development is

extreme in its allowances for lot coverage, height, number of floors and living area and density and is not in character with the surrounding neighborhoods.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of the comments received be forwarded with this Resolution to the Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority Board for their consideration.

RESULT:	**ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Joseph A. Irace, Councilman
SECONDER:	Robert Proto, Councilman
AYES:	Deerin, Gallo, Irace, Proto, Solan
ABSENT:	O'Brien

I certify that the foregoing Resolution #2019-73 was adopted by the Oceanport Governing Body at the Regular Meeting held March 7, 2019

JEANNE SMITH, RMC
BOROUGH CLERK

Clarke Caton Hintz
Architecture
Planning
Landscape Architecture

MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor and Council

From: Kendra Lelie, PP, AICP, LLA
Donna Miller, PP, AICP, CFM

Re: **Amendment #14 to the Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan**

Date: February 20, 2019

100 Barrack Street
Trenton NJ 08608
clarkecatonhintz.com
Tel: 609 883 8383
Fax: 609 883 4044

As requested, the following reviews Amendment #14 to the *Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan* (Reuse Plan).

The Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Planning Authority (FMERPA) adopted the Reuse Plan to guide the redevelopment of the Fort Monmouth Army Base. While there have been multiple amendments, the original Reuse Plan calls for the Oceanport Reuse Area (Reuse Area) to be redeveloped with approximately 1.75 million square feet of non-residential space and 720 residential units. Such development would include: a high-tech/green industry cluster, education/ medical campus, a neighborhood center, a boutique hotel and spa and expansive green space, including the historic Parade Ground.

The following considers the details of this Amendment and its applicability to components of the Reuse Plan and the *From Fort to Village Plan,* which is incorporated into the Borough's Master Plan.

Area Considered by Amendment #14

Philip Caton, FAICP
John Hatch, FAIA
George Hibbs, AIA
Brian Slaugh, AICP
Michael Sullivan, AICP

The proposed amendment would create an *overlay* alternative development scenario for the Lodging Parcel located in the Oceanport Reuse Area (Main Post Area). This development district, which includes the Lodging Parcel among others, is intended as a multi-use area, including retail, restaurants, offices, residences and other uses in a pedestrian oriented village format fronting on Oceanport Avenue.

Emeriti.
John Clarke, FAIA
Carl Hintz, AICP, ASLA
John Clarke, FAIA

The Lodging Parcel is located on the west side of Oceanport Avenue in the northern most part of the Borough and the Oceanport Reuse Area. The Lodging Parcel is located immediately west of the Allison Hall Parcel along Parkers Creek. The Lodging Parcel contains approximately 15 acres of land, is accessed via Signal Avenue and is currently improved with eight (8) buildings of which two buildings, Building #270 known as

Scriven Hall and Building #271 known as Gardner Hall, are considered contributing resources to the Historic District.

The adopted Reuse Plan envisioned that the Lodging Parcel be redeveloped for lodging and/or conference center use with a boutique hotel and spa along Parkers Creek with significant open space surrounding the lodging use. Additionally, Gardner Hall (Building #271) was the site of 15 apartment dwellings, Scriven Hall (Building #270) was the site of 16 permanent supportive housing units and Building #360 was to be reused for mixed-income apartments. Buildings #361, #362, #363, #364 and #365 were all slated for demolition in the Reuse Plan. Public access to the waterfront would be maintained and encouraged. Shoreline improvements and a riverfront promenade that would be limited to passive activities such as birdwatching and nature observation were envisioned by the Reuse Plan including no docking or direct access to the water.

Reuse Plan Amendment #11, created an overlay alternative development scenario to permit office, retail, restaurant or a boutique hotel on the adjoining Allison Hall Parcel while transferring the residential element (medium density apartments) of the Allison Hall Parcel to the Lodging Parcel. While the total number or type of residential units attributed to the Allison Hall Parcel were not provided in Amendment #11, it appears that there were two buildings on the Allison Hall Parcel proposed for apartment dwellings. Low-density residential development, such as the townhome proposal was not contemplated in the original Allison Hall Parcel.

Amendment #14 Description

This amendment proposes to provide an alternative overlay option that would permit the a total cap of 185 residential dwellings which are not currently permitted or envisioned in the Reuse Plan at this location including:

- 148 market-rate townhouses;
- 37 apartment dwellings located within Scriven Hall (Building #270) and Gardner Hall (Building #271);
- Removal of Building #360 which was to be reused for mixed-income apartments; and
- Construction of community amenities such as a clubhouse, pool, fitness center, athletic facilities and other recreational amenities as accessory uses.

The amendment also establishes specific bulk/design criteria:

- Parcel limits:
  - Minimum front lot line setback of 5 feet;
  - Minimum side lot line setback of 5 feet on each side;
  - Minimum rear lot line setback of 18 feet for new buildings from street or drive-aisle:
  - Minimum access aisle widths of 18 feet for one-way aisle widths and 20 feet for two-way aisle widths; and
  - Driveway and curb cuts shall not be less than 18 feet or more than 36 feet in width.

- For townhouse development:

  - Maximum permitted height of 3 stories/44 feet;
  - Maximum permitted lot coverage 75 percent;
  - Front and side lot line setbacks of 0 feet; and
  - Not to exceed 11 townhouse units in one townhouse building.

- For existing residential buildings parking will be permitted in the front yard setback area.

Reuse Plan Applicability

Residential Use. The overlay option permits the construction of up to 185 total residential units including 148 townhouse dwellings and 37 apartment dwellings. This would be an inclusionary residential development which would provide a 20% affordable housing set aside. The required affordable housing units would be located Scriven Hall (Building #270) and Gardner Hall (Building #271). It has been indicated that the residential portion of the Allison Hall parcel (Amendment #11) would be transferred to the Lodging parcel if the Allison Hall parcel were to be developed under the alternate overlay zoning scenario. However, it is unclear how many apartment units were contemplated for the Allison Hall parcel. The report issued by FMERA indicates further on page 11 under the sub-heading entitled "Traffic", that "additional traffic from the residential units in this location may be offset by a decrease in residential units in another part of the Oceanport Reuse Area". **The Borough may want to request a clear accounting of the number of units associated with each parcel in the Reuse Plan as compared to the number of units contemplated by the past and present Plan Amendments. The reduction of units from the Oceanport Village Center area may be detrimental to the viability of creating a main street town center as originally proposed for the area along Oceanport Avenue. In addition, Scriven Hall (Building #270) was the original site for permanent supportive housing. The Borough may consider requesting FMERA provide more information related to where this**

permanent supportive housing may be relocated and verify that the total number of permanent supportive housing units does not exceed the quantity provided for in the Reuse Plan.

Community Facilities. A clubhouse, pool, fitness center, athletic facilities and other recreational amenities are proposed as accessory uses, presumably to the proposed townhouse and apartment development. It is unclear if the intent is for these facilities to be accessible to the residents of the Main Post Area of the Oceanport Reuse Area or restricted only to residents of the townhouse and apartment development on the Lodging Parcel. The conceptual layout plan provided in the amendment does not indicate an area where such facilities would be accommodated on the parcel. **The Borough may consider requesting additional information or layouts which include these types of recreational facilities and whether they are open to the public or limited to the specific residential development occurring on the Lodging parcel.**

Public Access. The Reuse Plan depicts the Parkers Creek shoreline as a public riverfront promenade across the Lodging Parcel and the Allison Hall Parcel to the east, where the river edge is hardened by a bulkhead. A more natural / informal path is envisioned along the riverfront across the Officer Housing Parcel to the west. The amendment states, "an up to ±50-foot-wide waterfront esplanade along Parkers Creek including a 12-foot wide walkway designed in a complimentary coordinated style to the adjacent Allison Hall riverfront promenade" will be developed.

Public access to Parkers Creek is a vital element of the Reuse Plan. No provision appears to be made in the proposed amendment to permit connectivity to the riverfront on the adjacent Officer Housing Parcel to the west, and the conceptual layout provided in the amendment indicates the promenade would terminate at the western limit. **The Borough may want to request further information regarding connectivity of the riverfront promenade to the adjacent Officer Housing Parcel.**

Design Standards

The amendment proposes bulk standards for setbacks, frontage, lot coverage and building height, as well as criteria applicable to driveway, aisle and curb widths which expand the residential footprint for the Reuse Parcel.

We recommend the Borough consider requesting that the following standards include or be revised as such:

- All townhomes shall be rear-loaded.

- The minimum rear lot line setback for new buildings (especially townhomes) from street or drive-aisle be increased from 18 feet to 20 feet.

- The waterfront esplanade shall not be less than 50 feet in width.

- The 20% affordable housing set-aside is provided for the total number of residential units constructed on this development parcel.

Historic Resources

The Lodging Parcel falls partially within the Fort Monmouth Historic District – Main Post, containing, or within sight of contributing structures such as Officer Housing and Allison Hall. The Reuse Plan cautions that new construction may visually alter the area surrounding these resources, resulting in an indirect effect on the Fort Monmouth Historic District. The Reuse Plan specifically recommends that new construction be sensitive to the historic buildings in close proximity, such as Allison Hall, and the adjacent historic district and further identifies the natural areas alongside the Officer Housing remain and would be reforested. In order to remain consistent with the plan directive for these historic resources, the proposed townhouse units depicted in the conceptual plan between Barton Avenue and Gardner Hall (building #270) may require relocation or removal in order for the sight lines of Allison Hall from Barton Avenue to be unhampered. **The Borough may want to consider requesting the redesign of this section of the parcel to better meet the historic goals of the Reuse Plan.**

Fort to Village Plan Applicability

The *Fort to Village Plan* was incorporated as an amendment into the Borough's Master Plan. The overlay zoning option and layout does not comport with one of the primary goals of the Fort to Village Plan vision which includes:

> ***"The 28 acres along Parker's Creek is a prime waterfront development site that calls for the highest design quality with a unique resort hotel, spa and/or conference facility."***

The incorporation of a significant number of residential units on the Lodging Parcel contradicts this vision. Additionally, the *Fort to Village Plan* calls for the provision of 3-4 acres of open space within this parcel. The proposed scale of development anticipated by this plan amendment would significantly reduce the amount of open space envisioned by the Borough's plan for this parcel.

Additionally, the *Fort to Village Plan* contemplated the majority of housing units in the Reuse Plan Area would be provided in the Village Center. This plan amendment redirects a substantial percentage of the housing units planned for the Oceanport Reuse Area away from the Village Center, potentially compromising the economic viability of the Village Center as contemplated by the plan.

This parcel is a main block within the Oceanport Reuse Area and the layout and architectural treatment of development occurring here will have a significant impact on future development of the Reuse Area. As such, the Borough may want to recommend more in-depth coordination of the specific provisions of the overlay zoning and layout concepts for this Parcel.

Conclusion

The amendment proposes major changes to the Lodging Parcel which could negatively impact the effectiveness of the Village Center, the integrity of the Fort's historic resources and the adequacy of public access to the Parkers Creek waterfront.

This amendment does not contain any restriction to prevent residential uses to be developed on both parcels – mixed income apartments as permitted in the underlying zoning of the Allison Parcel and this townhouse overlay for the Lodging Parcel. While there may be strong market factors to prevent the development of two boutique resort hotels within the Oceanport Reuse Area, there is less to prevent the development of both sites for residential uses and losing the hotel use entirely. This would also be a significant departure from the plan.

The overlay alternative proposed for Amendment #14 also raises a particular concern that there could be a net increase of residential dwelling units in the Oceanport Reuse Area requiring a shifting of housing units from other areas to keep from exceeding the projected total number of units. This is of particular importance in maintaining the viability of the Village Center.

Additional information is needed to ensure the overall goals of the Plan are not compromised especially as it relates to the location and associated quantity of residential units. The Borough may want to consider requesting an accounting of the total number of housing units that were planned in the Allison Parcel to compare against the total number of residential units that this and other amendments anticipate

BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor & Council

FROM: Jeanne Smith, Planning Board Secretary

DATE: February 27, 2019

RE: Fort Monmouth Plan Amendment #14

Please be advised that the Planning Board discussed at their Regular Meeting on February 12, 2019, the proposed amendments to the Fort Monmouth Reuse Plan. The Board expressed several significant concerns regarding the proposed amendment which are entailed by Planning Board Resolution #PR-19-09, adopted at their February 26, 2019 meeting.

The Board respectfully requests that the Borough Council consider inclusion of the Board's resolution with any response to FMERA.

RESOLUTION

BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT PLANNING BOARD
FORT MONMOUTH REUSE AND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT #14

WHEREAS, the Oceanport Planning Board is a duly organized Land Use Board, organized and existing in accordance with the Rules and Regulations of the State of New Jersey and the Borough of Oceanport; and

WHEREAS, there exists within the geographical confines of the Borough of Oceanport a portion of the complex which previously hosted the former Fort Monmouth military base; and

WHEREAS, with the closure of Fort Monmouth, the Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority (FMERA) was, essentially, created to help establish the general process for appropriate redevelopment of the various parcels located within the former military site; and

WHEREAS, in furtherance thereof, a process was established whereby each of the 3 Fort Monmouth host communities have a process to review Fort Monmouth Redevelopment Plans, and / or amendments thereto; and

WHEREAS, Agents of FMERA recently requested that the Borough of Oceanport review and comment upon proposed Plan Amendment #14; and

WHEREAS, in due course, the Borough Council of the Borough of Oceanport forwarded the matter to the Oceanport Planning Board, so that the Planning Board could officially weigh in on the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment; and

WHEREAS, the Oceanport Planning Board officially reviewed proposed Plan Amendment #14 at its regularly scheduled meeting of February 12, 2019; and

WHEREAS, at the said Hearing, sworn testimony was presented by William H. R. White, III, P.E., P.P., CME, the Planning Board Engineer/Planner; and

WHEREAS, at the said Hearing, the following items were officially marked into the Record as Evidence:

- Communication from the FMERA, to the Mayor of the Borough of Oceanport, dated February 5, 2019, introduced into Evidence as B-1;

- Proposed Amendment #14 to the Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan, introduced into Evidence as B-2.and

- Review Memorandum from Maser Consulting, dated February 11, 2019, introduced into Evidence as B-3;

WHEREAS, the Board Engineer / Planner explained proposed Plan Amendment #14, in detail, to the Board Members, and other members of the public who were present; and

WHEREAS, the Board Engineer / Planner essentially advised that the proposed Plan Amendment #14, if adopted, would effectuate the following:

a) Provide a Zoning Overlay so as to permit the demolition of existing buildings 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, and 365;

b) Provide a Zoning Overlay so as to allow existing buildings 270 and 271 to remain intact, and to be rehabilitated, ultimately containing 37 affordable units (in 2 buildings);

c) Provide a Zoning Overlay so as to allow 148 townhouse units to be constructed in approximately 27 clusters;

d) Provide a Zoning change so as to allow each townhouse building to contain up to 11 units (whereas the current zoning regulations allow up to 8 units);

e) Provide a Zoning change so as to allow for a principal height of 3 stories (whereas current zoning regulations allow 2 ½ stories);

f) Provide a Zoning change so as to allow a building height of 44 ft. (whereas the current zoning regulations provide for a 35 ft. maximum);

g) Provide a Zoning change so as to allow a residential dwelling density maximum of 13 units per acre, with a maximum count of 185 units (whereas the current zoning regulations allow a medium residential density of 12 units per acre);

h) Provide a Zoning change so as to allow a minimum front and side yard setback of 5 ft. and 0 ft., respectively, for individual townhouse lots (whereas the current zoning regulations require a front setback of between 20 and 30 ft., and a side setback of 10 ft.).

i) Provide a Zoning change so as to allow a rear lot line to be located adjacent to a street with an 18 ft. setback (whereas existing zoning regulations do not permit a rear lot line to be located adjacent to a street); and

j) Provide a Zoning change so as to permit residential parking within a front yard setback (whereas the current zoning regulations do not allow the same).

WHEREAS, upon such a formal review of the matter, the Board Members expressed a number of significant questions, comments, and concerns regarding the proposed Amendment, and the impact the same will have on the Borough of Oceanport, and the surrounding communities; and

WHEREAS, Board questions, comments, and concerns in the said regard included, but were not necessarily limited to, the following:

Infrastructure Analysis

- There was a concern, that, for obvious reasons, the existing infrastructure cannot accommodate the wide-scale redevelopment efforts associated with the former Fort Monmouth complex.

- There was a concern that there is no Plan/Report identifying the status / condition of the existing infrastructure, including streets, sewers, laterals, etc.

- There was a concern that there is no Plan identifying what infrastructure improvements / upgrades are currently necessary (and what will be necessary in the future).

- There was a concern that there is no Plan identifying who will pay for any necessary infrastructure improvements/upgrades.

- There was a concern that the absence of a Plan for necessary infrastructure improvements / upgrades will only lead to future issues / concerns / litigation / disputes between the relevant State, County, and Municipal Agencies, and Developers, Tenants, and Occupants.

- There was a concern that sound planning, and basic planning, mandate that the Developers and the overseeing Authorities identify existing infrastructure capabilities, the need for certain infrastructure improvements / upgrades, the phasing schedule by which necessary infrastructure / upgrades will be effectuated, and how the cost for the necessary infrastructure improvements / upgrades will be paid.

- There was a concern that the massive / major redevelopment envisioned (with respect to the overall Fort Monmouth Complex) mandate a complete analysis of infrastructure limitations / capabilities, etc.

- There was a concern that an infrastructure improvement Plan / Analysis is a basic review element which cannot be, and should not be, ignored.

- There was a concern that it is inappropriate, and a dereliction of duty, to not incorporate an overall Infrastructure Improvement Plan into the immediate redevelopment efforts.

- There was a concern that the lack of an appropriate / professional infrastructure improvement analysis does not represent sound planning.

- There was a concern that the lack of an appropriate / professional Infrastructure Improvement Analysis does not represent sound management / development practices.

- There was a concern that the lack of an appropriate and professional Infrastructure Improvement Analysis will be harmful to the Borough of Oceanport, and the other host communities.

- There was a concern that the lack of an appropriate / professional Infrastructure Improvement Analysis will not be beneficial to the FMERA Organization;

- There was a concern that the lack of an appropriate / professional Infrastructure Improvement Analysis will not be beneficial for the site or the area.

- There was a concern that the lack of an appropriate/professional Infrastructure Improvement Analysis will compromise the overall redevelopment efforts.

- There was a concern that the lack of an appropriate / professional Infrastructure Improvement Analysis is short-sighted.

- There was a concern that the lack of an appropriate/professional Infrastructure Improvement Analysis will cause future problems.

- There was a concern that the lack of an appropriate/professional Infrastructure Improvement Analysis could prove (in the future) to be potentially economically devastating to the Borough of Oceanport (and the other host communities).

- There was a concern that in most circumstances, significantly less intense development methods would nonetheless require a proper / thorough analysis of Infrastructure capabilities / limitations.

- There was a concern that proper development practices require the review/analysis of infrastructure limitations and capabilities.

- There was a concern that documented / known infrastructure limitations represent a major problem on the National / State stage, which is only now beginning to be fully recognized / realized.

- There was a concern that recent documented and known infrastructure failures in the State, the County, and the general Oceanport area only

highlight the need for a professional and thorough analysis of existing infrastructure limitations and capabilities.

- There was a concern that the cost of infrastructure improvements / upgrades and extremely significant – and that the same should be addressed / studied / negotiated now (while development is being planned).

- There was a concern that not addressing infrastructure improvements / upgrades / limitations will only lead to certain / definite emergencies / crises in the future.

- There was a concern that future infrastructure failures/problems will cause economic hardship to future Owners / Developers / Occupants / Tenants.

- There was a concern that future infrastructure failures/limitations will cause major quality of life issues / concerns for future Owners / Developers / Occupants / Tenants.

- There was a concern that appropriate / responsible government mandates the need for infrastructure issues be immediately identified / studied.

- There was a concern that formal infrastructure improvements costs can and should be factored into current / anticipated development / construction / financing costs, so as to avoid future problems / economic crises.

- There was a concern that given the nature/extent/magnitude of the existing/anticipated Fort Monmouth redevelopment efforts, infrastructure studies should not be ignored or otherwise completed / studied in a piecemeal fashion.

- There was a concern, that based upon information known to date, it appears that there has not even been a basic infrastructure analysis completed to support the proposed redevelopment efforts, (at least to the knowledge of the Oceanport Planning Board).

- There was a concern that failed / failing / compromised roads / sewers / pipes / laterals, and associated incidents of failure, will significantly interfere with the operational success of any Fort Monmouth redevelopment efforts.

- There was a concern that from a strict cost-benefit analysis, some infrastructure studies / improvements should immediately take place (during existing / anticipated construction).

- There was a concern that immediately analyzing/addressing infrastructure needs could likely reduce, and even potentially eliminate, the need for some future emergency infrastructure repair costs.

- There was a concern that the failure / refusal to immediately study / analyze basic infrastructure issues / limitations will unnecessarily burden future governing bodies and residents of Oceanport, and other host communities.

- There was a concern that future FMERA representatives, future governing body officials, future Oceanport residents, and future Owners / Developers / Occupants / Tenants will ultimately appreciate appropriate oversight / analysis of immediate infrastructure needs.

- There was a concern that all major stakeholders in the redevelopment process, (including, but not limited to, the State of New Jersey, the County of Monmouth, FMERA, the Borough of Oceanport, the Borough of Tinton Falls, the Borough of Eatontown, the local sewer/utility authorities, etc.) should immediately / jointly review / discuss / analyze infrastructure limitations and capabilities.

- There was a concern that the failure to appropriately identify / review / address infrastructure limitations / improvements right now could result in potential future claims of negligence and / or litigation.

- There was a concern that the failure to appropriately identify / review / address infrastructure limitations / improvements can result in future litigation and burdensome legal fees.

- There was a concern that, based upon the information known to date, there is no money set aside for necessary infrastructure (roadway/water/sewer) improvements – and that the same does not represent sound planning.

- There was a concern that the failure to plan for anticipated / necessary infrastructure improvements is akin to “planning to fail.”

- There was a concern that standard provisions of New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law, and associated Case Law, allow / encourage Municipal Officials to hold Developers responsible for their fair share of development-related costs including, necessary infrastructure improvements / upgrades.

- There was a concern that a refusal to address infrastructure liabilities and limitations will only result in an unfair burden being ultimately placed upon the “last Developer.”

- There was a concern that, in conjunction with development efforts of this size, a Host Town / Planning Board would likely require the execution of a Developer’s Agreement – and such a Developer’s Agreement would, among other things, certainly identify a Developer’s Fair-Share costs associated with the development (and the same would be based upon a professional study analyzing existing infrastructure limitations/capabilities).

- There was a concern that if any infrastructure studies have been prepared, the Oceanport Planning Board has not reviewed the same.

- There was a concern that the within Resolution should not be interpreted as anti-FMERA, or anti-development – but rather, the same should be interpreted as a basic safe-guard to ensure appropriate/responsible development / redevelopment.

- There was a concern that the so-called “kicking the infrastructure can” down the road will not advance the long-term interests of the Borough of Oceanport, or the other host communities.

- There was a concern that the existing infrastructure limitations simply cannot support the massive redevelopment efforts envisioned herein.

- There was a concern that, generally speaking, the existing infrastructure was constructed in or about the 1930’s - and that the same simply cannot accommodate the wide-scale development efforts envisioned herein.

- There was a concern that appropriate infrastructure analysis is a hallmark of any modern development – and it would not be prudent to apply different standards to the widespread redevelopment efforts associated with the former Fort Monmouth complex.

Height

- There was a concern that the height / mass of the aforesaid buildings would be inconsistent with the current Zoning Regulations.

- There was a concern that the height and mass of the proposed buildings (as identified in proposed Plan Amendment #14) are entirely inconsistent with the majority of other buildings located within the Zone, and the Borough of Oceanport as a whole.

- There was a concern that the height and mass of the proposed buildings (as allowed under the proposed Plan Amendment #14) would clearly over-burden the Borough of Oceanport, as well as the other surrounding communities.

- There was a concern that allowing such massive buildings on the site would not necessarily reflect sound planning.

- There was a concern that there has been no formal analysis (for comparison purposes) of the heights of other buildings within the Borough of Oceanport and/or within the greater Fort Monmouth compound.

- There was a concern that if Plan Amendment #14 were adopted, and the anticipated buildings were constructed, the same could forever, and detrimentally, change the general landscape of the Borough of Oceanport.

- There was a concern that if the proposed Amendment allowing such tall buildings were approved, the same would be inconsistent with the scope and character of other existing development within the greater Oceanport area.

- There was recognition that the Developer’s representatives previously reduced the maximum proposed height from 48 ft. to 44 ft. – and that such a concession was recognized / welcomed / appreciated.

- There was a recognition that a further reduction in the allowable height would be very welcome as well.

Parking

- There was a concern as to how parking demands have been calculated.

- There was a concern that the proposed Plan Amendment #14 is devoid of an independent or appropriate parking analysis.

- There was a concern that while the development envisioned in Plan Amendment # 14 will satisfy prevailing Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS), the same will not provide areas, or sufficient areas, for guest parking.

- There was a concern, that, given the size of the Fort Monmouth Complex, and given the extensive amount of land which exists, appropriate guest parking should certainly be provided / accommodated.

- There was a concern that there are no known/sufficient/appropriate spaces where visitors / guests / non-residents can park at the site, to take advantage of some of the more guest-friendly elements (including the promenade, etc.).

- There was a concern that Plan Amendment # 14 allows parking in the front yard area; whereas the current zoning regulations do not allow for the same.

- There was a concern that parking in the front yard area can and will have a significant impact on the overall aesthetic appeal of the development.

- There was a concern regarding the parking arrangements to be utilized in the event of snow storms; (whereas parking on Municipal roadways may not be permitted during such times).

- There was a concern that parking concerns will simultaneously arise as the overall density increases. Specifically, it appears that Developers will be required to provide on-site parking in accordance with prevailing provisions of the Residential Site Improvement Standards. However, consideration should also be given to providing visitor parking, perhaps even in excess of the RSIS Requirements.

- There was a concern that the Concept Plan appears to provide two parking spaces per unit in rear yard driveways. The demand appears to be 2.3 spaces per unit, and thus, there are 55 parking spaces which are not addressed, (i.e. via garages, etc.).

- There was a concern that Building # 270 and Building # 271 have a parking demand of 74 spaces, which is not addressed in the FMERA Concept Plan.

- There was a concern that the promenade walk-way will provide an attraction to others who are not residents – and who will therefore not have a sufficient / convenient space to park.

- There was a concern that parking for the potential promenade users must be appropriately addressed, perhaps even by reducing the size of the promenade complex (as the said area appears to be the only open space envisioned in Plan Amendment # 14).

Traffic

- There was a concern that in 2019, sound planning requires the review, analysis, and approval of a comprehensive Traffic Impact Report – and that no such Traffic Impact Report has been provided.

- There was a concern that the approval / implementation of proposed Plan Amendment #14 should not take place until such time as interested parties can comprehensively review the traffic situation, and underlying professional testimony associated therewith, so as to fully understand the nature / level of the proposed traffic, and the impact the same will have on the Borough of Oceanport and other host communities.

- There was a concern that the development envisioned in Plan Amendment #14 will clearly and undoubtedly create / place heavy traffic demands both in and around the Fort Monmouth site.

- There was a concern that fundamental fairness requires the preparation / review / approval of a comprehensive Traffic Impact Study/Report.

- There was a concern that the existing roadways simply cannot support the traffic impact associated with the development envisioned in proposed Plan Amendment #14 and the other anticipated redevelopment of the former Army base.

- There was a concern that in reviewing much less intense development applications (than that envisioned in proposed Plan Amendment #14), the Borough of Oceanport has nonetheless required the submission of a Traffic Impact Report, and that nothing less than the same is appropriate herein.

- There was a concern that the development (as envisioned in proposed Plan Amendment #14) will clearly have a regional impact on all of the host communities – and that review of a comprehensive Traffic Impact Report is an absolute necessity.

- There was a concern that, under typical circumstances, substantially less intense development would nonetheless require a submission and review of a comprehensive Traffic Analysis – and that the very nature of the proposed use mandates the review / approval of a thorough and comprehensive Traffic Report.

- There is a concern that a more thorough Traffic Study / Analysis (associated with the entire Fort Monmouth redevelopment) could lead to better coordinated traffic signal / traffic calming / traffic flow improvements.

- There was a concern that a comprehensive Traffic Analysis of the entire Fort Monmouth site (prepared by a qualified professional) might identify certain traffic / parking issues which need to be addressed / improved as part of the development process. (There was also a concern that the absence of such a Traffic Impact Report might prevent certain traffic issues / concerns from being identified and / or addressed.)

- There was a concern that the absence of a Traffic Impact Report might prevent the Borough of Oceanport and / or other host communities from ever recognizing the scope of the traffic / parking issues associated with the development envisioned in proposed Plan Amendment #14.

- There was a concern that the existing infrastructure limitations may impact the ability of the site to comfortably / safely accommodate various traffic / vehicular / pedestrian / public safety concerns, thereby further underscoring the need to successfully review / approve a professional and comprehensive Traffic Impact Report.

- There was a concern that a comprehensive Traffic Impact Report could clearly identify the nature / extent of the traffic impact associated with the development as allowed under proposed Plan Amendment #14.

- There was a concern that, given the heavily trafficked nature of the area, given the intensity of development associated with the Fort Monmouth site, and given the already approved / anticipated redevelopment, it would be professionally problematic to not formally review / approve an overall Traffic Impact Report.

- There was a concern that a comprehensive Traffic Impact Report could clarify, with certainty, that the existing / proposed roadways, and existing / proposed traffic flows, are sufficient, safe, and appropriate.

- There was a concern that the public health and safety could be compromised if the pedestrian / vehicular Traffic movements/flows were not more formally identified and reviewed within the context of a comprehensive Traffic Impact Report.

- There was a concern that a Traffic Impact Report should likely be received, reviewed, and analyzed by the FMERA organization, the Borough of Oceanport, the Oceanport Planning Board, as well as other Agencies having jurisdiction over the matter.

- There was a concern that, to the Board Members' collective knowledge, there has not yet been a formal traffic study prepared – but rather, only a Concept Circulation Plan – and that redevelopment of the Fort Monmouth site requires / deserves / demands a more formal analysis.

- There was concern that a regional traffic study needs to be prepared / addressed / analyzed, as the traffic patterns of the existing / proposed / approved uses do not reasonably compare with how Fort Monmouth functioned in the past.

- There was a concern that a piecemeal approach by Developers of finite/limited tracts does not address the microscale problem which is certainly looming.

- There was a concern that contributions for off-tract improvements (beyond each Developer's tract) will be necessary and will be required to be addressed right now, as the Fort site develops.

- There was a concern that off-tract improvements, like water and sewer improvements, would still need to be addressed now, as the Fort develops.

- There was a concern that it is just not appropriate to delay infrastructure improvements until the last parcel is sold/developed.

Municipal Services

- There was a concern that there has been no official or unofficial study / analysis of how proposed development (as envisioned under proposed Plan Amendment #14) would impact, and otherwise affect, the Borough's Police Department, Fire Department, Public Safety Offices, as well as other First Responders.

- There was a concern that, in the interest of public health and safety, the proposed regulations (as referenced in proposed Plan Amendment #14) should be more formally reviewed and vetted with the Oceanport Emergency and First Responders.

Density

- There was a concern about the overall density/intensity as envisioned in Plan Amendment # 14 (in conjunction with the redevelopment of the entire Fort Monmouth complex).

- There was a concern regarding the increased density / intensity, as envisioned in the overall redevelopment of the former Fort Monmouth complex.

- There was a concern expressed regarding the overall density of development (as envisioned under Proposed Plan Amendment #14).

- There was a concern regarding the number of overall residential units proposed for the former Fort Monmouth complex.

- There was a concern regarding the combination of increased building height, unit massing, and density, with a corresponding decrease in required setbacks – and how that the same appears to be contrary to the

established Reuse Principles of decreasing density from West to East. Specifically, while a mix of low (8 units per acre) and medium density (12 units per acre) is currently permitted in the Zone, Amendment # 14 looks to increase the overall density to 13 units per acre. There was a concern that the referenced increase in building height, and the connecting of more units in a building will further magnify the overall building mass of the development.

- There was also a concern that the increase in the size of the developable area (as envisioned in Plan Amendment #14) reduces the open space, especially the area in close proximity of each unit impermissibly - and that the same does not provide sufficient space for necessary outdoor residential activity, such as grilling, recreation, sports, and other social activities.

Open Space

- There was a concern regarding the lack of open space associated with the development envisioned in Plan Amendment #14.

- There was a concern that open space is essential for suburban development – and that Plan Amendment # 14 does not provide a sufficient amount of the same.

- There was a concern that the lack of open space (as referenced in the Redevelopment Plan and Amendment # 14) is more appropriate for a large City – but not for a suburban town such as Oceanport.

- There was a concern that the lack of open space at the site, the lack of recreation space at the site, and the excessive building / lot coverage could compromise the overall success of redevelopment efforts.

Setbacks

- There was a concern that the proposed buildings (as envisioned in proposed Plan Amendment #14) do not have appropriate / sufficient Setbacks.

Affordable Housing Units

- There was a concern that Plan Amendment # 14 envisions that all Affordable Housing Units will be exclusionarily located in two adjacent buildings (as opposed to being distributed throughout the entire development).

- There was a concern that placing all Affordable Housing Units in 1 or 2 designated areas / buildings will result in an improper concentration of Affordable Units.

- There was a concern that the concentration of all Affordable Housing Units in 1 or 2 clusters could potentially stigmatize the same, and/or the good people who will ultimately occupy the same.

- There was a concern that the concentration of all Affordable Housing Units in 1 or 2 clusters does not appear to advance the spirit or intent of prevailing of Affordable Housing Regulations.

- There was a concern that a more appropriate/even distribution of Affordable Housing Units throughout the entire complex would more appropriately advance the interests of the Affordable Housing occupants / program.

- There was a concern that the distribution of Affordable Housing Units throughout the entire complex will more appropriately advance the interests of the Borough of Oceanport.

- There was a concern that social / economic segregation of the Affordable Housing Units does not advance the interests of a modern / progressive society.

- There was a concern that social / economic segregation of all Affordable Housing Units may potentially compromise the ability of the Borough of Oceanport to satisfy the spirit / intent / letter of the prevailing Affordable Housing Regulations.

- There was a concern that a more even distribution of the Affordable Housing Units (throughout the entire development) might better advance the inclusionary goals / principles of Affordable Housing Regulations / ideals.

Stormwater Management / Grading / Drainage

- There was a concern that the Stormwater Management Impact, Grading, and Drainage concerns need to be more formally reviewed / identified / approved before the proposed Plan Amendment is adopted.

Environmental

- There was a concern regarding the environmental impact of development (as envisioned under Proposed Plan Amendment # 14) – and that some type of Environmental Impact Study should be satisfactorily reviewed/approved before the Plan Amendment is adopted.

Outside Approvals

- There was a concern regarding the need for the Monmouth County Planning Board to more formally review the matter (as the same relates to affected County Roadways, and the interplay of the State / County / Local Road System.

Miscellaneous

- There was a concern that while the FMERA Analysis may have concluded that the proposed Plan Amendment # 14 will have no adverse impact on the community, the Board respectfully inquires as to the professional testimony and evidence upon which such a conclusion was allegedly made.

- There was a concern that the Development Regulations as proposed materially infringe upon the existing Oceanport Zoning Regulations.

Findings

WHEREAS, in light of the above, the Oceanport Planning Board respectfully **Finds** as follows:

1. That while the Redevelopment of the Fort Monmouth property will continue to bring many challenges and opportunities to the Borough of Oceanport and other communities, and while different Boards / Agencies / host communities can, in good faith, engage in legitimate debate as to the most appropriate overall development vision, and in that the development (as referenced in proposed Plan Amendment #14) will definitely impact the Borough of Oceanport and other host communities, the Board finds that the general development review / approval process should not be compromised or expedited by the premature adoption of Plan Amendment #14, absent a satisfactory submission, review, digestion, and approval of the appropriate Planning / Engineering / Traffic / Environmental / Infrastructure information (as more clearly set forth herein).

2. That while recognizing and respecting the historic occupancy / intensity levels of the former Fort Monmouth Complex, there must be a recognition that the development (as envisioned under the Redevelopment Plan, including Proposed Plan Amendment # 14) is, understandably, and obviously, very different from what previously existed at the site and, as such, the same will have a long-lasting impact on the Borough of Oceanport and the surrounding communities.

3. That while recognizing and respecting the historic occupancy / intensity levels of the former Fort Monmouth Complex, the host communities have, over the years since the Fort Monmouth closure, undergone substantial changes as well, thereby further reinforcing the need for a more thorough / professional review / analysis of engineering / planning / environmental / traffic / parking / infrastructure reports / studies.

4. That sound planning mandates a more thorough analysis of the overall development impact as envisioned in Plan Amendment # 14 (by the satisfactory review of professionally prepared traffic / parking / environmental / planning / economic / infrastructure reports / studies).

5. That the development of the Fort Monmouth site (as envisioned under Proposed Plan Amendment # 14) will forever change the general landscape of the host communities– and that appropriate development should not occur without the benefit of a satisfactory and

comprehensive review of appropriate traffic / parking / environmental / planning / economic / infrastructure reports / studies.

6. That a more formal/public review of appropriate traffic / parking / environmental / planning / economic/ infrastructure reports / studies will result in a more appropriate and transparent development of the former Fort Monmouth site.

7. That more immediately anticipating, addressing, and planning for various traffic / planning / parking / infrastructure needs will ultimately facilitate and improve the overall development process.

8. That more immediately anticipating, addressing, and planning for various traffic / planning / parking / infrastructure needs will prevent future problems.

9. The more immediately anticipating, addressing, planning, and negotiating various traffic / parking / density / infrastructure needs will only strengthen the redevelopment process, and the resulting product.

10. That the Board hereby memorializes the aforesaid written comments/concerns and respectfully requests that the Borough of Oceanport petition the FMERA Board so as to obtain additional information / responses to the questions / concerns documented herein.

11. That the within Resolution and list of concerns is not designed to serve as an impediment or obstruction to progress – rather, the within Resolution is adopted to memorialize the basic truths that appropriate redevelopment should, and must, be effectuated in a thorough, well-reasoned, measured, comprehensive, and responsible format, with full recognition of the impact that any such redevelopment will have on the Borough of Oceanport and the other host communities.

12. That the Borough of Oceanport Planning Board respectfully requests the right to supplement the within Resolution after review of the aforesaid traffic / parking / environmental / planning / economic / infrastructure reports / studies.

13. That the Oceanport Planning Board remains committed to assisting FMERA and related Agencies in the pursuit of appropriate development / redevelopment of the former Fort Monmouth site – but that the same should be effectuated in a more thorough / measured / studied fashion.

14. That a certified true copy of the within Resolution shall, if deemed appropriate by the by the Borough Council of the Borough of Oceanport, be forwarded to the following:

A. FMERA.
B. The Borough of Eatontown.
C. The Borough of Tinton Falls.
D. The Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders.
E. The Monmouth County Planning Board.
F. And any other Agency having jurisdiction/input over the matter.

This resolution memorializes an action taken at the regular meeting of the Oceanport Planning Board held on February 12, 2019 on roll call that evening by the following vote:

Offered by: Chairman Widdis

Seconded by: Councilman Proto

ROLL CALL	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT	INELIGIBLE
Widdis	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Whitson	( )	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
Davis	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Proto	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Foster	( )	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
Kleiberg	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Halpern	( )	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
Kahle	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Savarese	( )	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
Tvrdik (Alt. 1)	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Motzenbecker (Alt. 2)	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )

This resolution was offered by Councilman Proto, seconded by Mr. Davis, and adopted on roll call by the following vote:

ROLL CALL	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT	INELIGIBLE
Widdis	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Whitson	( )	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
Davis	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Proto	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Foster	( )	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
Kleiberg	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Halpern	( )	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
Kahle	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Savarese	( )	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
Tvrdik (Alt. 1)	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Motzenbecker (Alt. 2)	(✓)	( )	( )	( )	( )

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Planning Board of the Borough of Oceanport at its meeting of February 26, 2019.

Jeanne Smith, Secretary

KEK/dmp
S:\KevinKennedyLaw\Municipal\Oceanport Planning Board\Ft. Monmouth Reuse & Developement Plan #14\Resolution.docx

MASER CONSULTING P.A.

Engineers
Planners
Surveyors
Landscape Architects
Environmental Scientists

Corporate Headquarters
331 Newman Springs Road, Suite 203
Red Bank, NJ 07701
T: 732.383.1950
F: 732.383.1984
www.maserconsulting.com

February 11, 2019

VIA EMAIL

Jeanne Smith, Planning Board Secretary
Borough of Oceanport Planning Board
315 E. Main Street
Oceanport, NJ 07757

Re: Proposed Amendment #14
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
Borough of Oceanport, Monmouth County, New Jersey
MC Project No. OPP-001

Dear Board Members:

Our office has received a draft of the proposed Amendment #14 to the Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan prepared by Phillips Preiss Grygiel, LLC, dated January 2019. The Amendment pertains to the 15-acre Lodging Parcel located in the Horseneck Center District of Borough of Oceanport. The tract is bordered to the north by the Parkers Creek and to the south by the northern section of the RPM Development.

The subject parcel currently contains Buildings 270, 271, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, and 365. Which presently totals approximately 184,207 sf of floor area. The Reuse Plan contemplates a 75 room, 70,000 sf boutique hotel and buildings 271 and 360 were to be reused for mixed income apartments. Building 270 was to be reused for supportive housing. Buildings 361, 362, 363, 364, and 365 were to be demolished

Amendment #11 pertained to the Allison Hall parcel and permitted office and commercial uses. It also swapped the boutique hotel from the Lodging parcel and in return transferred the residential units over.

Amendment #14 provides a zoning overlay to permit the demolition of Buildings 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, and 365. The only remaining buildings would be 270 and 271 which are to be rehabilitated into 37 affordable units. The remaining 148 townhouse units will be constructed in approximately 27 clusters. The Amendment proposes to permit several changes to the current Ordinance. The following appear to be the more significant changes from the current zoning requirements in parentheses and bolded.

- Each Townhouse building to permit up to eleven (11) units, **(8)**;
- Permit building height of 3 story/ 44' high **(2-1/2 Stories, 35' maximum);**

- Residential dwelling density maximum of 13 units/ac, with a maximum unit count of 185, **(medium density residential at 12 units/ac);**
- New structures require minimum front and side yard setbacks of 5' and 0' for individual townhouse lots, **(front setback 20-30', side setback 10')**;
- Permit to be located adjacent to a street with an 18' **setback (not permitted adjacent to a street, 20' minimum)**;
- Permit residential parking in the front yard setback;

The State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP) designates the area in question as a Metropolitan Planning Area (PA-1). The area is to "provide for much of the State's future redevelopment". The Amendment is consistent with the SDRP as it provides redevelopment in an area that has a good transportation network.

The current Zoning Map of the Borough of Oceanport designates this area of the Fort as R-1 Residential which permits single family dwellings, parks and playgrounds, Municipal buildings, library, and Public Schools. The Zone has a maximum permitted height of 35' and no floor area ratio requirement. The Borough's Master Plan amendment from 2008 entitled "From Fort to Village, a Vision of Oceanport's Fort Monmouth" envisioned this area as a river front resort not as residential. It shall be noted that the FMERA Land Use Rules supersedes the Borough's Zoning and Master Plan.

There are several issues that should discuss prior to the Board making recommendations to Borough Council.

1. The combination of increase in building height, unit massing and density with the corresponding decrease in setbacks appears to be contrary to the Reuse Plan principles of decreasing density from west to east. While a mix of low (8 units/ac) and medium density (12 units/ac) is currently permitted in the zone the Amendment looks to increase the overall density to 13 units/ac. The increase in building height and connecting of more units in a building further magnifies the building mass. The increase in the size of developable area reduces the open space, especially in close proximity of each unit, and does not provide space for normal outdoor residential activities as grilling, recreation, and outdoor socialization.

2. Parking concerns arise as density increases. The applicant will be required to provide on-site parking in accordance with the Residential Site Improvement Standards. Consideration should be given to providing visitor parking in excess of the RSIS requirements. The concept plan appears to provide 2 parking spaces in the rear yard driveways. The demand is 2.3 spaces per unit thereby there are 55 spaces that are not addressed. Buildings 270 and 271 have a parking demand of 74 spaces which is not addressed in the concept. The promenade walkway will provide an attraction to others who are not residents. Parking for these users must be addressed so as to not reduce the promenade complex size as this appears to be the only open space.

3. A regional traffic study needs to be addressed now as the traffic patterns of the proposed uses cannot be compared with the Fort as it functioned in the past. The piecemeal approach by developers of finite tracts does not address the macroscale problem that is looming. Contributions for off tract improvements beyond each developer's tract will be necessary and will require planning for now as the Fort develops, similar to the water and sewer utilities. One can not wait until the last parcel is sold to address this major concern.

Should you have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Very truly yours,

MASER CONSULTING P.A.

William H.R. White, III, P.E., P.P., C.M.E.
Planning Board Engineer and Planner

WHW/nb

\\Hqfas1\general\Projects\Opp\Opp-001\Letters\2019\190211_whw_smith_amendment#14.docx

BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT

Michael P. Kelly
Chief of Police
Michael S. Chenoweth
Captain
Michael Fagliarone
Lieutenant

POLICE DEPARTMENT

732.222.6300
Main
732.222.6301 ext 1015
Records
732.222.0945
Fax

P.O. BOX 370, OCEANPORT, NEW JERSEY 07757

To: Jeanne Smith, Oceanport Borough Clerk; Donna Phelps; Oceanport Borough Administrator
Mayor Jay Coffey, Oceanport Borough Council Members

CC: Captain Michael Chenoweth, Oceanport Police Department

From: Chief Michael P. Kelly, Oceanport Police Department

Date: February 18, 2019

Re: Police Department Review of FMERA Draft Proposal Plan Amendment #14

I, Chief Michael P. Kelly, along with my staff have reviewed the FMERA Draft Proposal Plan Amendment #14 which represents changes to the plan impacting a parcel within the boundaries of Oceanport known as the "Lodging Area Parcel". We present the following comments, questions:

1. The plan lists the development of up to 148 market rate townhouse units with each townhouse permitted to have up to eleven (11) townhouse dwellings per building. In regards to Buildings #270 and #271, the plan lists construction of a number of affordable housing units within these two buildings. What will be the total number of units within each of these buildings? A clear understanding of the amount of residential occupancy will be needed to identify how this will impact the operations of the Oceanport Police Department.
Any significant increase in population (employee increase or full-time resident increase) will require a need to increase police staffing. How much of an increase will be determinant upon:

A. An increase in call volume and the types of calls that officers are responding to.

B. The amount of time an officer(s) remains at, or investigates specific incident.

C. Strains on patrol functions due to directive patrols, additional call volumes, scheduling of officers to supplement patrols…etc.

A Plan of this size and scope will surely have an impact on the operations of the Police Department. The impact will be contingent on the amount of residents and the time frame that the units are occupied.

2. A traffic analysis/study would be required. The wording in the amendment under the Relationship to Reuse and Redevelopment Plan elements under the Traffic sub-heading, states, "*the creation of up to 185 residential dwelling units at this location may cause an increase in traffic over what was anticipated in the Reuse plan in this section of the Oceanport Reuse Area*". Based on my observations of the increase of traffic within the Fort since the opening of the County 537 spur, and experience as traffic safety officer, and impacts of growth related to traffic safety, a traffic analysis study would be required due to the increase of vehicle traffic and related pedestrian vehicle conflicts that would arise from the development of the Plan.

If anyone has any questions or clarifications in regards to what is listed here, please let me know.

From:	Buzz Baldanza
To:	Jeanne Smith
Subject:	RE: Time Sensitive - Request for Comments - FMERA Reuse Amendment #14
Date:	Saturday, February 9, 2019 10:38:42 AM

In my review, for that site, I do see an impact on the north side of the property from a Cat 1 storm. A Cat 2 storm would overtake the area. Using Sandy impact graphics, this area would have been impacted, covering a third of the area from the north side.

From: Jeanne Smith [mailto:JSmith@oceanportboro.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2019 1:17 PM
To: 'Kevin J. Hayes Sr. (khayes@longbranch.org)' <khayes@longbranch.org>; Michael Kelly-OPPD <mkelly@oceanportpolice.org>; 'Kendra Lelie (klelie@cchnj.com)' <klelie@cchnj.com>; 'William White (wwhite@maserconsulting.com)' <wwhite@maserconsulting.com>; FA Capt <facapt@oceanportboro.com>; Fire Chief <Firechief@oceanportboro.com>; O EM <OEM@oceanportboro.com>; 'rdbroege@jbslaw.us' <rdbroege@jbslaw.us>
Subject: Time Sensitive - Request for Comments - FMERA Reuse Amendment #14

Hi, everyone.

Thank you for the many responses received for Amendment #13. Attached please find a copy of the proposed **14th Amendment** of the Fort Monmouth Reuse Plan. As some of you may recall from previous plan amendments in the past, each of the host towns are to provide comments to FMERA on the proposed amendment. The Governing Body believes it is important to gather input from all facets of our community as a policy, which is why this is being sent to your attention.

This amendment represents changes to the plan impacting a parcel within the boundaries of Oceanport known as the "Lodging Area Parcel".

Please review and provide your comments back to this office by February 21, 2019. As there is a limited review period, it is imperative that responses are received by this date. Your comments will be reviewed and discussed by the Governing Body with a final response to FMERA based on all comments received.

Please let me know if you'd like a hard copy. Thank you!

Jeanne Smith, RMC, QPA
Borough Clerk
Purchasing Agent
Planning/Zoning Board Secretary
Borough of Oceanport
315 E. Main Street
Oceanport, NJ 07757
Tel: 732.222.8221
Fax: 732.222.0904

2019
PRESIDENT
Doris Agaman
VICE PRESIDENT
Frank Lippolis
TREASURER
Kim Carroll
SECRETARY
Gina Egidio
TRUSTEES
Carl Ceralde
John Connor
Frank Lippolis
Ed Ryan

Oceanport Volunteer
First Aid Squad
2 Pemberton Avenue
Oceanport, New Jersey 07757
oceanportfas@gmail.com

OFFICERS
CAPTAIN
Kathy Kenny
1st LIEUTENANT
John Connor
2nd LIEUTENANT
Maggie Lippolis
SERGEANT
Joe Lombardo

To: Jeanne Smith, Oceanport Borough Clerk; Donna Phelps, Oceanport Borough Administrator; Mayor Jay Coffey, Oceanport Borough Council Members

From: Captain Kathy Kenny, Oceanport First Aid Squad

Date: February 19,2019

Re: Oceanport First Aid Squad Review of FMERA Reuse Amendment #14

Oceanport First Aid has reviewed the FMERA Reuse Amendment #14 and we have the following comments, questions:

- The large number of units cause narrow roadways and alley ways between the units- this is a concern for emergency vehicles. A single lane of 18 feet may be fine for one way but 20 feet for 2 way is not enough.
- As noted on page 17 “the fort to village plan noted that the bulkhead along Parker’s creek could provide the opportunity to get people close to the water’s edge” If there is a water emergency how would emergency services access the area? Boat ramp? Trestle/bridge? height/clearance issue…
- Along Parker Creek area they are discussing building a promenade esplanade- how emergency vehicles access that area?
- They are talking about 3 story townhouses, a hotel, pool, clubhouse, recreational facility, classified as amenities what does that really mean? and how would EMS be able to respond to, access, fund responding to, acquire equipment and vehicles to multilevel facilities as well as the sheer numbers of people in the area.

- What exactly does a historic parade ground mean? Will this mean it will be rented out every weekend for different events? Who will be responsible for safety and emergency response?
- An athletic facility and recreational amenities is mentioned- what does that mean? College size? High school size? Pro ball size?
- What happens in the event of a storm where people have to be evacuated? EVERY waterfront area is being built up impacting the local wildlife, wetlands, and the ability for the area to maintain integrity in case of storm surge. How will this be addressed in terms of rescue and medical emergencies?
- Higher taller commercial residential properties are making it nearly impossible for emergency services to get patients down to an ambulance without further injury to patient or EMS personnel. Multiple injury circumstances could be devastating.
- 185 townhouses are being proposed to be built. How many bedrooms in each town house? What is the maximum number for the townhouses.
- Regardless of the areas currently being considered for development in the event of an emergency on any of the construction sites will emergency services, either fire or first aid, have easy access without delay, to the scene, unlike parts of Fort Monmouth that currently do NOT have easy access.
- What does permanent supportive housing mean?
- What is the estimated taxable space and what amount of the taxable income will be directly earmarked for the emergency services, specifically the first aid squad?
- What is the anticipated resident increase?
- Will there be elevators to the residential units above the market units? AND will they be emergency compliant to fit emergency equipment and personnel?
- How many floors will the hotel have?
- As Fort Monmouth is developed it is going to have a cost factor on both the town and emergency services. This has to be considered when asking us to do more with less.

Sincerely,

Kathy Kenny
Captain

KK:ge

Jeanne Smith

From: Kevin Hayes <khayes@longbranch.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 7, 2019 1:31 PM
To: Jeanne Smith
Subject: Re: Time Sensitive - Request for Comments - FMERA Reuse Amendment #14

As requested, I have reviewed the proposed 14th amendment of the Fort Monmouth Reuse Plan. From my perspective as Borough Fire Marshal, I have no issues with permitting the increase of residential development as outlined in the proposal.

Kevin J. Hayes, Sr.
Director-Department of Building & Development
Fire Marshal
City of Long Branch
732-571-5664

From: Jeanne Smith
Sent: Thursday, February 7, 2019 1:17 PM
To: Kevin Hayes; Michael Kelly-OPPD; 'Kendra Lelie (klelie@cchnj.com)'; 'William White (wwhite@maserconsulting.com)'; FA Capt; Fire Chief; O EM; 'rdbroege@jbslaw.us'
Subject: Time Sensitive - Request for Comments - FMERA Reuse Amendment #14

Hi, everyone.
Thank you for the many responses received for Amendment #13. Attached please find a copy of the proposed **14th Amendment** of the Fort Monmouth Reuse Plan. As some of you may recall from previous plan amendments in the past, each of the host towns are to provide comments to FMERA on the proposed amendment. The Governing Body believes it is important to gather input from all facets of our community as a policy, which is why this is being sent to your attention.
This amendment represents changes to the plan impacting a parcel within the boundaries of Oceanport known as the "Lodging Area Parcel".
Please review and provide your comments back to this office by February 21, 2019. As there is a limited review period, it is imperative that responses are received by this date. Your comments will be reviewed and discussed by the Governing Body with a final response to FMERA based on all comments received. Please let me know if you'd like a hard copy. Thank you!

Jeanne Smith, RMC, QPA
Borough Clerk
Purchasing Agent
Planning/Zoning Board Secretary
Borough of Oceanport
315 E. Main Street
Oceanport, NJ 07757
Tel: 732.222.8221
Fax: 732.222.0904

BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT

DEPARTMENT OF FIRE **2019** CHIEF PAUL VANBRUNT

OCEANPORT HOOK & LADDER CO.
EAST MAIN ST.

PORT-AU-PECK CHEMICAL HOSE CO.
OCEANPORT

OCEANPORT FIRE POLICE 315
NEW JERSEY 07757

1ST ASST. MICHAEL LIPPOLIS

2ND ASST. RICHARD GALLO III

Proposed 14th Amendment Feedback

1. Will there be sufficient hydrant access, and more-importantly, capacity, to adequately supply worst-case incidents? What are the proposed types of connections for hydrants and FDIC connections at buildings?
2. Will any of these townhomes out of the proposed 185 units be ADA compliant? Ramps? Fire Alarms? Sprinklers?
3. Will access to buildings be large enough to accommodate and fit multiple pieces of apparatus adequately? Narrow streets with residential parking on both sides are already poised to be a challenge when incidents (will) occur at Liberty Walk/East Gate. Will there be parking lots?
4. Accessibility issues regarding elevator use (size of elevators), as well as the First Aid Squad being able to fit stretchers and equipment. How will police, EMS, fire access buildings? Will there be key card access or strictly physical keys for all buildings via a Knox-Box?
5. What type of construction will the proposed buildings be? (Fire Resistive, Non-Combustible, Ordinary, Heavy Timber, Wood Frame, or a combination) In addition, will modular construction be utilized? Fire stops?
6. Will these buildings have fire sprinkler/suppression systems, and to what extent? Fire pumps? Separate pump house?
7. Will the proposed promenade provide emergency access to the waterfront? Ramps? Access gates? Drafting out of the river capabilities when hydrant water is not sufficient?
8. Will this hotel/spa house any chemicals on site? Pool chlorine?
9. Will these new townhomes be able to withstand storm surges, flooding, and built on the proper elevation being so close to the waterfront?

These are some of the obvious questions that come to mind. The emergency services should be included in the conversation during all phases of the on-going construction process.

Sincerely,

Oceanport Fire Department Chiefs

Tonight we will be discussing Plan Amendment 14 from FMERA. This amendment is right on the heels of Plan Amendment 13. It certainly seems that FMERA is on a mission to cram as much high density and urban construction as they can into the Oceanport section of Fort Monmouth. Urban and Density are terms you will be hearing about a lot.

Plan Amendment 14 calls for 148 for sale townhouse and 37 affordable rental units to be crammed into a 15 acre parcel. It is yet another example of Bruce Steadman's utter disdain for our zoning laws and contempt for Oceanport's right to local control over our own development.

Plan amendment 14 allows the developer to build their townhouses 44 feet high. Our ordinance permits a height of 35 feet. It allows for 3 stories of living space. Our zoning allows for 2 stories. Setbacks are virtually non existent. Density is increased by 40% over the allowable amount. And most egregious, the affordable rental units are lumped into 2 buildings and segregated from the for sale units. In addition to the aforementioned, they are seeking a PILOT or tax break from the borough.

The planning board approved a 15 page resolution outlining their objections and concerns that include infrastructure, height, density, parking, traffic, impact on municipal services, setbacks, the affordable component, stormwater management and environmental. The full resolution is part of the agenda for those that want to read in greater detail. Our planner and engineer have expressed the same objections and concerns as the planning board.

At a recent meeting between Bruce Steadman, Somerset Development, the Mayor, our BA and myself, I expressed my concerns about the size and scope of this project. I also expressed my concern that the power of the planning and zoning board is being usurped by FMERA. I was told in no uncertain terms by Bruce Steadman that he didn't care and this was the project they are going with. There is a process at the planning board if someone needs to go outside our restrictions. It's the process of applying for a variance. In this process, the applicant must demonstrate a hardship and the board needs to exercise good judgment when granting a variance. In the case of Somerset Development, their only hardship is that they want to sell their units at the highest possible price, Now, I have no issue with

that. They are in business to maximize profit, but our roles as elected officials is to make sure that doesn't come at the expense of our town.

The counter arguments in favor of this project will most likely be 1) its over at the fort, nobody will see it; 2) the more they sell the houses for, the higher the ratables for the town; 3) the fort will be oceanport the city and we will be oceanport the suburb. I've heard these arguments and I don't agree with them. We can't stop the development at the fort but maybe we can stop the over development of it. If not, at least we should try. If anyone sitting up here can in good conscience support what we've seen from FMERA in plans 13 and 14, then I honestly don't see the need for either a planning or zoning board.

While we continue to fight for our town, FMERA can plan all the bus tours they want. FMERA is charged with replacing the jobs lost at Fort Monmouth. This development, when finished, will create 1 full or part time job. Yes 1. But don't worry, there is a $1500 penalty to the developer if they don't create that job. I'm not making this up. It comes directly from FMERA.

In my opinion, Bruce Steadman is not interested in doing what is best for Oceanport. He is interested only in getting as much money for the land and in his own job security. That is it! If you don’t believe that, I suggest when you go on his bus tour, you ask him to drive you to the nearest bridge he has for sale.

Councilman Robert Proto

March 7, 2019

Councilman Joseph Irace
Plan Amendment #14 Comments
March 7, 2019

As we are faced with yet another FMERA Fort Monmouth Plan Amendment, the propaganda machine lead by Bruce Steadman continues to pump out false narratives and half truths. Mr. Steadman's comments to the media that Oceanport knew about Amendment 13 back in September 2018, when they met with an Oceanport ad-hoc committee of who knows who, allows FMERA to wash their hands of any further obligation to notify Oceanport's elected representatives.

Perhaps I should refresh Mr. Steadman's memory. In December 2018, Mayor Coffey, Councilman Proto, our Administrator Donna Phelps and I met with FMERA to discuss Fort Monmouth redevelopment in Oceanport. This was some three months after Mr. Steadman claims Oceanport knew about any proposed plan changes by New Jersey City University. Yet, at our December meeting, there was no mention at all. I can't help but feel that Mr. Steadman and others at FMERA deliberately misled and failed to disclose any of this to your elected representatives. I have a guess as to why. Perhaps, Mr. Steadman feels that the less we know, the better the chances that things sail through without any objections. Why else would he fail to disclose this information?

Now on the back of a misguided Amendment 13 which still has not been changed, contrary to popular belief, we are handed another amendment which will permanently change the landscape of Oceanport, and not for the better. The Oceanport Planning Board did a fantastic job in showing everything that is wrong with this plan. This group of volunteers did a great job in defending Oceanport and trying to maintain our quality of life while keeping our town a great place to live.

I don't want to belabor the points made by the Planning Board but I want to reiterate the concerns of past councils who have insisted on inclusionary affordable housing rather than putting all 37 affordable, rental apartments in two buildings. Not our vision of Oceanport.

Also in comparison with another townhouse development we have had in town, Kimberly Woods, we see how dense and misguided this Amendment 14 is. I'm sure most of you have seen Kimberly Woods. Did you know that there are 120 units there at a density of 5.5 per acre? Amendment 14 is asking for 13 per acre. That is high density in any definition and not in keeping with the character or our Oceanport. Did you know Kimberly Woods is 30 feet high? That's 5 feet below our Borough height limit of 35 feet and well below the amendment 14 plan which calls for a staggering 44 feet. The developer of Amendment 14 is proud to call this a new urban planning development but I would like to remind him and FMERA that we are not an urban city but rather a suburban borough and we'd like to stay that way!

Currently, Oceanport is comprised of mainly single family homes, with a few townhomes and even less rental apartments. Why is it that every development, every single one proposed by FMERA, consists of high density townhomes or rental apartments? Not one single family home has been proposed despite that being the lions share of what we currently have in Oceanport. Again, one wonders why nothing being proposed by FMERA fits in with the character of Oceanport.

I urge this council to once again take a strong stance against this ill advised plan and in the strongest terms possible voice your opposition to FMERA control over Oceanport's future and I ask all our residents to show up at the FMERA meeting of March 20th and tell Bruce Steadman and the FMERA Board to follow Oceanport's planning and zoning laws and keep Oceanport, Oceanport!

RESOLUTION OF THE BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT
AWARDING CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES
TO MASER CONSULTING FOR ASBESTOS ABATEMENT AND DEMOLITION

Resolution #2019-74
03/7/19

WHEREAS, the Borough of Oceanport is a duly organized Municipal Corporation (hereinafter referred to as "Borough") having principal offices at 315 E. Main Street, Oceanport, New Jersey 07757; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for the Borough to obtain professional engineering services for the preparation of an asbestos survey, preparation of plans and bid specifications and construction administration services associated with the asbestos abatement of Buildings 901, 918, 977, and 983 and demolition of structures 918 and 983 within Fort Monmouth.; and

WHEREAS, the services to be provided are deemed to be "professional services" pursuant to the Local Public Contracts Law (N.J.S.A. 40:A 11-1, et seq.) and

WHEREAS, the Local Public Contracts Law authorizes the awarding of a Contract for "professional services" without public advertising for bids, provided that the Resolution authorizing the Contract and the Contract itself, are available for public inspection in the Office of the Borough Clerk and that notice of the awarding of the Contract is published in a newspaper of general circulation in the Municipality; and

WHEREAS, Maser Consulting has submitted a proposal dated February 20, 2019 to provide professional engineering services for the preparation of an asbestos survey, preparation of plans and bid specifications and construction administration services associated with the asbestos abatement of Buildings 901, 918, 977, and 983 and demolition of structures 918 and 983 within Fort Monmouth totaling $81,575.00 and having considered the matter, the Borough now wishes to authorize the Borough's Engineer, Maser Consulting to perform these services.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Borough Council of the Borough of Oceanport as follows:

1. That the Borough of Oceanport has awarded a Professional Service Contract to Maser Consulting as Borough Engineer for 2019 and the work to be performed will be consistent with their existing contract and a proposal for engineering services dated February 20, 2019 for professional engineering services for the preparation of an asbestos survey, preparation of plans and bid specifications and construction administration services associated with the asbestos abatement of Buildings 901, 918, 977, and 983 and demolition of structures 918 and 983 within Fort Monmouth.
2. That the compensation associated with the proposal shall not exceed $81,575.00.
3. That the within Resolution shall be subject to the Borough CFO confirming that funds are available for the stated purpose.
4. That the Borough Clerk shall publish a notice of the award in the LINK News and the resolution and contract shall remain on file in the Borough Clerk's office.

CERTIFICATION OF FUNDS

As required by N.J.A.C. 5:34-5.1 et. seq., and any other applicable requirement, I, Catherine D. LaPorta, Chief Financial Officer of the Borough of Oceanport certify that funds are available in the Account #04-215-55-474-007, not to exceed $81,575.00 for the above referenced professional services contract.

Catherine D. LaPorta, CFO

RESULT:	**ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Robert Proto, Councilman
SECONDER:	Richard Gallo, Councilman
AYES:	Deerin, Gallo, Irace, Proto, Solan
ABSENT:	O'Brien

I certify that the foregoing Resolution #2019-74 was adopted by the Oceanport Governing Body at the Regular Meeting held March 7, 2019

JEANNE SMITH, RMC
BOROUGH CLERK