1. (The meeting commences at 5:44 p.m.)
2. CHAIRMAN PESTANA: We'll call the meeting to order.
3. Everyone please rise to salute the flag.
4. (The Pledge of Allegiance is recited.)
5. CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Call the roll.
6. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Bado not present. Commissioner Dellabella not present.
8. COMMISSIONER DORAN: Here.
9. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.
10. COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Here.
11. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack.
12. COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Here.
13. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.
14. COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Here.
15. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti.
16. COMMISSIONER MARTINETTI: Here.
17. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Peneda.
18. COMMISSIONER PENEDA: Here.
19. MS. RAMOS: Chairman, we have a quorum with seven board members present, two not present.
20. CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Counselor?

2.

3. ALSO PRESENT:
4. MARY-ELLEN GILPIN, HCIA
5. JAMES POLICASTRO, HCIA
6. MICHAEL O'CONNOR, HCIA
7. MICHAEL COMBA, HOBOKEN STRATEGY GROUP
8. JEFF LANIGAN
9. TED DOMURACI
10. DAN KNITZER
11. MICHAEL COHEN

4. MR. NETCHERT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is a public meeting. Notice of tonight's meeting was forwarded to the Jersey Journal and the Star-Ledger for publication in those newspapers, and, in fact, were published in the newspaper on May 29th, 2019. Notice was also forwarded to the Clerk of the County of Hudson and Clerk of the Hudson County Board of Freeholders for posting on their respective bulletin boards. And finally notice was posted on the bulletin board outside of this meeting room and on the Authority's website. These notices are all in compliance with the requirements of Open Public Meetings Act.

5. CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Thank you. Okay. So at this time, we'll call for approval of the minutes of the last meeting. Do we have any motions?

6. COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Motion.
7. COMMISSIONER DORAN: Second.
8. CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Motion by Commissioner Goldsack, second by Commissioner Doran.
9. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran.
10. COMMISSIONER DORAN: Aye -- yes.
11. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.
COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Abstain.
MS. RAMOS: Okay. Commissioner Goldsack.
COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes.
MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.
COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes.
MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti.
COMMISSIONER MARTINETTI: Yes.
MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Peneda.
COMMISSIONER PENEDA: Yes.
MS. RAMOS: Chairman Pestana.
CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes.
MS. RAMOS: Resolution Number 6-2019-4 and Resolution 6-2019-5, as amended, pass with seven board members voting yes, two not present.
MR. GUERRA: Item Number 6, Resolution Number 6-2019-6 of the Hudson County Improvement Authority authorizing an agreement with Counseling Care Associates, LLC, to provide employee assistance program to Authority employees. Care Counseling has been providing for our program for the past few years. They have been most responsive to our employees and continue to demonstrate the compassion needed when counseling our employees. The contract is a renewal, the same terms and conditions as the expiring contract. I recommend the contract be awarded to Care Counseling in the annual amount of $5,220 for a period beginning July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2020.

Number 6-2019-4 of the Hudson County Improvement Authority ratifying payment of certain costs and expenses of the Authority for the month of May 2019.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Can we do June as well?
MR. GUERRA: Item Number 5, Resolution Number 6-2019-5 of the Hudson County Improvement Authority authorizing payment of certain costs and expenses of the Authority for the month of June 2019.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Are there any motions authorizing payment for May and June?
COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Motion.
COMMISSIONER PENEDA: Second.
CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Motion by Commissioner Goldsack, second by Commissioner Peneda.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran.
COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes.
MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.
COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes.
MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack.
COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes.
MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.
COMMISSIONER PENEDA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes.
MS. RAMOS: Resolution 6-2019-6 passes in the affirmative with seven board members voting yes, two not present.
MR. GUERRA: Item Number 7, Resolution
6-2019-7 of the Hudson County Improvement Authority authorizing renewal of an agreement to provide governmental affairs consulting services and inter-local agreements for shared services with the County of Hudson, Hudson County Community College, and Hudson County Vocational-Technical School with Winning Strategies Washington, LLC.

They have been working in conjunction with the entities I mentioned. They’ve been working with the various County departments on the 2019 federal agenda budget hearings. They’ve been keeping the County abreast as to the appropriations. There’s a number of programs such as CDBG, the homeless assistance, the Ryan White, and many other programs that they’ve been working on for those other entities.

The resolution before you authorizes its renewal. Again, it’s the same terms and conditions. It’s a one year contract, it’s $8,000 per month, which, again, is shared equally by the three entities. And I recommend the contract be renewed with Winning Strategies as noted in the resolution.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Any questions?

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: All these entities contribute to the $8,000?

MR. GUERRA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: That includes Hudson County, County Prep also?

MR. GUERRA: It’s the Schools of Technology, that organization. It’s the community college and it’s the County of Hudson.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Any other questions?

Any motions?

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Motion.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Motion by Commissioner Goldsack.

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Second.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Second by Commissioner Lorenzo.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti.

COMMISSIONER MARTINETTI: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Peneda.

COMMISSIONER PENEEDA: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Chairman Pestana.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Resolution 6-2019-7 passes in the affirmative with seven board members voting yes, two not present.

MR. GUERRA: Item Number 8, Resolution 6-2019-8 of the Hudson County Improvement Authority authorizing the renewal of property casualty insurance for the Skyway Golf Course to the Scirocco Group. Selective Insurance sort of specializes in golf course insurance, has been providing coverage since the opening. The increase, I believe it’s in the amount of $920, is primarily due to a slight increase in the rate.

The expiring premium was $41,875. This renewal is $42,795. I recommend the renewal -- renewal of the contract in the amount of $42,795 for the next year.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Any questions?

Motions?

COMMISSIONER PENEEDA: I’ll make the motion.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Second.
13 | board on May 8, 2019, in accordance with the
2 | provisions of N.J.S.A. 40A:5A-7 with respect to
3 | issuance of County-guaranteed pooled notes.
4 | Again, the matter relating to the pooled note
5 | program and issuing of such notes. And we have
6 | the received positive findings on this matter.
7 | The resolution before you confirms that it’s been
8 | reviewed by the Board.
9 | CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Any questions?
10 | Motions?
11 | COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Motion.
12 | COMMISSIONER DORAN: Second.
13 | CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Motion by
14 | Commissioner Goldsack, second by Commissioner
15 | Doran.
16 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran.
17 | COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes.
18 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.
19 | COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes.
20 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack.
21 | COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes.
22 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.
23 | COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes.
24 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti.
25 | COMMISSIONER MARTINETTI: Yes.

14 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Peneda.
2 | COMMISSIONER PENEDA: Yes.
3 | MS. RAMOS: Chairman Pestana.
4 | CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes.
5 | MS. RAMOS: Resolution 6-2019-10 passes
6 | in the affirmative with seven board members voting
7 | yes, two not present.
8 | MR. GUERRA: Item Number 11, Resolution
9 | Number 6-2019-11 authorizing the execution of an
10 | agreement by and between the Hudson County
11 | Improvement Authority and the Hudson County
12 | Schools of Technology regarding certain services
13 | related to the Authority’s design-build agreement
14 | with Terminal Construction Corp.
15 | This has to do with the chilling and the
16 | cooling tower, which is part of the system. The
17 | purpose of the agreement is to be providing
18 | funding to the school, who in turn, will enter
19 | into an agreement with a company called EMCOR to
20 | provide for the warranty services. This agreement
21 | with the school requires funding to be dedicated
22 | for that purpose only. So the warranty services
23 | for a ten year period is $73,619.
24 | So we will do a contract with the
25 | school, provide them with that money, from the pot

15 | of funds we have and they will be required to use
2 | it strictly for that maintenance agreement.
3 | Ted Domuracki is with us, if you have
4 | any questions. I think that pretty well sums it
5 | up.
6 | COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: This is the
7 | company that put in the chiller or this is a
8 | different company?
9 | MR. GUERRA: This is Ted Domuracki,
10 | he --
11 | MR. DOMURACKI: We got proposals from
12 | three firms. This was a requirement after we put
13 | in the application for paper for permits in order
14 | to get the rebate and it’s a fairly large rebate.
15 | One of the consultants at the state added this
16 | requirement, based on our final approval to get
17 | the rebate.
18 | So as you recall, your approved the
19 | micro turf for 119,000 about four months ago.
20 | This was an additional ask for maintenance for a
21 | ten year contract to get approval to pay for the
22 | performance rebate. It was over $500,000.
23 | MR. GUERRA: And while Ted is touching
24 | upon that, we did receive -- we’re going to
25 | receive the check, but we have been notified that

16 | we’re going to be receiving approximately 500 --
2 | MR. DOMURACKI: $580,000.
3 | MR. GUERRA: And $80,000 under that same
4 | program. And we also were just given another
5 | award, along with the school, for LEED Gold. And
6 | that was by the United States Green Building
7 | Association.
8 | MR. DOMURACKI: So the rebate that we’re
9 | going to get for the micro turf, which is 120. So
10 | the total rebate we’re going to get is about 580,
11 | plus 120.
12 | COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Ted, my
13 | understanding from the previous meeting we had was
14 | that if we’re going to get the rebates and credits
15 | for this, we had to have some guarantee that there
16 | was upkeep and maintenance, and that we would be
17 | providing that?
18 | MR. DOMURACKI: What we did was make
19 | sure that we put it in escrow, so that we didn’t
20 | pay a ten-year fee up front, but rather we’re
21 | paying it ten years, each year, tentatively.
22 | COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Right. But it’s
23 | really maintenance and regular upkeep.
24 | MR. DOMURACKI: Yes, it’s a maintenance
25 | and repair, which is a good thing for the school.
CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Any other questions?

Any motions?

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Motion.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Motion by Commissioner Goldsack, second by Commissioner Doran.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martineatti.

COMMISSIONER MARTINEATTI: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Peneda.

COMMISSIONER PENEIDA: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Chairman Pestana.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Resolution 6-2019-11 passes in the affirmative with seven board members voting yes, two not present.

MR. GUERRA: Item Number 12, Resolution 6-2019-12 passes in the affirmative with seven board members voting yes, two not present.

MR. GUERRA: Item Number 13, Resolution 6-2019-13 of the Hudson County Improvement Authority authorizing the redirection of non-processible solid waste generated within Hudson County from the Keegan Landfill to the solid waste transfer owned and operated by Advanced Enterprises Recycling, Inc., in Newark, New Jersey, for disposal.

As I'm sure most of you are aware, under our solid waste management plan, Keegan Landfill has been our designated facility for what's known as Type 13 waste, which is construction, demolition, and bulk waste. Over the past few years, they have been in litigation, there's been a lot of litigation surrounding the landfill and the New Jersey Sports Authority. I'm sure you've seen the press regarding the odors emanating from the landfill.

In 2019, the town filed a complaint and order to show cause in Superior Court to seek to close the landfill. By the order issued on May 24, the Court ruled that it had to close immediately. We, on an emergency basis, redirected a little bit of Type 13 that goes to Keegan to our facility that accepts our Type 10 because they are permitted to accept two types. And I had been in contact with the DEP at that time.

The purpose of this resolution before you was to provide for that authorization for the redirection. Since then, on May 31st, the Superior Court Appellate Division ordered the landfill to be reopened. So we've -- so what we did is we redirected our waste back to the Sports Authority for now.

However, we handed out a resolution that
replaces the one that was in your packet. So we
don't have to go through this again because I have
a feeling there's going to be more flip-flopping.
And this provides me with your authorization to
make that determination, as it happens, on an
emergency basis.

So the one in your packet isn't the one
you're acting on, it's the one that I handed out
tonight. And there's just one added clause at the
very end that in the event of an emergency, I can
authorize the waste to go to the other facility.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Norm? This may be
a question for Mr. Netchert. We passed a
resolution in Harrison recommending opposing the
landfill and supporting the efforts of Keeney in
doing so, only because I can't describe to you how
on different afternoons, I could not go out in my
backyard and work on the garden or do anything, it
was just that bad. I mean literally sickening.
I've also a chest cold for the last month and a
half and we can't figure out why. But it really
is bad, the smell. And we know regards to where
it's coming from, I guess the question I'm asking
you is would it be appropriate for me to be
abstain on this particular vote?

MR. NETCHERT: If you feel you prefer to
abstain, you can. There's no need for you to
abstain.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Even though we
passed a resolution at the council?
MR. NETCHERT: This is a resolution
authorizing your director to take care of the
waste --

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Gotcha.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: I get it, not
necessarily a position taken.
MR. GUERRA: And may I add for the
long-term, our Type 10 -- DART is designated in
accordance with the County Solid Waste Management
Plan and the Safe Solid Waste Management Act as
our designated facility for Type 10, and Keegan
was for 13.

So in an emergency, we're doing that.
But we're also working on our bid specs because
they expire the end of this year -- next year --
MS. GILPIN: June.
MR. GUERRA: Middle of June. So when I
go out to bid, I'm going to put both types of
waste because we don't know what's going to happen
with Keegan. And at some point, the DART or
whoever our designated facility is for Type 10
will probably be taking our Type 13. So this is
just that short-term.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Okay.
COMMISSIONER LORENZO: But I would think
he would abstain, since he took a stand in
Harrison against the landfill and the thing,
that wouldn't it be conversial of him to make a
vote on something, like, similar to this, even
though this was in litigation?

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Right.
MR. GUERRA: That's what --
MR. NETCHERT: The answer was this
resolution really is not contrary to the
resolution that Harrison has adopted and passed
against the Keegan Landfill. This is authorizing
the director to --

COMMISSIONER DORAN: It's got to go
somewhere, this is directing him.
MR. NETCHERT: Right.
COMMISSIONER LORENZO: I get it.
CHAIRMAN PESTANA: This is a resolution
for you to redirect. But do we know about the
other types, 27, where that is going or --

MR. GUERRA: We did that notice, Mayor,
13.
MS. GILPIN: 13 and 27.
MR. GUERRA: 27 is --
(Unreportable cross-talk)
CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Now, it goes to
Keegan. But I'm hearing something interesting
that Mary-Ellen was told today having to do with
grits.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes.
MS. GILPIN: According to -- I checked
with the people at DART. And they cannot accept
grits and screenings. But the DEP said that grits
and screenings are not currently classified, they
have no classification. So, therefore, they don't
fall under our waste flow at the moment. They're
working on a classification, the DEP, for grits
and screenings.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: I'm sorry, what are
grits and screenings?
CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Grits and screenings
is material that settles in your treatment plan or
sewer lines, like the road debris that may have to
be cleaned out. It used to go to Keegan and, you
know, that was part of the issue.
But related to what DEP said, I got
clarification on that as well a few months ago.
And if it's after the pretreatment process, it is
not -- it is classified as something else, but
it's not -- it can't go to Keegan. So we were
like up in the air as to where to take this stuff.
So we were in limbo.

MS. GILPIN: We're in limbo on it still.
I think until they classify it, but at this
point --
(Unreportable cross-talk)
CHAIRMAN PESTANA: We're going to
SpectraServe, but, you know, we're paying more
money.

MR. COHEN: Right.

MS. GILPIN: Yeah.

MR. O'CONNOR: Just for the record, the
last discussion was between Chairman Frank
Pestana, Director Mary-Ellen Gilpin, and Norman
Guerra. And it was related to the colloquially
termed grits and screening.
CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Any other questions
or motions?

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Motion.

---

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Second.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: We have a motion by
Commissioner Goldsack, second by Commissioner
Lorenzo.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti.

COMMISSIONER MARTINETTI: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Peneda.

COMMISSIONER PENEDA: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Chairman Pestana.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Resolution 6-2019-13 passes
in the affirmative with seven board members voting
yes, two not present.

MR. GUERRA: Item Number 14, Resolution
6-2019-14 of the Hudson County Improvement
Authority authorizing the fourth amendment to the
purchase and sale agreement with Morris Kearny

---

Transit negotiation and the eventual taking by
Transit of our property, which is expected to take
place on June 21st of this year, a slurry wall
issue, a whole bunch of other DEP issues.

And the fourth amendment would require
that upon execution of that right of extension,
that the purchaser pay an additional $150,000.
That $150,000, we have agreed to credit toward the
purchase price.

So to date, we have received the
$700,000 deposit, the $450,000 extension fees,
approximately $70,000 in reimbursement for
professional fees paid to the appraiser for the
condemnation that we're going to take place on the
both the Kearny side and the east side of the
property. Yes, it is. And, you know, I guess we
can cross our fingers and hope that we will close
prior to that date.

We will be coming to you with a fifth
amendment, not extending the contract, but
amending certain of the terms of the purchase and
sale agreement, shifting some of the obligations
and/or responsibilities, removing some of the
obligations and/or responsibilities of the
parties, dealing with security by the purchaser of
the Authority after closing and things like that.

Am I covered, Mike?

MR. O'CONNOR: I think so.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Questions? Any motions?

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Motion.

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Second.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Motion by Commissioner Goldsack, second by Commissioner Lorenzo.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti.

COMMISSIONER MARTINETTI: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Peneda.

COMMISSIONER PENEDA: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Chairman Pestana.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Resolution 6-2019-14 passed.

in the affirmative with seven board members voting yes, two not present.

MR. O'CONNOR: So just because of the circumstance that we are recording this with suboptimal equipment, I’d ask -- the next item will have a presentation by our professionals.

This is a video presentation, so if we -- obviously with the question and answer, if we could keep it to one person at a time in a Q and A, just so that it's easier for the transcriber ultimately to pick everybody up, if possible.

MR. NETCHERT: Should we say the name of the person?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes. Hopefully, again, the person -- I'm sorry, I forget her name, the person who is the regular court reporter will be the one that will transcribe this, and she's generally familiar with everybody's name and terms.

But I think I've been doing that here, but I think it may be more give and take, if there is, just to do that, that's all. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: So we should be recognized if we --

MS. RAMOS: State your name.

clicks, etcetera. We met with all the respondents, one of them had dropped out and that was The Grove.

The County had formed a selection committee to evaluate and make a recommendation to this Board. The committee consisted of Graig Guy, chief of staff; Mira Prinz-Arey, Jersey City Council Member; Ward B; Brian O'Reilly, an employee of the Authority; Tom Deleo, the County Parks Director; and Marion Rogers, who is a Jersey City West Side community member.

The project team met with the committee, we reviewed and discussed the submissions. There were follow-up interviews, we met with not only -- we met with the committee and the respondents to evaluate everything. The criteria used was broken down into three points, demonstrate the experience of the respondent, proposed use of the facility, and incorporation of the community use in the new facility.

Since then, they have made a recommendation. What we're going to do now is I'll ask Mike Cohen and Mike O'Connor will hit the button on that presentation or Kurt. If you want to grab that, Kurt, all you got to do is click and...
it will start. It's all set up.

I also gave the members of the Board a copy of the PowerPoint because there's one section that might be a little hard to read as Mike -- that's really the most important section of all.

Mr. Cohen: Thank you, Mr. Guerra, and good evening, Commissioners. This is just a short PowerPoint that basically summarizes many of the points that Mr. Guerra just made. That we put out an RFP in early February and received responses at the end of March.

Again, as noted, three responses were received originally. One dropped out and we were left with two companies that were interested, Landmark Hospitality and Liberty Prime.

We put together a chart, a comparison chart of the two respondents. This is information that is after all of our meetings and discussions, it summarizes basically their final response. And it gives you a little idea of both of the similarities and the differences between the two responses.

Basically, building size, Liberty Prime approximately 26,000 square feet versus Landmark, approximately 24,000 feet for the whole building.

The footprint, which is an important element, which is looking down on it on the site, 10,200 square feet versus 11,800 square feet for Landmark. You can see their architects that they each used.

And then there's a listing of kind of the significant elements of each facility, the restaurant, the meeting rooms, the kitchens, the bars, and the lobby. A comparison of basically sizes and the numbers of each of those. I think one of the interesting things here -- they're relatively similar, neither one is twice the other, they don't have half of both, the number of rooms or size. They're basically showing a very similar type facility.

The next slide, again, it's a couple more of the elements. Number one, which was an element that a lot of people were concerned or interested in, which was the rooftop. One of them, Liberty Prime really just showed some balconies outside the meeting halls, while the other one shows quite a large use of the roof with a balcony or a rooftop venue, a bar and a lounge, if you will.

Parking was one of the significant issues that came up quite a bit in the discussions, in their submissions. They did change their kind of approach, as we went through this. As anyone, and I think a lot of us here have been to the Casino in the Park over the years, parking is an issue. There's relatively little parking around the building and in the park. Depending on what's going on, it can be a challenge to find parking. And they both dealt with it.

They originally dealt with it in different ways and they came back with kind of different solutions. But in the end, they actually both came back with a very similar solution, which was, in effect, to make the building footprint -- that earlier element we talked about, the building footprint smaller to open up more space on the ground, on the site proper. So they both could fit between 70 and 80 cars right on the site. That's not enough for the whole event, but it does take a good chunk of cars into account. The rest will be dealt with around in the parking various spots.

The next thing that you see is -- and this is a number that they didn't provide, but our
several of. As opposed to Landmark, which has quite a collection of restaurants and similar type facilities throughout the state or throughout the region, several in New York and several else in New Jersey. The Boathouse at Mercer Lake, the Stone House at Stirling Ridge, the Liberty House obviously here in Jersey City, among others. So one has quite a few facilities versus the other which has one main facility.

The last element on the comparison chart is their incorporation of the local community into their thinking, into their response. And both of them were actually very good at responding and saying that they want to be involved with the community, they want to get folks involved, they want to get the employment opportunities out to folks in the area. They were both very responsive and very positive in that regard. So really nothing to choose from there.

So that kind of gives you an idea of the elements that the selection committee used to make this selection. Those were the main points.

The other thing we have here, which is next -- well, again, Mr. Guerra mentioned to you this was the evaluation makeup of the evaluation committee.

And again, as noted, these were the basic three criteria for their selection. Their experience, what they were proposing, the facility they were proposing, and the extent or how they incorporated the community into the facility.

So based on that, they have recommended that the Authority negotiate with Landmark Hospitality to try to work out a long-term lease to the property, based on, again, their excellent experience and qualifications, the facility that they proposed, and their interest in working with the community.

The other thing they did submit, we thought we would show you quickly, are some of the concept drawings. Again, these are not final architectural drawings, but these are concepts that they came up with. This again is the footprint we talked about. By making it a little smaller and moving it over to one side, you see they were able to get quite a bit of parking on -- this is actually a smaller footprint than the building that's out there.

MR. GUERRA: But that's two and a half stories.
1 look at those areas of concern, to see the value
2 of them. And we are working -- we will be working
3 with the operator to try to work with them on
4 their design to try to incorporate this into it.
5 One other thing to be said, Mike, the
6 County has also -- is willing to provide up to $6
7 million towards this project for what's known as
8 the core and shell. The core and shell will be
9 clearly identified, of course, during the design.
10 And the operator will be required to pay for
11 everything else, all the interior, finish,
12 equipment, kitchen, everything else, elevators.
13 So what will happen next is the County's
14 formed a -- is forming a negotiation committee,
15 who will sit and negotiate a long-term lease with
16 Landmark. Landmark will do the construction
17 themselves, they'll pay for the design, they'll
18 pay for all that. But our engineering firm and
19 mass construction will work with them on the
20 project.
21 So what you're asked here tonight is to
22 accept the recommendation of the selection
23 committee. And that will permit us to begin
24 negotiations with Landmark for a long-term lease.
25 Mr. O'Connor, did I miss anything?
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1 MR. O'CONNOR: I think that's it. The
2 only other thing that I would add is back in --
3 back last year, the Authority entered into a lease
4 with the County related to the facility. It was a
5 30 year lease. But because of the time interm
6 and the fact that the County is now pledging
7 significant capital amount, the $6 million, we'll
8 have to -- the County will have to amend that
9 lease by action of the Freeholder Board. And then
10 we'll come back to the Board here to execute a
11 sublease with the respondent.
12 COMMISSIONER DORAN: What's the current
13 state of the Casino in the Park, I know at one
14 point it was --
15 MR. GUERRA: It's closed. We inspect it
16 every single day, we put in an alarm system, it's
17 completely vacated. And once we have a signed
18 agreement and probably once we actually get the
19 permits to start, just before we start
20 construction, independent of this contract, the
21 County is going to pay have it demolished.
22 COMMISSIONER DORAN: Okay. So pretty
23 much taking --
24 MR. GUERRA: Yes, yes.
25 COMMISSIONER DORAN: Other than whatever
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1 they --
2 MR. GUERRA: Other than trying to
3 salvage possibly a couple sections.
4 COMMISSIONER DORAN: It's probably
5 cheaper to build a look-a-like.
6 MR. GUERRA: It's one of the options, we
7 call it replicate. We try to replicate something
8 that was there.
9 CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Do we have a motion?
10 COMMISSIONER DORAN: Motion.
11 CHAIRMAN PESTANA: We have a motion by
12 Commissioner Doran.
13 COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: I'll second.
14 CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Second by
15 Commissioner Goldsack.
16 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran.
17 COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes.
18 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.
19 COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes.
20 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack.
21 COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes.
22 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.
23 COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes.
24 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti.
25 COMMISSIONER MARTINETTI: Abstain.
All in favor? Aye. Meeting adjourned. Thank you.

(The meeting was concluded at approximately 6:30 p.m.)
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