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(Agenda)
Resolution 186-2017, resolution approving the settlement agreement with Intervenor, the $S$. Hekemian Group, LLC to partially resolve the Borough's affordable housing declaratory judgment action.

The motion.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: So move.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Second.
MAYOR GHASSALI: We have a discussion and before we go through a discussion invite our special Counsel, Mr. Jeff Surenian to make few comments and then we'll open it to the public for public comments which normally, with resolutions, we don't do but we will do for this one. And then the Council will have their comments and then we will vote on this resolution.

Mr. Surenian is our Special Counsel.
MR. SURENIAN: My name is Jeff Surenian. I'm from Jeffrey R. Surenian \& Associates. My law firm is located in Brielle, New Jersey. We represent municipalities all over the State. We represent probably over 60 municipalities. I would venture to say we represent more municipalities than any other
two law firms combined.
This is all we do. We do it all over the State. We're only involved with representing the municipalities. We only represent them on affordable housing matters.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: I'm sorry to
interrupt. Excuse me. But, Mr. Surenian, is there a way that you can kind of direct your face and voice out to our audience?

MR. SURENIAN: Hello.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Yeah. Not that your back isn't attractive.

MR. SURENIAN: I don't want to offend you but if that's okay...

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Okay.
MR. SURENIAN: My name is Jeff Surenian and, as I indicated, my law firm is in Brielle, New Jersey. We represent only municipalities only on affordable housing. We represent them all over the State.

What's before this town tonight is they need to make a decision on a matter that's been around for awhile involving a possible settlement with the Hekemian Group.

Mount Laurel matters are very difficult and this
matter has been difficult as well. But at the end of the day what, what needs to happen is your elected officials need to make a judgment about what's best for your community. And often times the impulse is to say no and fight, fight, fight. But there are
consequences to how a town votes. And a -- and so I think that a town could just say no and have, have no consequence would be a grave mistake.

If, if this case doesn't settle, the town is looking at full scale litigation. And that litigation could forever impact your community.

If you were my sister, if you were my brother, I'd say make this deal because the consequence of not making the deal is you force the developer to come at you full scale and the laws are toted against you in the Mt. Laurel venue. The Supreme Court has set up a body of law that is set against you. You have a fair share housing center in this case which is very aggressive, is either going to be, help you settle this whole case or is going to team up with the developer and make your life very significantly different and significantly impact the town.

So I'm recommending the settlement. The settlement involves 350 units on the Mercedes sites, the two Mercedes sites and on, and on the Glen View
site. It's a total of 350 on both sites. It's a 15 percent set aside.

The affordable units on the Mercedes site will be for sale. The affordable units on the Glen View site, there is only nine, would be either rental or for sale. They don't know yet. It all depends on where the market shapes up.

This case is part of a larger case where the town is trying to get approval of a plan to meet all of its obligations but the developer has been at this a long time. The developer is frustrated as is the town and the developer's position is, look, if this deal is not going to go through then we're just going to come to litigation and let the chips fall where they may.

As someone that is in the trenches every day and fights these every day, $I$ just got through a 41 day trial on, in Mercer County on one aspect of what's the Fair Share formula. It's extremely expensive and very difficult litigation.

So I would rather this town spend its money on things that benefit the community than on my law firm and on other experts. It's a better use of your money.
So, the -- there are also economic consequences
to how the sight gets developed. If it gets developed the way it's proposed in the settlement, it would be a substantial non-residential component that would generate ratables. If this goes into the war zone and the whole site is developed for residential, it will have the opposite consequence. So even from that narrow perspective of the, of the economics of the community and, and the tax consequences of the community, this is more beneficial than a project that would be a hundred percent residential.

You know, as I said, we came in at the tail end and had we come in any earlier, $I$ don't know if it would have been any different. Frankly, I think your attorney, Joe Boyd (phonetic), did a good job in negotiating this. But we're at a point, we're at a day of reckoning where a choice needs to be made.

So it is my recommendation that this town adopt this, this agreement, move on and try to wrap up this whole Mount Laurel issue so you can take control of your community. If you don't do that, I'm afraid you're going to lose control.

There is, there is applications for immunity that we have to periodically make and what will happen in that setting is we'll make an argument that the, that the court should keep us insulated from Mount

Laurel suits and in the litigation mode the developer would make their argument that we should lose immunity. Heaven forbid you lose your immunity.

There is a case called J. W. Field versus Franklin where 11 developers brought suits against the town, the town lost control. You don't want to be in that, in that position.

You don't want to suffer that risk. What you want is you want to try to put this to bed on the best terms you can get which are the terms in front of this council right now and move on and settle the other piece of this case and get this behind you.

2025, when that comes around, we'll see what the world looks like at that point. But right now you're at a crossroads and at a critical point in the evolution of your community. You have a beautiful community and $I$ encourage you to maintain control of it.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Jeff, can you talk to the difference between the one that we voted down on June 27 th and this one?

MR. SURENIAN: Yes.
As you know, there was a vote on a similar project but not the identical project recently. The agreement that is before the town tonight is far
preferable than the one that was before the town that it voted down. And the difference is the agreement that the town voted down, it was the community that bore the financial risk that the hundred percent affordable project on Glen View would be funded. And there's a lot of risk involved with that.

If, if you can get funding, you can minimize your risk but if you don't get funding what happens in these cases is a court requires you to commit to bond to cover the gap in financing. The difference between this project and, and the project that was voted down is you don't have that risk in this project because the developers are required to build the units and integrate the affordable units through the project. So that's another very significant benefit to this project compared to the one that you had before.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you, Jeff.
At this point $I$ open the meeting to the public for your, for the questions and comments to, try to limit it to five minutes and then we'll come back to the council if we have any questions to the council.

Motion to open the meeting to the public.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: So move.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Second.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Vote.
(Aye)
Members of the public who wish to speak, step up to the podium.

MR. SURENIAN: I'm sorry. I misspoke.
The affordable units on Mercedes are rental, the affordable units on Glen View are either to be rental or for sale.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Your name, please.
FEMALE SPEAKER: I'm sorry. All are
rental on Mercedes Benz? Every single one, 360 ?
MR. SURENIAN: It's a rental project, yes. The affordable, affordable units, the affordable units are, are rental on the Mercedes site.

FEMALE SPEAKER: What about the rest of
these?
MAYOR GHASSALI: Your name, please. Your name, please. Your name.

MS. FERRARA: Renee Ferrara, on Montvale Terrace in Montvale.

Well, $I$ guess my first question now is directly to that, so the affordable units on Mercedes are rental.

What about the rest of the units?
MR. SURENIAN: So there, there, under the, under the agreement there would be a total of 308
units on Mercedes-Benz, there would be affordable units associated (inaudible).

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: We can't hear you.

MR. SURENIAN: Is this live?
Okay. On the Mercedes-Benz site there would be a total of 308 units. Those would all be rental, both the market rate and affordable and on the Glen View site it would be 42 total units either for sale or rental for both and nine of those would be affordable. So on the other site you would have 44 affordable.

MS. FERRARA: And has anyone tried to negotiate that some of those be ownership versus rental?

MR. SURENIAN: So, as I said, as to Glenview, they would be either rental or for sale. And as to the remaining portion of the site, yes, we did try to negotiate it, A.; and, B., there's a significant benefit to having rental as opposed to for sale. You get --

MS. FERRARA: (Inaudible) so let the -MAYOR GHASSALI: Let him finish, please.

MR. SURENIAN: You get a one-for-one
credit. You have a quota you have to meet. For every rental unit you do as opposed to for sale you get two-for-one.

MS. FERRARA: What is that? Right now are you prepared to enter into the settlement? Do you know our quota?

MR. SURENIAN: This will not dispose of that portion of the litigation.

MS. FERRARA: So basically if this is approved the only thing that happens is Mr. Hekemian is no longer in the action that he was just brought into a couple weeks ago? That's it? It doesn't satisfy --

MR. SURENIAN: Consequence -- okay. So, so this is the situation. Your total number, the Fair Share housing center, is 779 .

MS. FERRARA: And what were our numbers?
MR. SURENIAN: Our expert is around 550 .
MS. FERRARA: That's Econsult?
MR. SURENIAN: That's Econsult, that's
correct. Just let me, just let me finish.
If we settle with the Fair Share Housing Center which is what we are anticipating if we can wrap up the agreement with Hekemian and wrap up the agreement with Cornwrap (phonetic) which is not on for tonight, we would be well-poised to enter into a settlement with the Fair Share Housing Center. If we entered into a settlement with the Fair Share Housing Center
we would be able to negotiate 30 percent off their number.

So their number would be our number were we to litigate.

So the cost of litigating fair share which could cost you over a half million dollars, you would be able to, if you decide that, you can settle with Fair Share Housing.

MS. FERRARA: And if you went to trial are you forced to use Econsult or don't you have a right to obtain any expert you so choose.

MR. SURENIAN: The matter you are ending up with Econsult $--\quad$ j just went through a 41 day trial in Mercer County. There is no other expert out there that has done a fair share formula that could defend it in, in court.

MS. FERRARA: What town is that, the 41 day?

MR. SURENIAN: The 41 started out with a number of Mercer County trials. And by the end of the case it was down to two municipalities, Princeton and West Windsor.

MS. FERRARA: So the towns in Mercer
County joined forces?
MR. SURENIAN: They joined forces.

MS. FERRARA: And they collectively shared in the -- (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: That's right. That's right.

And that has not happened in Bergen.
And as far as, as far as $I$ know, what's happening in Bergen is Judge Toskos is making Park Ridge, for example, litigate Fair Share issues all by itself. So it's an enormous cost to the citizens of Park Ridge.

MS. FERRARA: Well, are they making the Fair Share -- are they making Park Ridge or did Park Ridge so choose? (Inaudible)

MR. SURENIAN: My understanding from that is the judge did not do what $I$ would have wanted him to do which was to make, you know, spread the cost around. He's making Park Ridge do it alone is my understanding.

MS. FERRARA: So what is Darlene Greene's (phonetic) numbers at the Fair Share plan.

MR. SURENIAN: She's working with -- look, there's going to be a number (inaudible) --

MS. FERRARA: I just want to know her number.

MR. SURENIAN: She doesn't have her own
number. She works off the Econsult number.
MS. FERRARA: Well, she had a fair share plan in 2015.

Right?
MS. FERRARA: With an RDP of 15.
Right?
MR. SURENIAN: Those numbers all change.
MS. FERRARA: But, but the question then becomes where is, where are those changes because the public has a right to see the numbers and the numbers that we see are in the 2015 Fair Share Plan --

MR. SURENIAN: Yeah.
MS. FERRARA: -- that, that was a very long time ago, before Mr. Hekemian purchased the property.

MR. SURENIAN: Wait. So hold on. You are (inaudible) two different things.

So there's a fair share, right. There's a Fair Share Housing number. Darlene Green didn't come up with the Fair Share Housing number. In 2015 or at any point after that, those numbers were on the table that I just articulated to you.

MS. FERRARA: So what is Darlene Greene's
numbers? (Inaudible) our Fair Share Housing plan. MR. SURENIAN: She's working with -- look,
there's going to be a number.
MS. FERRARA: I just want to know her number.

MR. SURENIAN: She doesn't have her own number. She works off of Econsult's number.

MS. FERRARA: Well, we had a Fair Share Housing plan in 2015.

Right?
MR. SURENIAN: Well --
MS. FERRARA: With an RDP of 15.
Right?
MR. SURENIAN: Those numbers all change.
MS. FERRARA: But, but the question is, then becomes, where are those changes because the public has a right to see the numbers and the numbers that we see are 2015 Fair Share Housing Plan.

MR. SURENIAN: Yeah.
MS. FERRARA: That (inaudible) have been
struck a very long time ago is before Mr. Hekemian purchased the property.

MR. SURENIAN: So hold on. You are conflating two different things. So there's a Fair Share Housing, there's a Fair Share Housing number. Darlene Greene didn't come up with that.

The Fair Share Housing number in 2015 or any
point after that those were the numbers that were on the table that were just articulated to you. RDP is, RDP, realistic development potential is an adjustment to those numbers but the residual portion of the obligation remains. It's called eminent need. It leaves you exposed to developers in your community. MS. FERRARA: So, for example, Darlene Greene says RDP of 15 which is basically a recommendation, you need to build 15 and then the residual is your unmet need that may be built in the future but you don't have to develop it today.

Correct?

MR. SURENIAN: So the RDP is a product of vacant land. Right. So you take -- I don't want to get too far down this road but --

MS. FERRARA: I think the public needs you to go down this road because, unfortunately, a lot of people do not understand this and we are told, a lot of either $I$ don't know or you don't get it. $I$ get it. I have read it all. I know what I'm talking about.

And to go back to my question was anyone negotiating a deal back in 2015 when the RDP was 15 and there was potential for future unmet need and maybe a developer would come in and maybe build on some overlay zones.

MR. SURENIAN: Right. Okay. So RDP is a very fluid number. That No. 15 that you keep referring to was, was not endorsed by the court. It's not like it was a COAH number. It had never been litigated.

So in these settlements you take your number of vacant, underutilized sites, you apply presumptive density to it and you assume a 20 percent set-aside.

That sounds very simple but in fact it's not particularly when you have redevelopment sites.

The Supreme Court in the infamous case, the Cherry Hill decision said, if you have a change in circumstances you have to reopen that RDP calculation --

MS. FERRARA: Okay.
MR. SURENIAN: -- and when and if it
happens and you have developers who are proposing, they're not vacant, that's a change of circumstances, your RDP goes up --

MS. FERRARA: That's why you should have settled before this.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Excuse me. Your time is up. Your time is up (inaudible). We will go around. MS. FERRARA: (Inaudible).

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Excuse me.

MS. FERRARA: Their own, there
(inaudible) .

MALE BOARD MEMBER: That's why there's --

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Can I -- someone
else's settlements - -

MAYOR GHASSALI: Finish your --

MS. FERRARA: A couple other questions.
So are there any trials that you're aware of
that moved forward in Bergen County?
MR. SURENIAN: No. My understanding is
what trial is coming up is Park Ridge.
MS. FERRARA: Okay. But they don't
actually have a trial date.
Right?
MR. SURENIAN: I don't believe they have a
trial date.

MS. FERRARA: Okay. Do we have a trial
date?

MR. SURENIAN: We do not have a trial date.

If this thing blows up, the developer is going to ask for a trial date.

MS. FERRARA: Of course. When is our immunity extended until?

MALE SPEAKER: October 31.

MS. FERRARA: When was it extended,
recently?
MR. SURENIAN: Yes.

MS. FERRARA: One thing that $I$ think the public needs to understand are the numbers, all people here are, you either give Mr. Hekemian everything he wants or you will get hit for a thousand units.

What basis do we have for that?

Are you relying solely on what, relying solely on this South Brunswick trial that you had tried?

MR. SURENIAN: No.

MS. FERRARA: So what is the basis for the litigation, Judge Toskos --

MR. SURENIAN: We didn't try South

Brunswick. We tried Mercer.

MS. FERRARA: Okay. You are the attorney of record on the decision, Judge Wolfson?

MR. SURENIAN: No. I was not. I
challenged Judge Wolfson's decision which is another matter altogether.

MS. FERRARA: You
represent South Brunswick?

MR. SURENIAN: Not in that trial. I
represent them now challenging Judge Wolfson's right
to make those decisions but I did not represent South Brunswick in that trial.

MS. FERRARA: Is that on appeal?

MR. SURENIAN: No, it's not on appeal because the case is, still hasn't reached a final judgment yet.

MS. FERRARA: Okay. Are there any other towns in New Jersey, besides South Brunswick, that have reached that stage of litigation?

MR. SURENIAN: The closest one is Mercer. We're awaiting a decision of Judge Jacobson. The trial ended mid June and $I$ would expect that we'll have a decision by the end of the year.

MS. FERRARA: So basically three out of the 565 towns have voted (inaudible) so far.

MR. SURENIAN: Well, even now in the South Brunswick case it was one town was at trial. In the Mercer case, it was for all the Mercer county towns.

In the Bergen case, right now, it's just one town, Park Ridge.

MS. FERRARA: Okay. What is the basis for anyone's belief that Judge Toskos would order that 1,000 units be built on the Mercedes-Benz property?

MR. SURENIAN: I, I have never said that Judge Toskos would order 1, 000.

What $I$ would say is in the trial it is possible that Judge Toskos is going to order that you satisfy your obligation and we could have such a large RDP that you would have to use that site to evade the chance -- if that site was slated for development it would be all residential. There wouldn't be a mix of non-residential and residential because the developer could say $I$ want to use all of my site for residential. And we'd be fighting for a thousand, we would be fighting for a lower number. It would be a lot more than 350 .

MS. FERRARA: And if it were more than 350, there would be no commercial aspect.

Right?
MR. SURENIAN: Right.
MS. FERRARA: So it's not necessarily that the (inaudible) it's either a thousand apartments or 370 apartments plus a bunch of retail, hotel and those other things. It's really something more in the hundreds, something above 300 less than a thousand but no commercial.

MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. SURENIAN: So, so, yeah. I mean it's 350, first of all, and a thousand but when you say a thousand that's only Mercedes-Benz. There was also

Glenview, so it's really a thousand fifty, what it shakes out to, what it translates out to, what it ends up costing in litigation between 5, 600, a thousand, whatever we negotiate down that is, yes, the proper way to think of this is all residential versus mixed use, apples to apples or --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: (Inaudible)I would expect in litigation, residential to 1,000 or lower density and we're now in the judge's hands. (Inaudible).

MS. FERRARA: How many were (inaudible) on Mercedes Benz?

MR. SURENIAN: I don't know the number offhand. I'm guessing 22, 25, something like that.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: 23.

MR. SURENIAN: The engineer indicated 22
acres so $I$ was in the ballpark.
MS. FERRARA: Okay. How many units are you proposing per buildable acre?

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MR. SURENIAN: What, what's it now, 350
units between the developer -- well, there's only 308 on Mercedes so 308 divided by 22 --

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: 308 divided by 22 .

MALE BOARD MEMBER: (Inaudible).
MALE SPEAKER: 14 units an acre on
developable property.
MR. SURENIAN: 14 units an acre on
developable property.
MS. FERRARA: So the 350 building
(inaudible) on the 22 acres or is the commercial part the 22 acres you're talking about?

MR. SURENIAN: The commercial is probably
22 acres.
MS. FERRARA: So how many acres is
reserved for the 350? (Inaudible)
MALE BOARD MEMBER: I don't know if we got
the plans (inaudible).
MR. SURENIAN: You have a concept plan.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: Actually (inaudible) plan.

MS. FERRARA: So it's not 14 actually units per acre because within 22 that you have (inaudible) commercial.

MR. SURENIAN: Yes.
MS. FERRARA: Okay.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: Commercial (inaudible)
residential. I think -- I'm not the developer. But one would thing, the reasoning is residential above
commercial (inaudible).
MS. FERRARA: Shouldn't we notice (inaudible) prepared to enter into a settlement? MR. SURENIAN: We -- there's been a concept plan. We've been presented that concept plan before. It's been -- it was here before, you know. MS. FERRARA: Okay.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Do me a favor, let's hear from more people and then you can come back again. I promise you.

MS. FERRARA: Sure.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Anybody else?
Good evening.
MR. BUCKNER: Good evening. My name is Dan Buckner, (phonetic) Cole Schotz. I don't have a problem with anything that was said today. Everything is a hundred percent accurate and I'm sure the business implement is the right thing to do.

The problem $I$ have is that the number of housing that's being forced upon us keeps going up. And some developer comes in, picks a piece of land and forces us to be right in this situation where we are now.

So, I, I don't see how this is ever going to stop if we continue to give in to the developer and after developer, after developer and $I$ think we should
in (inaudible) with Park Ridge before that idiot Toscos decides to kick in and allow that to happen. I don't know how he could do that, frankly. It seems to me if two towns have the same problem why shouldn't they be able to litigate it together.

MR. SURENIAN: There, there is something that is significant about what you said that I'd like to respond to about, you know, how does a community take control so that it's not beholding to any developer that comes along. And the answer to that question is you try to get this case to the point where there's a final judgment.

In the Mount Laurel case the final judgment is called the Judgment of Repose and it is that judgment that you use to try to defend you if other developers come along. It's possible that there may be changed circumstances even after you get a final judgment and you have to deal with the developer. But if you have that Judgment of Repose in hand, that's a very powerful weapon to insulate you from any developer that would try to leverage you.

And even under that circumstance, if you had to recalibrate your number, the Judgment of Repose would entitle you to decide how to meet that additional number. It would not give the developer the leverage.

That's why you want to get this case settled, you want to get it to the point where it's settled with everyone and the judge enters an order and says, I declare you have satisfied your obligations to 2025.

MR. BUCKNEL: To 2025. Thank you. In seven years we'll be right back here talking (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: That, that is the nature of this beast.

MR. BUCKNEL: That's, that's my point. The beast is not going away. It's just pushing you off into the future.

MR. SURENIAN: Look the one thing that $I$ would say to you is I'm shocked that there hasn't been Mount Laurel legislation, you know. The realtor is, the legislature, if you want to change the structure of the laws right now which every 10 years you get a new number and you have to deal with it.

MR. BUCKNEL: Well, maybe we need to be a little more (inaudible). I don't know what the answer is, is here. But as far as I'm concerned, the developer is going to come in, maybe you should be outside and not let him come in.

I don't know. It just seems to me it's got to stop at some point.

MR. SURENIAN: Well, I think what you need to do is you need to get ahold of the situation in front of you right here right now. And unless you want to be part of a larger movement to change the laws of the state I'm all for it. I think that the laws are unreasonable. I think we have come a long ways from what was ever intended.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you, Jeff.

MR. BUCKNEL: Thank you.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello. How are you. My
name is Anne (inaudible) and I live on (inaudible)
Road. What $I$ am here (inaudible) about getting figures, started asking non rentable units. First 308 and then there's another --

MR. SURENIAN: Let me give you the
numbers.
FEMALE SPEAKER: SO --

MR. SURENIAN: Hold, hold on. I wrote the numbers down.

FEMALE SPEAKER: That's okay. (Inaudible) about.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: (Inaudible).
FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. With that --
MR. SURENIAN: Yeah. Let me, let me
repeat it again. The 350 is a number on both sites, Mercedes and Glenview.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Total?

MR. SURENIAN: 350 is total count.

FEMALE SPEAKER: 308.

MR. SURENIAN: Let, let me just finish
this. You are getting confused. Let me clarify that. 350 is the total number on both sites.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Total combined numbers.

MR. SURENIAN: It's everything.

FEMALE SPEAKER: 350 that's real
definitely (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Hear me out. Let me just finish.

MALE SPEAKER: Let him finish.

MR. SURENIAN: 308 on Mercedes.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Um-hum.

MR. SURENIAN: 42 on Glenview. The split from market to affordable on Mercedes 264 market, 44 affordable. The split from market to affordable on Glenview, 33 market, nine affordable. Okay.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Are they all rentals?

MR. SURENIAN: The Glenview site is either going to be for sale or for rent. We don't know yet.

The Mercedes site is a rental project.

FEMALE SPEAKER: So you're going back to the numbers $I$ just gave you. The 308 are definitely rentals.

MR. SURENIAN: That's my understanding. FEMALE SPEAKER: All right. So can, just can I mean (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Okay.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Okay.

FEMALE SPEAKER: The only thing you start out by saying -- I did a calculation -- there was going to be 14 units per acre not including the commercial. So we're talking approximately four stories?

MR. SURENIAN: I believe that's the case. FEMALE SPEAKER: What are the -- how many bedrooms are the units? How is this (inaudible) how many legalities (inaudible) I am very aware of (inaudible) schools so how many bedrooms are going to be (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: The, the affordable units there's a formula that the developer has to comply with. No more than 20 percent of the affordable units can be three bedroom units and $I$ believe that it's no
more than 20 percent can be one-bedrooms and then the rest can be two-bedrooms is I believe where the numbers come out on the affordable.

FEMALE SPEAKER: The average is
two-bedrooms?

MR. SURENIAN: Whatever that -- I don't know exactly what the average is but it's always 20 percent three-bedrooms that the formula requires and I believe there's a 20 percent limit on how many one-bedrooms.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) pretty much even and then the rest would be --

MR. SURENIAN: Yeah. That's what I would anticipate.

FEMALE SPEAKER: So that is a very likely (inaudible) on our school system because is that something we need to consider because you're saying 2025 (inaudible) our Housing Center in 2025 (inaudible) and again between what you said here --

MR. SURENIAN: You have twice as many residential units on that site at the end as you do now it's (inaudible) impact.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Correct. And we don't have the room for that.

MR. SURENIAN: Unfortunately, they can't
go to the court and say our schools can't take it, reduce my number. That's not part of the law.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I understand that but, again, (inaudible) my numbers and I'm thinking financially we're paying for the (inaudible) as well. MR. SURENIAN: Yeah. Well, it's a, it's a fair consideration. You have every right to, to be concerned about that and that is a concern that, that we, as a community, would have in trying to limit to the extent we can the total number of units.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you. (Inaudible). Good evening.

MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Mayor. (Inaudible)
road.

I have a question. You said 350 units to be used as affordable total. The Board is (inaudible) Mayor and Council voted on it their resolution tonight, $I$ have a copy of the resolution (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Right.
MALE SPEAKER: It says the (inaudible) 70
units. So if the council was going to vote on this I would like --

MR. SURENIAN: Let me, let me -MALE SPEAKER: Excuse me. Could I finish?

MR. SURENIAN: Sure.

MALE SPEAKER: To match your numbers so that we're not approving 70 units instead of (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Okay. Let me explain.
There is a different standard that's used to determine the set-aside from the standard that's used to determine what's called the RDP that the site would generate. The standard that's used to used to determine the RDP for the site is 20 percent of the units. That's why the resolution says 70. That's why it has to say 70. We're getting 53 units but what those 53 units are is the rental units so those units will be eligible for a rental bonus. And it is possible that we'll end up with even more credits than 70 as a result of the rental bonus.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay. My suggestion (inaudible) because there is the nothing in the resolution that the council is going to vote on tonight that says 53 units rental (inaudible) sale. (Inaudible). It just says 70 .

My feeling is when you vote on something the number that you're approving or denying should equal the same number.

MR. SURENIAN: I'll take another look at
the resolution before the vote is taken and if there's any issue with it, I'll make sure it's correct. The RDP attributable to the site is 70 , the number of units that will be generated by the project is 53. To the extent --

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: To the extent that that's not clear in the resolution, I am providing you my personal assurances and I'll make sure that it's clear.

MALE SPEAKER: Will it be (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Yes. That's what I just said.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
(Inaudible)

MR. SURENIAN: Okay. You know, you know, let me just get to this. I, I'm thinking I have a follow-up comment to the comment $I$ just said about the RDP The RDP, if there's 350 units is 70. Heaven forbid that the developer got a thousand units, the RDP for this site would be 200 units. So, so (inaudible).

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: So one of the values of this settlement is it fixes the RDP attributable to
the site. So it facilitates your ability to get certainty on the adjustment to which you are entitled to. It's very significant because whether your RDP is 200,400 or 73 is, is determines what -- how much of an adjustment you have and how much you have to do so it is, so it is extremely important and valuable that that RDP be fixed at 70 and essential and non severable condition of the agreement is that the court rules that we get is only 70 unit RDP from that site not a bigger RDP.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi.
MR. SURENIAN: Hi.
FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) I wanted to clarify -- I understand set 20 percent of the affordable (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: There's not a limit on the market. The Mount Laurel laws don't limit the bedroom mix on the market.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)I'm asking about what's in the proposal. (Inaudible)

MR. SURENIAN: There's just a concept plan at this point. There's, there's not a specific number of bedrooms as far as, as far as $I$ know.

FEMALE SPEAKER: And the (inaudible).
MR. SURENIAN: Well, there's an ordinance.

The ordinance will be introduced. It will then be up for a hearing at which point it will be a hearing on the ordinance and once it's adopted it will set the standards but it's not going to limit bedrooms. It's going to limit things like height, setbacks, bulk, all those kinds of things.

FEMALE SPEAKER: So there is
(inaudible) developer (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: It, it always is up to the developer. I'm not aware of any, of any case where someone limited the bedroom mix on the market units.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I personally think Mr.
Del Vecchio is doing a fine job (inaudible) representing the Borough of Montvale.

MR. SURENIAN: I am. And if you were my sister, $I$ would tell you to make this deal.

MAYOR GHASSALI: (Inaudible).
MS. MORRIS: Morris (inaudible) Road. You
talked about there is some favorable agreement
(inaudible) doing the rental versus purchase.
MR. SURENIAN: Okay.

MS. MORRIS: Just explain again
(inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Okay. So let's say that we end up with an RDP -- are you familiar with that?

Okay. So let's say we end up with an RDP of 200 when the smoke clears the battle field. 25 percent of that number must be rental. So that means that we could get, rental bonuses for up to 50 units. So this project would generate at least 44 rental units on the Mercedes site which would be which, which could generate a rental bonus depending upon the ultimate RDP.

MS. MORRIS: Let just say Montvale (inaudible) said to Hekemian (inaudible) purchase condos. And you had 350 units, what number would be affordable (inaudible) 15 percent? What is that? (Inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: If 20 percent of the units were for sale?

MS. MORRIS: What I'm trying to say is why are we making the same deal that we turned down in May?

MR. SURENIAN: You're making a better deal than you turned down in May.

MS. MORRIS: Let me just say (inaudible) scale of the project is five floors is too much, we don't know. It could be four floors. We still don't know what the total (inaudible) is. It's all rental it was all rental before.

What my dream project would be and $I$ know (inaudible) get developed here is, why can't we have 350 purchased condos, have some percentage of them be affordable at both sites? Why should we (inaudible) you know, even if the number if we went back and said, you know, there are 65 units in affordable at Glenview and Mercedes let's have (inaudible) because it's all purchased, let's say the affordable number of units is 30, is half, I still think it's a better deal. Because, because just as that gentleman said, we're going to (inaudible) five years, 10 years, we sold the Sony property. We have Annie Sez (inaudible) there are buildings all over the place. Why can't we just make, you know, a stand here or at least $I$ don't want to say a stand enter into a mutually beneficial agreement with Hekemian which benefits the town by making a purchased condos and not rental. Rental takes it down a very different path (inaudible). Is that possible?

MR. SURENIAN: At this point I don't think it's possible. And the reason why $I$ say that is because we've come in at the tail end and we've reached a point in the negotiations where the developer has said this is it. I've been negotiating. I'm done negotiating. This is it. If you want it,

I'll live up, I'll live up -- I'll give my word, I'll implement this deal. If you don't want it, I'm going to court.

So we can't tell the developer don't go to court. The developer has made it very clear that he's out of patience. You know, his lawyers are probably whispering things in his ears that are encouraging him to litigate and, and we think that there is great risk in litigation. That's why we, that while we litigate these things all over the state we think it's very risky to get yourself in a litigation mode. We think there's great risk of losing control of your community.

MS. MORRIS: Again, let me just ask you, have you ever (inaudible) Hekemian and asked for an agreement that (inaudible) that involved condos and not rentals? Did we ever ask him that? Did we ever enter into a discussion about this?

You know, I hear what you're saying and, you know, I don't know. It's game over (inaudible) I mean I --

MR. SURENIAN: You know why I think it's game over? It's game over if you lose control, if you lose your immunity or, or if they argue -MS. MORRIS: It doesn't matter because,
because you're going to come back and it's going to be (inaudible). It's going to be this one (inaudible) so we made a deal with the devil instead of crushing him, moving forward you (inaudible) you can't get this genie back in the bottle.

You have an opportunity here. I wish they would be good neighbors and come to the table and say, listen, you know, we were saying we would like to do something that's perhaps more in keeping with, with this community. You know, it's too bad. I don't know why we haven't had this conversation unless you say, yes, we did (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: We did. We did, as a matter of fact, as of 2:00 this afternoon, we were in conversations. We were trying to make a deal.

MAYOR GHASSALI: We were trying to make it palatable as much as we can. But he would not budge.

This is it. This is the ultimatum. Either we vote on this or (inaudible). We have been calling. Jeff has been talking to him. Most of us have -- any member of the council here spoke to Jeff Surenian and we try to get to the developer to try to come up with something that we can live with and he is not budging. MS. MORRIS: Thank you. MALE BOARD MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. So, Jeff or Mike. MR. SURENIAN: Okay.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
Anybody else? Your name.
FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you. Anybody else? Name.

THERESA: Theresa (inaudible) Well, first of all -- the first thing I'm going to ask (inaudible)

I know this develop (inaudible) development has been (inaudible) $I$ hear about the 350 units and $I$ haven't heard anything that (inaudible) what their going to get. 90 percent (inaudible).
(Inaudible)
MALE BOARD MEMBER: Okay. Do you know
what the mix (inaudible) is on non-residential
development. (Inaudible).
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: It will sit right there.

MALE SPEAKER: That: --
MALE BOARD MEMBER: Speak into the mike. MAYOR GHASSALI: Councilman.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Just go ahead.
THERESA: Can you hear me now?
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Yes. Thank you.

THERESA: Okay. Thank you. My name is Theresa Volk, 26 McGuire Court and I started to say that $I$ know there's going to be 350 units and all of that of which $I$ believe you said 54 would be the affordable homes.

MR. SURENIAN: 53.

MS. VOLK: 53. And how much does that satisfy of what we need to do in town?

MR. SURENIAN: That's a 15 percent set aside.

MS. VOLK: 50 .

MR. SURENIAN: 15 .

MS. VOLK: 15. 15, one five. Okay.
We're talking about what the censorship of the property that's going to be built on with these 350 , if only 53 of 15 percent is going to be affordable housing. So thank you very much developers for significantly taking care of that for us.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Yeah. (Inaudible).

The development that you're discussing right now, 15 percent of the 350 set aside for affordable. That's (inaudible).

MS. VOLK: That's the right question.
MR. SURENIAN: The total re-- I would say
this, in a litigation mode the Fair Share Housing

Center will argue that the total obligation for Round 3 of town is 779 .

In a settlement mode, the Fair Share Housing Center will say that the settlement number is 545. You know their standard position in settlement is 30 percent off. Our expert says that the number is 548. MS. VOLK: Okay.

MR. SURENIAN: So, you know, so if you can wrap up this, wrap up Cornrock (phonetic), wrap up Fair Share Housing Center you can get a fair share number that would be the best you could hope for if you had this 41 days of trial and won every argument.

MS. VOLK: Okay. Now the property size of these 350, I think I brought this up the last time. I'm still kind of not understanding this big picture. I'm still not understanding the (inaudible) --

All right. Thank you.
I'm still not understanding this big picture. This is a very large piece of property.

MR. SURENIAN: Okay.
MS. VOLK: Again, we're back to where we were the last time but we are only talking about 8 percent of the land. All right. So we have 93 percent where the property still has to be developed. Has anything changed as to what they are going
to be able to get to satisfy this? I suppose now we're back to the (inaudible) what you said, 10,15 percent number or it's even lower than that.

What are they getting out of this deal? Are they still building banks and something, interested in the hotels and stuff like that?

MR. SURENIAN: Yes but it's a mixed use project.

MS. VOLK: Okay.

MR. SURENIAN: So they're getting a residential yield count and they're getting non residential.

For example --
MALE BOARD MEMBER: (Inaudible) example.

MS. VOLK: Thank you.

MR. SURENIAN: Yeah. I was about to read from the ordinance.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Just (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Yeah. The principal,
permitted principal uses minimum 40,000 square feet of professional, medical, educational and general offices. Hotel with a minimum of 150 rooms and 8, 500 square feet of conference room and retail component with a minimum of 30,000 square feet in the aggregate inclusive of -- $I$ can go through the list if you want.

MS. VOLK: No. I understand you don't need to go -- a lot of people got the picture. I think you may --

MR. SURENIAN: Okay.
MS. VOLK: I think what $I$ want to see the ratio was 350 units as compared to what they're developing, how much of the property is that? That's 92 percent. We're getting only 8 percent being built for the affordable homes.

Correct?
MR. SURENIAN: I don't know.
MS. VOLK: Did you understand the line -what they're developing, all right, they really are only satisfying about 10 or 15 percent of the units of affordable housing. They're getting a lot out of this deal from us. I'm still kind of lost in this picture. MR. SURENIAN: Okay. Hold on. Hold on. MS. VOLK: I still don't understand. So if --

MR. SURENIAN: So just quickly. If there were 53 affordable let's say for argument's sake your RDP was 212.

MS. VOLK: Right.
MR. SURENIAN: That would mean you are eligible for 53 bonus credits.

Right?
MS. VOLK: Right.
MR. SURENIAN: So we would be getting 106 credits towards your RDP, in the context of your RDP, 50 percent of your RDP.

MS. VOLK: All right. Okay. Well my point is this. I understand. I just --

My point is this $I$ just don't see how this is a fair share for Montvale. All right. Such a large piece of the property is going into retail value for their profits. Plus I, personally, am looking at the hotel that's on my side because that's what I'm involved.

There was a meeting last night in two hotels. I work with one of the hotels, all right, and I'm going to say it again, all right, we have, we have 184 rooms, we have (inaudible) over 200 rooms, people at these hotels have put almost $\$ 8,000,000$ in renovations. All right. The occupancy is significantly down. All right. And now you're going to start building another hotel and more retail.

You're going to start putting people out of work. And $I$ think that needs to be looked into also as well as (inaudible). It really needs to be seriously considered.

There's not one iota of marketing statistics as far as all of these retails coming in, Wegman's opened but you didn't open restaurants, you didn't open anything else that's on that property. We still don't know what's going to happen. All we have is one store open. The entire property not opening up yet.

So traffic is not an issue yet because we still don't know what's going to happen. Mercedes $I$ hear all of this about, 90 percent of the land, all right, that's going to be developed on for, I don't think much of a return to Montvale. All right.

Beautiful property that has incredible trees that all we can see is pictures of big apartment buildings and retail. There's no discussion on what we'll get in return not just in the homes but on a ground level as well. All I see a (inaudible) developer saying you need help, we're going to give you two but we're going to take so much more from you. And we don't care. This is what $I$ see.

I don't hear anything about, anything about taking care of the look and the feel of Montvale.

We are not Fort Lee and I will fight to the death to not be Fort Lee so enough with this and let's take care of what we need to take care of as far as the way this town looks, sounds and feels.

We're not even close to what's going to happen when all of the Wegman's retail opens up. God knows we don't need another bank. All right.

So, fine, you made your negotiations but $I$ don't hear anything about how it's going to look. I don't hear anything about how it's going to effect the traffic. I don't hear (inaudible).

I'm not worried about having more students. We have a good town. We have a good school system. (Inaudible) kids going to get to school. How are they going to get to school?

Again, we're talking about 8 percent of our property being built for us, big deal. They're still getting 90 percent, what it's going to look like, what's going to happen. All right.

Are businesses going to come in? This is (inaudible) in the town and everyone (inaudible) so many ships that we're all going to drown together. I don't think any of that was taken into consideration in this retail.

That's all I have to say.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you. You're next.
MR. TALBOT: Good evening. Hi. Jerry
Talbot (inaudible) here in Montvale. I want to make sure $I$ heard you correctly. The (inaudible) the total
number of units here is, total 350 give or take.
Is that correct?

MR. SURENIAN: 350 on the money.

MR. TALBOT: Okay. How many units are currently in Montvale? How many homes, units? About $2,000 ?$
(Inaudible)
MR. TALBOT: So has anyone here ever heard of a 10 percent increase in the number of units in the town with one development?

Is that normal in these projects because $I$ have never heard of that.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Yes.

MR. TALBOT: In New Jersey?
MR. SURENIAN: Yeah.

MR. TALBOT: So we're going to increase
our properties by 10 percent based on our developer at least.

MR. SURENIAN: It happens. You know it's not, it's not --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: But the answer is yes.
MALE SPEAKER: But it's not an unusual
thing.
MR. TALBOT: And our schools already have, the highest level it ever did in the history of

Montvale. In fact, I was told so is it possibly true that we're at or near capacity in all our public schools. And (inaudible) increase that by 10 percent as well in basically about two years in the time it takes to do this whole development, give or take, Dereck. Give or take?

DERECK: We don't know. It could happen five years from now. I don't know.

MR. TALBOT: Two years to build condos, houses, apartments.

MALE SPEAKER: I don't know.

MR. TALBOT: So how long is it going to take to increase the size of the schools to compensate? (Inaudible) how long until the schools are expanded (inaudible). Because the way I see it three years from now we're going to have 350 units, the schools are going to be 10 percent busier, it's not going to be until about eight or nine years until the schools catch up in size. I don't know about anyone else but my kids only go to each grade once so by the time school is expanded it's too late for them.

MR. SURENIAN: Look. The consequence of not making this deal is you could have substantially more units so the very concern that you have with the influx of school age children could be dramatically
worse.

MR. TALBOT: Is the State court system perfectly willing to say that it doesn't matter (inaudible) schools (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Yes. The State court system says exactly that, we don't care about your schools. That's what the state court says. That's what your laws say.

MR. TALBOT: Because we are not close to full, we are full.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: We are not all full. Just for the record the information we have from the superintendent of both schools is that we are on a decline for the next five years but after five years they are expecting it to go back up again.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Hold on. Let's back up. So in terms of the school statistics this not me offering an opinion. This is just factual information. So the school enrollment over the past four or five years you saw a dip across Bergen County. Not just in Montvale.

The reason why you saw that dip in enrollment is because it coincided with the recession in 2009, 2010, people stopped having children. So nationwide birth rates were at all time lows.

Those children who would have been born in 2009, 2010, 2011 were children who were coming into schools. So my son was in fifth grade in school or is currently. When he started kindergarten there were 85 children in his class. He's now in fifth grade. There are over a hundred.

When you look at the current, I think, second, third and fourth grade, they started at around 80 and they have increased as, as residents have moved in. I believe the current kindergarten class I have twins in kindergarten is 120. Is 120. So 80 children six years ago in kindergarten, 120 now.

MR. TALBOT: So that's a 50 percent
increase.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: So just in terms of, again, factual information, that's consistent across Bergen County.

Speaking to the question about schools, you know, I work in Fair Lawn. I'm a school administrator. We are currently planning for a $\$ 25,000,000$ referendum to add 16 classrooms to our middle schools to accommodate for the influx that we're currently seeing and the influx that we anticipate and that, that cost will be passed along to the taxpayer.

MR. TALBOT: Taxpayers and proportionally the (inaudible) is it fair to say that the taxpayers that are here now pay a higher percentage of that than people who are --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: I'm not offering an opinion whether it's right or wrong. Factually, that's correct. That's the reality of the situation.

MR. TALBOT: The people, proportionately 350 units are not going to pay proportionately the cost of the schools.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: I don't think it's fair.

In speaking with the superintendent to accommodate for and then anticipated increase in, in enrollments. Let's say enrollment increased by a hundred to 200 students you are probably looking at adding six to eight classrooms at Memorial and six to eight classrooms at Fieldstone. Memorial you would build up on the kindergarten wing and at Fieldstone you would build out on the grass area between the building and the turf. That's, again, just factual information, conversation.

That would roughly cost anywhere from 20 to \$25,000,000 because, remember, you're not just building classroom space when you add students,
science labs, cafeteria to accommodate multipurpose rooms so it's not just classroom space. It's, it's all of the other pieces that go along with it.

MR. TALBOT: So just quick math, 2,000, each household will be on the hook for 3,035 hundred by the time development happens.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: So 3,500 to \$4,000 residents would be on the hook for $\$ 25,000,000$.

And, remember, the school board can't just spend that money. They have to go out for referendum and they have to get the public to vote to be able to spend that money. So if the public votes it down you're stuck with the space that you have.

MR. TALBOT: Does anyone see an issue where -- hypothetically to 10 percent of the tax increases by this development and another 10 percent, five years or seven years because of the development, maybe because they're rentals, they are using schools. They don't live here permanently. They vote no for the expansion and those of us here who want (inaudible) we can't have that option.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: It's a definite
concern. It's a definite concern not just in Montvale but anywhere you're doing the school referendum you need to sell it to the public.

MALE SPEAKER: I think you need some perspective here. And let me just give you some perspective. You're focusing on one aspect of this. (Inaudible) and $I$ don't, $I$ don't need to, $I$ don't -look, I don't mean to minimize the, the significance of the concern. I do not mean to minimize it but $I$ do mean to put it in context.

Here's the context. This is the law in Mount Laurel. You comply voluntarily or you comply involuntarily. So, so, so, so let me just, let me explain what that means.

Let's say that you tell every developer that comes along, we don't want you. We're not going to comply because whether you do it on this site or whether you do it on the other site, you have the identical problem that you put your finger on. So your options to deal with your problem is to say no to Mount Laurel, to say we don't, we don't want anymore. MR. TALBOT: That's, that's my final question. If we were to litigate this indefinitely -MALE BOARD MEMBER: Right. MR. TALBOT: -- as far as far as we possibly can, we say no to what the cost, (inaudible), what's the cost in dollars, what's the cost of that, how, how much would we have to pay?

MALE SPEAKER: Depends. A thousand units, it cost a lot more.

MR. TALBOT: No. The PO -(Speaking at the same time.)

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Hold on.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Hold on. Hold on. Hold on, guys.

Can you just put the question to me, the Chair, and I'll point the question to --

MR. TALBOT: What is the theoretical cost per year.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Based on some of the towns we have heard, a half a million dollars.

MR. TALBOT: I'm sorry. Say it again.
MAYOR GHASSALI: A half a million dollars.

MR. TALBOT: Half a million dollars a year to fight?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Jeff is that, is that (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: You could easily spend a half million dollars to litigate just the Fair Share issue. And then, and if you lost your immunity you could be fighting multiple builders remedy lawsuits. And, and that cost would be substantial because if $I$ could describe what a developer's proposal is in a
builder's remedy lawsuit, the word is shameless, they're outrageous and towns dig in and they fight and it's a long, expensive battle where the playing field is totally against you.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay.

MR. TALBOT: Okay. Thank you.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: I have something
nice to say first, to thank Mr. Hekemian for building and developing Wegman's for us. We fought for Wegman's because we didn't want apartments on that site. We fought for Wegman's because it would bring revenue to the town and it is (inaudible) million dollars. We fought because Wegman's is going to be a community minded citizen and they are.

We fought for Wegman's because it was going to offer jobs and they have, over 500. And that's what I kind of -- $I$ guess $I^{\prime} m$ a prisoner of hope, kind of try to empty myself of all my prior thoughts about this before $I$ came this evening.

But I find that kind of offensive to hear that we are here on impulse, as you said impulse. I copied down your words.

MALE SPEAKER: I don't.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: You also said you're doing what's best for our community and you mentioned
that it would be a grave mistake for us to follow through with this.

Indeed, as an attorney, I could understand. You are, you are being paid to advise your clients.

MR. SURENIAN: Right.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: You don't want to cost us a lot of money. But as I heard the cost of an additional school and whatever that cost may be, did you say $\$ 32,000,000$.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: 25.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: 25 million give or take, so $\$ 25,000,000$ for us to pay for an additional school eventually here in town for which is the reason most people moved to Montvale besides low property taxes. So $\$ 500,000$ a year is not a great, great difference for us to absorb.

My husband used to call me Dona $P$. Hote (phonetic). So I do believe that there is a need for us to, to fight.

And, and I, and once again I know Mr. Hekemian is in the audience and someone stated an attorney may be whispering in his ear and he probably is, I'm if he go to appeal to his higher sense. If he could build something as wonderful as Wegman's and that community, and I'll never cook again because of Wegman's, that $I$,

I would appeal -- we don't want to deal with Soviet negotiating. We don't want to have to say it's either this or that, is that there's still, as a person of hope -- and I hear Amazon wants to find a place to build in New Jersey or, or Deblasio wants it in New York, who says they wouldn't want to build in Montvale other than their competitors that, now with Whole Foods, and $I$ think that, and we very intimidated by the, the legal, the litigator -- I have a daughter who is an attorney and a big one, I understand full-well that the full power of the law when you're dealing with ruthless judges, literally, supremacists that we have, we are, we're up against a very difficult decision.

But once again, a prisoner of hope and appealing to are Mr. Hekemian's higher sense of purpose is that he has great opportunity to find us someone for that area that will not hurt our school system, that will not hurt our property taxes and one of the reasons we did not choose to -- I remember what former Councilwoman, who is sitting here, used to work for, used to volunteer for the tri-borough ambulance (inaudible). I met her if Wegman's today and she said that they got no volunteers out of rental units and certainly that's another consideration for us, too. I
still think that's true now.
And as much as I'd like to live in Montvale for the rest of my days, which are growing shorter, I tend to think that we have an opportunity here yet to fight the good fight, to be prisoners of hope to appeal to Mr. Hekemian's higher sense of purpose and in regard to what he's heard tonight and, and hearing that we have gone from 350 units to 1,000 units and back to 350, perhaps there is still room for further compromise.

I don't -- I used to, my last job with Citi was in the real estate department so $I$ was in the consumer aspect of it. I would deal with the, with the corporate developers, though, and I will say they are rather ruthless and they're very difficult to deal with. But, nevertheless, with the relationship that you develop with them $I$ think that we can perhaps still work with the Hekemian organization, still find a happier compromise and still have hope for something far greater for that site than what we're hearing tonight.

Once again you heard people not speaking on impulse tonight but coming forward with very sincere research , questions, love of town, love of community, dedication to community, dedication to their children,
dedication to our wonderful form of governance in this country that we can speak so freely and openly.

But we can see that nationally people have rebelled. People have rebelled against touch down governance, out of control judges.

And I am going to be hoping that you, once again, did as you did the last time, you may have made your decision before you come before us tonight.

Thank you for the opportunity for letting me speak.

As you know, I don't hesitate to speak but I would hope that you would not consider us being an impulsive community.

You may not have heard it. I did. And I voted it down. I write down key words. It's my way of remembering how to address you, not impulse, sir, no. That's, that's not (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: I don't know that I used the world impulse but it doesn't matter.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: But I do.

MR. SURENIAN: Okay. (Inaudible).
FEMALE SPEAKER: I think the main thing
here for me, I have a kindergartner so I'm, I'm beginning my time here in Montvale. We've been here since 2009. I plan to stay here. And the schools are
a big reason. And $I$ watched those ratings they are going up.

I work in the district and we were No. 1, were No. 1 .

And $I$ watched my high school go from 800 kids to 1,202 kids as of today in less than eight years and a lot of that is because of the rentals. So I need -that's the part that bothers me. I guess I can kind of understand even the condos, someone buying into this town and really digging their heals in, saying I'm going to be in Montvale for years. Rentals, you're not going to get that. Theoretically go to Pascack Hills for four years and then leave. I see it every day in my job and that's what I'm also concerned about, is that piece.

And, yeah, my son has six kindergarten classes. They only have six rooms. So I don't know what they're going to do next year if there's more than that.

So I just -- the rental piece is the real concern for me. I'm just wondering if Woodcliff Lake has any feelings about Hills and the High School. They all go to that High School. I'm wondering if Woodcliff Lake has any thoughts. MAYOR GHASSALI: Yeah. They have their
own issues, too.

FEMALE SPEAKER: It will effect them, too.
And I watched our ranking go from one to much lower than that. And property values go along with that.

And $I$ don't think $I$ have to say, from my personal experience, they're not coming from Bergen County where the students are coming from because we're trucking in population and the bubble in New Jersey and the demographics, that's not where my students are coming from. They're coming internationally. They're being advertised in International Papers to come into the district and that's where these students are coming from for four years and then they're going back to their country.

So it's not New Jersey numbers that you're looking at, the numbers we probably shouldn't have but they're not in New Jersey.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay.
Mr. Mocker: Good evening, Judd Mocker (phonetic).

So I come to just about every meeting that, I've been to meetings related to the Mercedes property. And $I$ first came to the meeting with that point it was in the community center and not really having too much of (inaudible) way. And speak with many of you.

Pretty much the reality of the situation is that we fight and probably lose, we take the deal and those are really our options and that's the reality that keeps being said at meeting after meeting, we should take this deal.

I know it's not the popular one. I know everyone wants to find and spend whatever money they think is possible because at the end the day how many of these cases have been on and have been favorable for the town?

MR. SURENIAN: The playing field is totally heavily against the town.

MR. MOCKER: So I'm not a lawyer. I'm a CPA so most of my job is about minimizing the risk and the risk currently seems to be 50 units or we spend money and potentially eventually compromise on something that's more than 350 units.

MR. SURENIAN: Substantially more.
Mr. Mocker: With that --

MR. SURENIAN: Yes.

Mr. Mocker: So take the deal. I know
from the last time there is a lot of words about density and in our town it's money for the schools.

The risk, if we lose, is much, much greater than if we take this deal. I, I'm just going to keep
saying that we need to take this deal, we need to take this deal.

The amount of units if we lose -- I'm not, I'm not coming up as a proponent of development. I'm here as trying to bring across the reality of the situation that $I$ have heard for the last year and a half that if we don't take the deal it's going to be more than 350 units. It's going to be more than 350 units. It's going to be more than 350 units.

I don't think everyone is hearing me. Because everyone keeps coming up and saying, well, if we finagle it this way and reality is different we could win. The reality of the situation is based on what all of these people who have been dealing with this for the last at left two years has been, the reality of the situation is settle or we're forced to take a lot more units.

I know I'm not the majority, in the majority here. But part of governance on your part is to make the decisions that are right for the town that might not be the most popular ones.

Thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
MR. PERINI: Thank you, Mr. Hekemian. (Inaudible).

Mr. Mayor, thank you. MAYOR CHASSALI: Name. MR. PERINI: Oh, Tom Perini (phonetic) from Montvale Avenue.

I want to say mostly, $I$ know $I$ came for a totally different reason. I'm going to ask you for a favor later on not to be too obnoxious but $I$ just wanted to cover a couple things real quickly. I agree with the woman earlier who mentioned 90 percent development. I think that's really, I think that's really a bad job there. You go around New Jersey and you look at some of the most desirable development locations and down Weehawkin you see developers building these, these complexes in some of the most expensive real estate in New Jersey and they're building little league fields, community centers right on the Hudson River, staring at Manhattan giving and giving back a huge amount of expensive real estate in these towns doing it at the expense (inaudible).

We're getting a hotel. I agree is going to be empty every night is kind of mind blowing to me. In addition, I think, I think the wheels of this movement are moving in our favor. I think if you look at some of the things Assemblywoman Shefcy (phonetic), I don't know if you're familiar with her work and movement, I
think she was in Upper Saddle River recently and she was basically she's got two bills in front of the State Assembly I believe which were addressing the very concerns you're saying we can't address with the court and it's possible we can, Assemblywoman maybe can. We can talk about the apocalyptic damage this can be doing to the State schools population wise right across the state. She's asking the state financier on this by the end of the year which in New Jersey is probably a decade but at the same point these are things that are developing situations.

You have a situation in Lakewood which is kind of related to our stuff that you have going on here. What's happening with the schools there in Lakewood and everything with the prosecutors finally cracking down on those people and everything that's happening.

So there's people that are actually starting to look at (inaudible) what a sham this is and what's happening. So I think the waves are starting to come and $I$ think people are jumping on this right now there's no reason why that might not be a good idea for us including we might gain momentum on our side for this.

So when you start talking about and the stuff about the two-bedrooms versus three-bedrooms honestly
and when you look at Riverdell High School you look at these people paying taxes an River Edge and they have 20 kids using the address in River Edge living at that school so two-bedrooms three-bedrooms it doesn't matter. This is an invasion. That's what it is. Let's be real about it. It's nonsense. So that kind of stuff doesn't matter.

Talk about losing control, the way it sounds tonight is that ship has sailed.

So at this point I don't know, I guess Mr. Hekemian is here. I don't know who he is and Wegman's also. And $I$ just went there for the first time. That's cool. But, at the same time, thank you for that but, at the same time, I can appeal to his senses like she did earlier.

I could also say (inaudible) willing to go to the mattress on this, too. I mean $\$ 500,000$ a year sounds like a good deal to me as opposed to entering into this hell hole that we're going into, you know, with the enormous (inaudible) with this town especially when the momentum, like is said, several factors going with us.

Let's kick the can down the road and see what Hekemian is willing to give us. Both in 15 years about appeals and everything else and, and let's see
how long you want to go with this.
That's my vote.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
Good evening.
MR. PAULSEN: Hi. Brian Paulsen from
Eagle Ridge.
Sir, a few questions. I, I didn't quite get some of the numbers straight. The housing, how much this would count towards affordable housing and how much was leftover. It sounds like we would have 50 units that would come for it but even if this, we agree with the Fair Housing Comission and the other developers, our, our total amount, that would be required would be 550 .

Is that correct?
MR. SURENIAN: In a settlement mode 550, in a litigation mode they would argue like 749 -(inaudible).

MR. PAULSEN: What about the other 500 units? That doesn't sound --

MR. SURENIAN: Let me, let me -- this is kind of complicated but let me explain this.

The way it works is, you get an allocation. And once you have your allocation you either have enough land to meet your allocation or you don't. If you
don't you say $I$ want a vacant land adjustment and you adjust that number down.

And so let's say that the number was 500 just for round numbers and let's say that we adjusted it down to 200 in a settlement mode. In a litigation mode you lose control of these numbers. But let's say that that's a settlement mode. So now we have the 200 unit RDP otherwise known as Realistic Development Potential. You have an obligation to create a realistic opportunity for your Realistic Development Potential. The 300 that you don't have enough land to meet that, that's called unmet need. That's nomenclature. Okay. And that's a different -- it's more aspirational than it is hard. And so the courts are looking for you to, you know, make an effort to try to do what you can to the, for the unmet need. In many instances you never achieve it.

So that's, that's the way it works.
So, in a settlement mode we'd be trying to control the RDP and we would be trying to find means to address the unmet need that have the least impact on the community.

In a litigation mode that, you get arguments at each stage. You get arguments at what your allocation is, we say 550, they say 780. The judge comes out
wherever he comes out. After a half million dollars, $\$ 600,000$ spent.

The next layer is what, your RDP. Let's say we say 200 , they say 400 . They mercilessly attack the town at every point to try to jack that number up.

MR. PAULSEN: Just one question. You say they would say 400 . Is that the Fair Housing or is that the developer or --

MR. SURENIAN: That's the developer.

And what you would basically be doing in a litigation mode is forcing the developer to join hands up with the non profit and try to jack that RDP up as high as possible. And they would argue for sites that you would say you got to be kidding me. But that's where that fight would go. Okay.

And then at the end of that unmet need there can be significant flexibility or there can be ruthlessness. Okay.

And those are the risks of litigation. You get fought at all three levels where in a settlement mode you can control that. You have a much better chance of controlling that at all three levels and controlling the future of your community.

MR. PAULSEN: So let's say hypothetically we go with the settlement mode is expectation then
that we would come out of this meeting all the need up until the next 2025?

MR. SURENIAN: The, the plan would be to resolve this, to resolve Hornrock, to go to Fair Share Housing Center which we have had discussions with and say, hey, this is what we can do, let's wrap this in a bow. Let's put this behind us. Here's our whole plan. And it would be a very different plan in a settlement mode than in a litigation mode.

They have been very clear, hey, we're litigating, you know, we're going whole hog on every issue. We're leaving no stone unturned.

I don't know if you've been in the, if you've been in the bow of the Fair Share Housing Center before but they can make, they can really make demands that are really unreasonable in my opinion.

And, unfortunately courts are often receptive. I mean sometimes I'm looking at the judge saying are you serious? But the answer is yes.

MR. PAULSEN: No, I understand the, the risks of the litigation mode.

What I'm trying to understand there, the risks of the settlement mode. So, you know, it doesn't sound like if the council votes let's, let's agree to this, let's try to settle. It doesn't sound like this
is a done deal yet.
Right?
This is a deal we should go to Fair Share Housing. We try to get that are them to come down on their number as well. It sounds like a fairly significant --

MR. SURENIAN: Well, for example, for essential and non severable condition of this agreement is that we have a fixed RDP attributable to this site of 70. Okay.

In a litigation mode they're going to be arguing there could be a thousand units and it should be 200.

MR. PAULSEN: So what stops another
developer coming in between the time that the settlement, let's say the council agrees to take this on, we're trying to negotiate with all the different, Hornrock and them and Fair Housing, some other developer comes in, hey, you have this new site here, I want to -- there isn't anything formalized, why can't they come in and also say let's reopen all the litigation and they can try to develop, too.

MR. SURENIAN: Well, well --
MR. PAULSEN: How quickly does this get
wrapped up when you say we have immunity against further development.

MR. SURENIAN: Well, if we get to the point that we have the Judgment of Repose -- that's the goal. The goal is settle, settle, settle, manageable number, our number were we to litigate it a, a, an RDP that we can handle, measures to address the unmet need that we may not like but we can hande and now we have a Judgement of Compliance and Repose.

I can't guaranty that after that Judgement of Compliance and Repose, after the ink has dried, that someone doesn't come along and say, well, that was then now is now. There's another site you could do more.

But what, what you can do, what you can manage in a Judgment of Repose is you can say I'm in control of my community and if another guy comes along and says, you know, $I$ can do this, $I$ can do that, you know, you can, if you think the site is unsuitable you can say it's unsuitable, you can litigate that. If you are successful there would be no RDP generated by the site. If you're not successful you can control how that RDP is satisfied. If you lose control of, of your community -- I'll give you the nightmare scenario.

You lose, you lose your immunity. You know what this town is going to look like if you lose immunity?

The locusts will descend from the heavens and they will pour over every square inch of this town and they'll find every site that's developable and they'll try to say, look, I'm willing to do it. It will be a horror show.

And that's what happened in J. W. Field versus -- 11 developers sued the town, 11 builders remedy lawsuits.

MR. PAULSEN: So is it fair to assume then if the Council votes for this, that the expectation then is that this would all be wrapped up before our immunity ends which is October 31st?

MR. SURENIAN: Well --
MR. PAULSEN: Or if it's not done, what happens after October 31 st and developers say, hey, your immunity is over, the locusts are descending?

MR. SURENIAN: Right. I'll take you down the settlement road. I'll take you down the litigation road.

In a settlement mode we would try to very quickly settle with all three, get a Judgment of Repose as quickly as possible.

MR. PAULSEN: And from your experience how quickly does that -- give me a ballpark range, I guess. Are we talking weeks, months?

MR. SURENIAN: Well, we have had, we have had discussions with Fair Share Housing Center. And we think that if we can resolve these two cases we could get to a Judgment of Repose quickly.

You know, I, I hesitate to give you a number in the Mount Laurel world because things, you know, sometimes you have to notice these, people come, they object and sometimes it gets ugly.

In the best case scenario six months, worse case scenario it could be much longer. I can't control who responds to a notice. That's in a settlement mode.

Your costs are under control. You have the maximum opportunity to control the future of your community.

In a litigation --
MR. PAULSEN: Sorry. One question. In the settlement mode, is there the expectation then that our immunity would be extended?

MR. SURENIAN: Yes. Yes. Yes.
In a -- judges want settlements. Okay. Judges put enormous pressure on you to settle cases. Some of that mode you have a very happy judge that, and a, and a master that's going to be very happy and, and recommending to the judge, you know, these guys have done what they needed to. It's a bitter pill. Extend
immunity. Don't expose them to litigation.
So that's, that's, yes, part of the, of the picture in a settlement mode is extensions of immunity that I've, that $I$ don't really think would be a problem at all.

MR. PAULSEN: If this were to go to
litigation or say some other town (inaudible) some other town goes to litigation, is it possible that those judgments then let's say it goes all the way to final judgment, is there a possibility that gets used as a precedent for other towns or does each judge tend to -- because $I$ know we're in kind of this new world where the judges are deciding what's proper and what's not.

MR. SURENIAN: Yeah. That's a good question.

For the life of me, I don't know why the judges in Bergen County didn't consolidate all the cases that they had. They must have had 40,50 or more.

The D. J. action, I don't know the exact number. If $I$ was a judge, this is not something $I$ would want to do twice. It's very complicated.

It's 41 days over six months in Mercer County. It was really hard on the judge. It was hard on the attorneys but that's what this judge said.

So, in theory, yeah, the judge would be doing it as, you know, all over again unless at some point the judge changed his mind and said I'm going to consolidate all and did it once.

But right now Park Ridge is on a path to litigate by themselves.

MAYOR GHASSALI: You need to wrap up, please. You need to wrap up.

MR. SURENIAN: Let me just, unless you have another question, I have to explain the litigation.

So the litigation road, the problem is that you risk, you have risk -- there's a guy that was manages risk before. And I look at it as Risk Management as well. In a litigation mode you're litigating the number, you're litigating the RDP, you're litigating the adequacy of what you can do on the unmet need and, and you're doing it and, and you're litigating your entitlement to immunity and you're doing it where you're forcing developers and Fair Share Housing Center to create this alliance to leverage you.

It is a nightmare scenario whereas Fair Share Housing Center, we could try to make a deal with to get this done and, and have them support us. We would force them to dig in and be our enemies in a
litigation mode.
MR. PAULSEN: Let me just wrap up with a few comments for the Council.

I know you guys have been probably talking about this for years or, or 18 months $I$ think it was $I$ have heard. I'm not going to pretend I understand the concept and all the issues involved as, as you must.

I do know this is an extremely hard decision. I do not envy the spot you are in.

Either way you vote for or against it's going to change the character of this town. I, I'll be one that's in the minority here. I kind of think that voting against this is going to lead us down the dark path of legislation that, under the current environment, we're probably going to lose and it's going to look bad for our town in terms of what gets developed at the end the road. Voting for it is a different deal with the devil.

And, like I said, $I$ just really don't envy your decision.

I'm going to trust that we voted in wise people that can make what they feel is the right decision however, however that means. God help us whatever that, whatever happens at the end of this.

Thank you.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Thank you.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Thank you. FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Thank you.
(Inaudible).
MAYOR GHASSALI: Hold on. Hold on, please. The lady comes.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: I would like to throw out a different scenario. We seem to be very, very concerned about being a defendant in a case which we will most likely lose.

Two questions, what if we were to be a plaintiff by getting together with a dozen other towns which are in exactly the same situation which we are and sue the Fair Housing Center? And, Question No. 1 .

Question No. 2, would that potentially put all these other litigations on hold until that was settled?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Let me take that for the first question.

We did talk to the other towns. We formed an alliance and we've been meeting and talking. The fact of the matter is every town is in at a different stage of settlement with Fair Share and it seems that it's good to talk, it's good to share some information but it seems every town is looking out for their own just
like we were looking out for our own.
Where if we were to join, we would probably lose the most because we have more buildings available.

To have the joint force that was the idea, we loved that, we had six towns sign on and then as we started to discuss it, everyone seems to be pulling to their side and saying, well, $I$ don't want to talk about this because this will effect me, and it came to us and we don't want to talk about that either because I was the most if we were to join in a joint settlement so that didn't go too well.

MR. PAULSEN: I wasn't talking about settlement. I was talking about that, being a plaintiff and sue the Fair Housing Center. That's a totally different way to look at it.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Like they did in Mercer County at the, whatever county they did.

MR. SURENIAN: The problem and first of all we are a plaintiff. We brought a Declaratory Judgment action.

But the problem lies in, in the law itself, the way the law has been established. There were Supreme Court decisions and then the legislature enacted the Fair Housing Act in 1985 .

So right now if you wanted to change the law and
the law is absolutely ready for a reset because it's a different world in 1980 -- in 2017 than it was in 1985. But, no one, the legislature has not tried to rework the Fair Housing Act which has been extremely unfortunate because I had hoped that that would happen and we could have more reasonable standards.

Right now we're operating under the standards that had been established in that legislation and unless that legislation is changed, the courts are now relying on that legislation. When, when this issue came up before the Supreme Court in 2015 and 2016, the Supreme Court went from saying, you know, this is our doctrine and here's how it's going to be to say and the legislature has spoken and here's how worry going to operate given what the legislature has said. And the Supreme Court said the legislature wants to change it, that's fine with us. We'll review it. If it's legal we'll uphold it. If it's not, we won't.

But it's really in the lap of the legislature right now.

The other thing that went wrong in the history of this doctrine and went terribly wrong is the Council on Affordable Housing decided to lock its doors and put a gone fishing sign on its door.

Had that agency been in place and had that
agency done its job, you wouldn't have to spend a half million dollars, no town would have to spend a half million dollars litigating what the Fair Share was. There would be an entity with institutional knowledge that could be making these judgments and be, and then it could go to that agency and try to persuade that agency to have standards that are more favorable than, than not.

And, in fact, what's happened is COAH was on the verge of adopting regulations that were, were fairly municipal friendly. And they deadlocked 3-3 and they didn't do anything to reconvene and try to solve it. And the Supreme Court came in and said I'm not waiting anymore, $I$ 'm sending this back to the courts.

So if you're looking for something to have more permanent change in how these laws operate your two targets should be having COAH open its doors again and have a debate in front of the public about what regulations it adopts and also having the legislature change the legislation. But there has been very little activity legislatively. I really had hoped for much, much more.

MR. PAULSEN: It just seems to me and I'm not (inaudible) all right, but the legislature, too many people who want to push the whole concept more
and more and more and more out (inaudible) so it's not fair but it seems to me if there was a court case, all right, with a large enough basis of plaintiffs, it would kind of force --

MR. SURENIAN: Let me, let me, let me give you an example. I handled this GAP Decision and the, the argument that $I$ made is the question about should there be an obligation that emanates from what happened between 2008, the end of Round II, and 2015 .

I made an argument that it wasn't part of the prospective need and it wasn't part of the present need.

I was right. The Supreme Court revoked the Fair Housing, revoked the law and created another category. And said, oh, yeah, we have a new Category of Need.

So, you know, this is not a sympathetic supreme Court to making significant changes to the Mount Laurel doctrine.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you, Jeff.
MR. PAULSEN: Thank you.
MS. TUCHMAN: Debra Tuchman.
So my first question I guess is I find this highly unacceptable. I'm an attorney. I work for the Attorney General's office for over 10 years. I have plaintiff background, labor background, government
practice. I'm very disappointed one being the fact that I still don't know what our RDP is? What's our RDP?

Then my, my issue with that, my issue with that is, how do we settle anything prior to knowing what that number is?

MR. SURENIAN: Well, so, a couple things. Initially, you know, someone had referenced earlier a 15 unit RDP. That number was never subject to any litigation in this concept that, that, oh, if we had settled the RDP then we wouldn't be in this situation. There is a Supreme Court case directly on point, when and if a site becomes available, suitable, developable, it then contributes to the RDP whether it's now or five years from now.

Secondly, the settlement agreement tries to secure at least RDP as to this site because it could go up depending on, you know, crafty arguments, different litigants, the number could go up so as a non severable part of this agreement we say the RDP has to be 70 units attributable to this site.

We have had preliminary discussion with Fair Share Housing Center about what an acceptable RDP would be and really one of the primary incentives for entering into a settlement would be that we can
solidify the RDP as opposed to opening up to litigation and debate where that number could get very, very scarey very quickly.

MS. TUCKMAN: I know exactly what settlement agreements are for and they are very necessary in certain circumstances. I also do know that and $I$ know Pete Hekemian. He may not remember me. (Inaudible) I'm Armenian. Somehow we know each other. But --

MALE SPEAKER: You don't know me.

MR. PAULSEN: No, I don't because you're a South Jersey guy. That's a different state as far as I'm concerned.

So that's another issue, you know. We are in Bergen County. We have, we have, we have a much different area than -- like I said, I work down if Trenton. It's a completely different area.

I worked in the courthouse. I clerked for several judges. So $I$ do know that they live in Bergen County. They understand where we live. They know the towns. They know our landscape.

And my major issue with this is, you know, we have to realize we do have a Master Plan and although I do understand and we know there's an affordable housing obligation, absolutely, but we also have to
respect our Master Plan and we have to -- and what is in the spirit of our Master Plan and where our town needs and what we can cope with and I don't think that we're in a totality of what you have put forth, that you have taken everything into account.

And, again, you know, this is -- Pete Hekemian is a good guy. I know he will come forth and sit down with you again.

And $I$ just don't think that we've gotten to the point where everyone is happy.

Is everyone happy with this agreement?
AUDIENCE: No.

MS. TUCHMAN: No. I don't think we have reached that point yet and I think that he would be more than willing to come back to the table and sit down and agree with some of this.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: So, a couple things.
We have had mediation today. And I think it's pretty clear, A., that this has been the subject of on-going negotiations. Yes, we came in at the 11 th hour but this has been negotiated ad nauseam for two years so $I$ mean in every, every avenue was explored.

MS. TUCHMAN: With the wrong people.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: I have -- I think your municipal attorney did a great job of getting you a
favorable -- let me back up for a second.
I don't think $I$ have ever sat in front of the public and maybe Jeff would say the same thing where affordable housing is a popular project.

And, you know, COAH didn't do any favors by going out of business for 16 years and then 16 years later, after not absorbing it in a rational way, and say, oh, you owe me affordable housing for 10 plus years into the future.

There's no great answer. I don't think anyone in this room would say we're thrilled, you know, to change the entire character of our town or, you know, provide a ton of affordable housing with a ton of associated market rate units. I don't mean anybody is thrilled with that prospect.

But the bottom line is, you have only so many choices and there's not a lot of maneuverability. You have a lack of land, a large obligation and a lot of office space that's going to be redeveloped.

MS. TUCHMAN: Yet you have not told us your obligation. You're guessing. It's not, it's not legit. It's not, it's not --

You have a number. What's the number? 70? MALE BOARD MEMBER: For this site. MS. TUCHMAN: For this site.

I don't know what the town --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: We told you. We have
litigation. We have told you that your allocation ranges from roughly 780 to roughly 550. We have told you that. We think we're entitled to an adjustment. We will try to adjust it down roughly 200 in a settlement -- in a litigation mode developers are going to try to jack that up over 400 and, who knows.

You know, (inaudible) in a settlement mode we can control how we address the (inaudible) area of more discretion area, more flexibility.

In a litigation mode, I've been in situations in a litigation mode where it is unbelievable the demands that are made on a community to address that. So, so, to me there's really two very clear paths.

I've been doing this for 34 years now, 1983. I think it's 34 if my math is right. And this is all I do.
(Inaudible) Judge Serpentelli. I worked for a judge as well. I worked for Judge Serpentelli. He was one of the judges who shaped this area overall. I was on that side of the bench. I spent my whole career wondering how do you just look at this. And it's very clear to me that the litigation is fraught with risk, fraught with potential that you lose
control of your community and it's very clear to me that our best chance of avoiding that is settling with this developer, settling with Hornock (phonetic), settling with Fair Share Housing Center, trying to get you a Judgement of Repose so you have some measure for at least some area of (inaudible).

And the gentleman with the red shirt, I encourage you to go down to your legislature and go down to COAH and have some wholesale change to this doctrine because this doctrine has run amuck.

I don't think this is really what Wilentz intended when he wrote Mount Laurel II in 1983 .

But that's the avenue that you need to change the legislation. You know, that's, that's what you have to do if you're going to change.

MS. TUCHMAN: We're working on that.

But, in the meantime, our township will suffer because of that. So I think that we need to revisit the settlement because $I$ don't think in the eyes of everyone around here, to our Mayor and Council, I don't think that this is it. And $I$ may think that we need to revisit it.

And $I$ think that, being that this was so rushed and, you know, rushed in less than 24 hours notice to get to this hearing and learn all of this stuff when
we thought for most of this was put to bed in June.
Now this was a big surprise on everyone.
So, thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
We are going to have to hold on. Hold on. Hold on.

We have a request from a couple of the council members to take a short break so they can make the right decision when they come back.

So we'll take a five minute recess. (A recess is taken.) MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. All right. We're back in session. Please come in.

Here we go. Okay. All right. We're back in session. Please, come.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible), Acres
Avenue, Montvale. I'm not an attorney. I'm a citizen of this town for 30 something years. I, I dare say that a lot of us are missing the point.

These attorneys have made great points. People in the audience made great points.

Everybody is frustrated and angry. I think it's all being routed in the wrong way. None of us is happy with what we're seeing but instead of putting it -- we're all looking at it very locally.

Guess what, the answers aren't local. This is a matter of, $I$ think, as a citizen, lousy laws and so if we have lousy laws and $I$ want to know how many people in the audience have so far and if they haven't there's tonight and tomorrow. I think the guy's name is Prieto. I emailed him after the very first meeting.

Everybody must, must contact the law makers and tell them how stupid is this. The judges, they all live in towns in New Jersey and my understanding is that every town is being faced with similar garbage. It makes no sense. It's lunacy. But fighting it here, amongst us, what we have to do right now is do what's right for Montvale.

The first meetings $I$ went to we were talking much bigger numbers. They have come down. That's a good thing and this shows, I think, good faith here and they're still not so happy with it. But, please, if nothing comes across, if everyone is here tonight, goes on their computer and tells a friend who tells a friend and I have friends that live in probably 50 towns in Bergen County so $I$ should tell them because they, they (inaudible) unless I'm thinking contact the law makers and tell them how stupid is this.

I don't think that the Hekemian group is a bad
group.

As a matter of fact, I, I liked how we, as a town, said let's go with them because they're stand up people. I'm hoping they can stand up for a little bit more. And $I^{\prime} m$ hoping we can come together but, again, we've got to change the laws.

Thank you.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.

Counselor, you're on the clock, buddy come in.

Also for the public. (Inaudible).

MS. MENAY: Can I go ahead of him?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. All right. Go
ahead.

MS. MENAY: All right. The reason I asked the questions $I$ asked in the beginning of this, I already know the answers to all of them.

I am an attorney. I'm a litigator. I actually don't typically talk in terms of settlement mode versus litigation mode because there is only one, litigation.

Once a lawsuit is filed, once Declaratory Judgment is filed, you're in litigation and all but probably 2 percent of cases settle at the end.

I, for one, have never said go to trial tomorrow, litigate to the end because I am very
reasonable, $I$ am very realistic. I know the laws. I have read the Fair Share Act. I have read our plan. I know all the tort cases. I have read every opinion.

I do recommend that we resolve this.
What I am upset about is I don't feel that we have been adequately represented. I don't feel that anyone has fought for us and $I$ hate when people (inaudible) that for us means that we have to, you know, hate Peter Hekemian and go to trial. No one said that. You can advocate for your client by coming up with your best defenses, with your best arguments and if you need to argue, argue PF-15 to jump start negotiations then that's what you have to do when you're a skilled negotiator.

I represent apartment owners, that's actually who I represent, property owners and property managers and every time a lawsuit is filed and I file an answer defending them, don't you think every person comes to me and says $I$ want a million dollars and do you think that I go back, even though I know the New York City laws and $I$ know what they say and $I$ know that my client is in trouble, don't you think that $I$ defend them vigorously and come up with the best settlement I can.

So that's what we are talking about here is
coming up with the best settlement and I just think what's happened unfortunately is you're stepping in this in August of 2017. You guys are coming in at the 11th hour. So in one sense $I$ can't really blame you because, quite frankly, that's what everyone does so when they pick up a file right now before trial, they just go you should settle because I'm panicked and it's a lot to catch up on in a short amount of time and you really can't undue all the mistakes that were done over the years.

But so far all I've heard tonight is you have to take this exact deal. End of story. It's either that or a thousand.

But then when $I$ questioned you kind of admitted --

MR. SURENIAN: I never said it was a
thousand. I said their demand is a thousand. I've never thought that was real.

MS. MENAY: Right.
MR. SURENIAN: But $I$ do think it's
substantially more than we can settle, yes.
MS. MENAY: So right now --
MR. SURENIAN: And, and can I just respond?

I appreciate you came up here. I appreciate you
saying you're an attorney, I appreciate where you're coming at it because you'll understand what I'm going to tell you.

So when -- this is all I do. My firm doesn't spend a penny on advertising. It doesn't spend a penny on political campaigns. We represent more municipalities than any two towns combined.

So when I come at this, I don't come at it from any political perspective. I come at it as someone who studied this law, who knows this law, who understands this law, whose been doing this law for 34 years.

And the only thing that $I$ have to trade on is my reputation. That's it.

So, so I come at this and I look at it and I say, okay, if we go to war -- and I like to fight.

MS. MENAY: (Inaudible).
MR. SURENIAN: I mean it doesn't put me off. I know that when $I$ go in that courtroom $I$ know as much as anyone in that courtroom including the judge. I know that.

But I make an assessment. And I make an assessment about where are we in the settlement mode, where are we in the litigation mode.

MS. MENAY: This all litigation mode you
either settle during litigation or you go to trial. Those are the --

MR. SURENIAN: The, the bottom line is this, the developer is right, as is his right to say here's my final offer, take it or I'm litigating. I can't control what position the developer has taken.

MS. MENAY: Absolutely.
MR. SURENIAN: So the developer has taken that position.

MS. MENAY: Sometimes I wonder if you're not suited and some people are not suited to really work with Peter Hekemian because back when things started and people were saying we don't want to go to trial, let's work this out with Peter Hekemian and there was an idea that he is a reputable developer. He's from the area. He'll be reasonable.

And what I'm a little bit concerned is what's been happening with the back deals over the years that he is so upset right now.

Why aren't we negotiating a good deal for everybody? Why don't we make him some money and also come up with something that we can all live with less maybe more ownership, less rentals or rentals less, less --

MR. SURENIAN: Look, we came in at the
llth hour. There was extensive negotiations that resulted.

MS. MENAY: Who negotiated that, Joe Boidus (phonetic).

MR. SURENIAN: Yeah.

MS. MENAY: Joe Boidus negotiated with Peter Hekemian? Give it a shot.

MR. SURENIAN: Hold on. I think he did a pretty good job --
(Speaking at the same time)
MAYOR GHASSALI: Jeff, Jeffrey, please. Hold on.

MR. SURENIAN: Yes.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Miss Menay, can you get to the question rather than pointing fingers to other attorneys who are not here?

MS. MENAY: Actually, it's not that I'm pointing fingers. It's that I, I love, I would love to work something out with Peter Hekemian and all I'm looking for is for, maybe it's too late but looking for people who can advocate for us and really fight for us and also work with him and $I$ just don't think that we have gotten that.

So with that said, I'm, you know, we would love to continue working with Peter Hekemian. I don't
think anyone wants to go to trial and I'm really tired of hearing everybody talk about do this or you go to trial. It's absurd.

The other thing is that you need to settle these things globally. It's crazy to think that we're going to do things in piecemeal.

You know, Mr. Hekemian intervened not even a month ago and here we are, have his settlement on the table (inaudible) Fair Share Housing is not here. We have to RDP globally. We have no negotiable plan. We're basically, here's 70 Fair Share to start with.

What else did you want us to do, bid against ourselves.

MR. SURENIAN: We have had discussions with the Fair Share Housing Center and we have been trying to come up with a global settlement. These are essential pieces.

MS. MENAY: Did they tell you what the RDP needs to be?

MR. SURENIAN: I don't know that we want to get in a public forum those specific discussions but, yes, we have discussed those kinds of issues.

MS. MENAY: And the other thing is, if the public is not allowed to know any of these details which is what the public is, is always told. This is
exactly the problem.
Someone like me stands up, starts talking, everyone wants to shut me down and have me take a seat.

The problem is the public doesn't know what's going on half the time they're trying to understand but everyone is blocking the right questions from happening. People are blocking information from getting out.

So if the public can't know the details, then you know what, set up a mediation committee that we've been asking for forever where the residents can be involved and attorneys that people trust to, to work the deals out, you know.

But that doesn't ever happen and it's just -and we go round and round and round and we'll be back here in six months to do the same exact thing. It's ridiculous.

I think that if Peter Hekemian, he obviously wants to make the most money possible and $I$ don't know which part of this aspect will do that, probably the rental apartments. If that's his top priority then why don't we start working from there and then see where he can work with us in other areas or that's gone (inaudible)? That's done?

MAYOR GHASSALI: That's done. But we have, we have the settlement that we have here tonight. It's either that or we go to court tomorrow morning.

MS. MENAY: How do we go to court tomorrow morning and when we have a meeting October 21 st?

MR. SURENIAN: Well, we have immunity but that doesn't mean --

MS. MENAY: I know. The thing is I'm an attorney so $I$ understand what the Mayor is saying but the public doesn't.

When you tell the public it's either this or we're going to court tomorrow, the public gets scared. Because they believe that statement, they believe that tomorrow we're going to court. They need to understand this process the way it works.

I'm tired of everybody acting like we have a gun to our head.

MR. SURENIAN: We do have a gun to our head.

MS. MENAY: What, what --
MR. SURENIAN: Tomorrow they go to the court and they ask for a trial date.

MS. MENAY: You know why? Because no one is advocating for us and because of all the back deals
that are going on.
MR. SURENIAN: What do you mean no one is advocating?
(Speaking at the same time).
MAYOR GHASSALI: Hold on, hold on, Miss Menay (phonetic), Miss Menay. Hold on. Hold on, please. I think two things.

The first one said no one said sit down. That doesn't happen. The second one, there's no back room deals. There's nothing happening behind the doors. No negotiation behind the doors. And all this stuff we always have the attorneys advice.

None of us are talking to him, to the developer and making any deals. It's with the attorneys with the guidance that we have from our Borough and the special attorneys.

So to say there's back room deals. We don't -we don' let you speak. Let's be reasonable.

MS. MENAY: I'm saying the public doesn't know what any deals are. We ask for RDP, we can't know. We can't know any of the information so how do we know that anyone is doing a good job negotiating? How do we know we have skilled negotiators working on it.
MAYOR GHASSALI: You're going to have to
trust the council that you elected to make those decisions on your behalf.

MS. MENAY: Then we want counsel in those meetings. We want counsel present for every single meeting with the attorneys, with Mr. Hekemian and everybody. We don't want Joe Boidus, just one person or even, you know, Darlene is consulting us. Let's say we have our professionals. They consult. They don't lead the negotiation. We lead the negotiation so we want the council members to know that.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Noted. Okay. Any other questions? Any more questions? Ask them. Go ahead. MS. MENAY: I want the public to understand all of this. And I want them to understand what it all means.

And I just, you know -- again, they're, they're scared. And they're intimidated and they are being told all of these things about Peter Hekemian and what he's going to do to us and how he's going to annihilate us. I don't think that's really fair because that's not truly how litigation happens.

I litigate every single day and that is not the reality of it.

And you know what, $I$ (inaudible) in the Bronx. And we (inaudible) for $\$ 8,000,000$ and I'm settling
that for less than 500,000. You know why? Because I worked my tail off to negotiate the very best that $I$ could. It's not like, yeah, we can't get hit but admittedly if we get hit it's not going to be for a thousand units.

So I mean our deal doesn't sound all that better than if you did give us, you know, this many apartments and then there was no commercial is what I'm trying to say and, and everyone is trying to be reasonable. No one says go to trial. Everybody said let's work this out.

I just don't hear a ton of people saying any arguments we have at all. I mean defend us, come up with something. (Inaudible).

MALE BOARD MEMBER: You would, in an open setting lay out all your arguments?

MS. MENAY: No. I would actually set up a mediation committee and $I$ would work the residents that the people trust and $I$ would work with the council members, people that $I$ have asked to be a part of and, and that's what $I$ 'm doing and while Peter Hekemian is here you shouldn't show your cards.

You know what? That's exactly the problem. We keep showing our cards. We keep offering more and more and more and that's what got us into trouble in
the first place.
MAYOR GHASSALI: All right.

MS. MENAY: (Inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: We do have, we did have a committee, a mediation committee, a COAH committee where two council members and myself are on it. The professionals are all on it. The settlement the, the guidance that we give to get to the developer will come out from this committee so this is not Joe or Jeff or one of us going in. It's, it's the committee that's made of those people.

So we have been working on this for 18 months. We have been spending endless hours on this. We've been negotiating. We've been talking, we've been calling, weekends, nights, 3:00 a.m.. I take issue to say we're not fighting for you. We are fighting for you and this is, you know --

MS. MENAY: Mayor, I feel different about this. I didn't say it about you. I do think that you're fighting for us but you also are -- have your hands tied a little bit because you are at the mercy of advice from people, from negotiators that are working for you, you know. That's the reality of it.

It's not like you're dealing with these type of litigation issues every day, you know.

You know you have my support and I just want the best deal we can get. I don't want to go to trial. I don't want to fight. I want the best deal.

This is really the best deal?

MALE BOARD MEMBER: This is the best deal at this juncture.

MS. MENAY: (Inaudible).
MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody else?
FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. Between, (inaudible)
I will be short. I do, I believe that (inaudible) the best.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Speak up, please.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Mayor and all
of you how on hard you are all working so I don't think that that should be mentioned in a way $I$ don't think that you're not. I think we think everything could be better. It always could be. All right.

What I'm here $I$ just want to leave on a note only because the last time we met and the council members, this is about the council members right now, the last time we met and you were taking your votes, there was some negativity which I'm not going to go major into. But $I$ was kind of taken aback by it.

And knowing that the newspaper is in here, $I$
think that, hopefully $I$ speak on behalf of everyone here that $I$ don't think anybody takes issue with affordable housing so $I$ don't think that is to be written up in the newspaper that Montvale disagrees with affordable housing. So I want to make that point.

And for the very reasons we don't agree with it is for the reasons somebody thinks we do disagree with that. That's absolutely wrong. All right.

So I think that should be mentioned and I think it's a good way to end if we're going to end at this moment.

I think what's most important for me in negotiations and what's truly trying to come out here is trying to preserve the integrity of this town not just for us but for the people who are seeking affordable housing. They are trying to come out of concrete homes and live among beautiful homes that they can raise their children the way we do. The real negotiation during this negotiation whatever we vote on tonight, it's still going to continue even after tonight. There's going to be all the little things we have to discuss. I think we need to understand that the whole point of the Mount Laurel is to give people a better place and a better chance.

If you're going to build a concrete jungle and you're going to take them out of one concrete jungle and put them in another then you did not do your job. That's what $I$ have to say.

And we need to preserve this town and it's integrity and (inaudible) the Master Plan, the way it was done. These people deserve a chance. They deserve jobs, they do deserve to look out their window and see concrete between. Whatever we'll build, whatever we're going to (inaudible) the house in Montvale, New Jersey.

All politics is no good. So I agree with you. (Inaudible) that's the whole that needs to be negotiated you need to have a topic and also come up with details and the topic at hand is who are we doing this for. What already happened.

Do we have to bring ourselves down or bring everybody down, too?

I don't think that was the purpose of this. The purpose of this was to give people better lives and (inaudible) our integrity. I (inaudible) understand that that's what this is all about. And (inaudible) we'll go back and negotiate (inaudible) again, negotiate with Mr. Hekemian who $I$ just met. By th way, he's very charming.

All right. Let's keep that factor involved. I'm not trying to tell people (inaudible) not the same so let's keep this perspective. I know this is not, I know this is all legalities so $I$ don't come from that avenue. I just felt I'm not going to (inaudible) the school part. That's just the way $I$ am.

But concrete to concrete (inaudible) that's not what we're here for. So let's keep the integrity, let's keep the (inaudible) out of this. Let's keep the (inaudible) going around the whole country lately out of it.

Montvale is in full favor of (inaudible) component. Not a (inaudible). Let's negotiate on those terms. (Inaudible) as well as our integrity.

Thanks.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Mayor, I'm sorry to come up a second time. Paul Thorny (phonetic). I live in Montvale, invested in Montvale just to -- I disagree with affordable housing especially in the, especially in the manner in which, in which it is being put on us. And $I$ further that, $I$ just want to, I just wanted to put that on the record and further to that $I$ just wanted to ask a question because I generally don't understand and it may be, it may be
something that's already been reviewed here in the past so (inaudible) wasting everyone's time. I don't understand what the urgency is. I understand the immunity, I understand talking about this emergency court date tomorrow but $I$ understand a little bit of the legal system and $I$ don't get that. It seems like an ambush to me. It seems like -- 18 months, 3:00 a.m. and all that we're being thrown in here, it seems to me there are lots of ways in this legal system, especially in this State to kick the bucket down the road. That's the New Jersey way.

Mercedes-Benz moved out of here. If the governor was on the top of his game (inaudible) nothing gets done in this state and we were told this has to happen tonight.

MAYOR GHASSALI: It absolutely has to happen tonight.

MALE SPEAKER: I don't, I don't -- with all due respect, Mr. Mayor, you could get food poisoning tonight and we could probably delay this vote. There's lots of things that could happen, push this thing around.

And what $I$ said before about Assemblywoman Shefsey's efforts on behalf of everyone in the State, all the things that are happening, the tide is going
towards the people on this issue. And my biggest concern is that we get rushed into something here where there are, where there are tactics, either legitimate or even dirty trick type of tactics, that could put us in a more advantageous situation, come down the road a couple months, we got rushed into, forced into a deal here that a person of position, when those better days come, we're locked into a position, something that's not good for us.

MAYOR GHASSALI: We've been given an ultimatum by the developer, either vote on this time or by 12:00 a.m. it's off the table and they go to court tomorrow.

MALE SPEAKER: So if we get a trial date tomorrow when is that date going to be?

MAYOR GHASSALI: I don't know. That's where we're at.

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) it's going to be six months from now.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Yes.

MALE SPEAKER: What happens in those six months?

MALE BOARD MEMBER: It will be before Holly's legislation is heard.

MALE SPEAKER: How many times --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Nothing is happening with Holly's legislation. Let's not talk about it as a trend. It's not happening. Let's not talk about as the winds are bringing change.

MALE SPEAKER: No happens (inaudible).

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Exactly. Settle in the courts.

MALE SPEAKER: The only thing happening in New Jersey is this thing tomorrow, that's what $I$ would believe. (Inaudible) timeless. We had time, use it to create time. It may be late, too, (inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: All right. Noted.
MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) you made these people sit and wait, too.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Noted. Thank you.

Anybody else.
Thank you, sir. Thank you.
Carrie.

CARRIE: He mentioned integrity. My
friend mentioned integrity. That's terribly important for us to remember because $I$ do have many friends in Newark.

And, John, when $I$ was talking about something like this is they don't necessarily want to come to Montvale. They want to have the monies in their
community so they can build up their schools, be with their relatives, go to their churches. They don't necessarily want to come here and, indeed, it's not everybody who is in a coalition of affordable housing, $m y$ former friends (inaudible) are anybody $I$ would be ashamed to live next door to.

So keep this in mind that indeed the coalition of affordable housing tends to always weave itself into these conversations but for us to maintain the integrity of our town overrides all of it.

And, and that is for you to consider this evening if you have not already considered.

And as I mentioned the last time that we talked, and I used to work with the UN delegates and they would say to me, oh, Carrie, you know we don't make our decisions on the general assembly, we would make our decisions in the, in the cloakroom or, or in the delegates assembly in the cocktail room.

So if you made your decision ahead of time, that's not unusual. But $I$ would trust that, once again, you listen to the people that are here that have spoken with their hearts and their minds and their pocketbooks and that your decision will give a sense to all of this if you have (inaudible) the integrity as we have trusted you and elected you to
do. Thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. Thank you.
MR. ROSE: Chris Rose 5 Lark Lane, I just have a question for you regarding the 350 units, has already been established as far as rest of the development. 3,000 square feet of medical and educational.

MR. SURENIAN: I said the ordinance says a minimum of 40,000 square feet in the aggregate of professional/medical/educational and general office.

MR. ROSE: Okay. So we just changed our zoning in Montvale, I believe, a year and a half ago to prohibit educational in that zone. There's supposed to be no educational between the Parkway and (inaudible) the Parkway border up to Summit.

MR. SURENIAN: This settlement, like most Mount Laurel settlements, involves an ordinance that is the subject of, of a discussion and this ordinance will be introduced and, you know, if it --

MR. ROSE: Okay. The 350 that's already settled?

MR. SURENIAN: Yes.
MR. ROSE: The 40,000 then is to --
MR. SURENIAN: It's part of the ordinance.
MR. ROSE: We have to agree to that?

MR. SURENIAN: Yes. That's part of the ordinance, that's part of this deal.

MR. ROSE: 40,000 square feet of possible educational use?

MR. SURENIAN: An aggregate of professional, medical, educational and general offices.

MR. ROSE: (Inaudible) is that's what I'm asking, you could put a school there?

That's what I'm asking. You could put a school there.

I believe everybody on the Board who's been here long enough understands --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: I suppose you could.
MR. ROSE: You could put a school there.
Okay. Thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
Anybody else? Anyone else?
MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Mayor, Counsel, I know it's getting late and $I$ know you have to (inaudible) and I'm going to say this before you do. I know everybody here knows that you have an impossible decision tonight because (inaudible) a good thing for Montvale tonight. It's either a bad thing or a very bad thing and only a hand -- only in New Jersey is --
are we forced to say this is the least bad thing we can do for our town so we take it. So essentially, as you said many times tonight, we're negotiating (inaudible) that the State has forced this upon us, that nobody in Montvale wants this, (inaudible) nobody wants this and have to do something, obviously.

And whether we do it tonight or down the road, (inaudible) we're looking for the least bad apple, for example.

And my plea to this council -- Mr. Lane, I know potentially that you feel this way; Mr. Mayor, I know you feel this way. I, I pray, I plea to you, please go to Trenton, please speak to our governor, senators because (inaudible) they won't listen to us.

We'll write, we'll advocate but you have their ear, we don't.

So I, I beg you, please because tonight is not the last time this is going to happen (inaudible) 2025. Seven years, eight years from now this is going to come down with another property. If it doesn't come up here, it will be Park Ridge, Woodcliff Lake.

But, please, you can speak to our, you can speak to Trenton, you can speak to politicians. We can't.

So please, I beg you, because this is going to happen again.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: You can speak to politician and you can do that on election day and something that was forwarded to me today and $I$ was unaware of is that $I$ think our, our democratic candidate for governor, Bill Murphy, is one of the largest donors to Fair Share.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Election Day is on the 7th.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: All right.

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) you all know
how I'm going to vote, myself and hundred people in this room.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Noted.

MALE SPEAKER: I beg you, Montvale, not just our town, it's all of New Jersey. How we vote, unfortunately, we're not the majority of New Jersey. MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. Thank you. MALE SPEAKER: One more?

MAYOR GHASSALI: One more. Because we
have --

FEMALE SPEAKER: I'll be brief. It's just a quick follow-up because of Chris's question.

With regards to that additional information about medical offices, education and so on, why
specifically was that inserted into the language of this, of this settlement? Who put it in there?

All right. I guess is what I'm asking. Why is it required?

MR. SURENIAN: This was part of a package that was negotiated.

FEMALE SPEAKER: By the developer so they asked that this be inserted into the language of this settlement?

MR. SURENIAN: Well, this negotiation has been going on a long time between the developer and the town.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I guess, I honestly agree a year and a half ago there was a great deal of discussion about this very issue and a great deal of time and effort went into consideration.

So I'm wondering why this was slipped in and I would please beg you to think about, you know, first of all why it was put in but secondly think about it, please.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay.

MS. BUTTON: Female speaker. Jeannie

Button. I promise I'll be real quick. I just want to be heard tonight.
I'm not a lawyer, I'm not a realtor. I used to
teach kindergarten. I have a first grader in the school at Memorial. And every so often we just give the kids a break from homework and we do a family night and tonight's family night so to do an activity as a family shows how you make a difference in your community so $I$ find that (inaudible). I'm here. (Inaudible).

But I just wanted to say that you are voting tonight, have that same opportunity to make a real difference for us. So $I$ know that it might be the road less traveled and it might be a harder fight but it will be the one that will certainly make a difference for our kids and for everyone in this community. So I just beg you to consider that.

Thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
MS. THOMAS: Rita Thomas (phonetic), Eagle Ridge. I just wanted to say my plea is not to the Mayor and Council mit's to Peter Hekemian who $I$ know is sitting two rows in front of me. And we were told tonight many times by Surenian and others that it's the final deal or no deal at all.

And I just ask, since you are a neighbor of ours in the neighboring town and you have children and you understand what everybody here is saying that you will
continue to have conversations with us.

We're frustrated. We're angry. It's not really at you although you may feel like it is. It's at the process. We know you've been in this for two years with us. I apologize that it's taken so long but we are now just really getting into it so if you would please come back to the table and have more discussions with us, $I$ know we can come to a better settlement than what is on the table right now.

And the fact that that piece about the school just got brought up between, it's makes all of us very concerned and all on council and most of you (inaudible) so $I$ ask really Peter to have more discussion with us. We're not unreasonable. We want to settle. We know something has to happen on that property, let it be something that we both could be happy with.

Thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
All right. If there's no one else the process now, Mr. Jeff Surenian will address the Council and the Council will give their comments and put it to vote.

Anyone else from the public, seeing --
If members of the Hekemian team would like to
talk to the public, this is your chance to talk to the public.

Thank you, Mr. Del Vecchio.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, members of the Council. I don't intend to shed any light or discuss the negotiations leading up to this moment.

The reason $I$ did get up $I$ wanted to plea for council's benefit and the public's benefit, I guess what is a scary thing for those who went through it in Montvale a year ago on the educational issues relative to schools potentially moving int the area. And the ordinance as it's attached to the settlement agreement and as proposed the following is an educational office as a room or group of rooms used for conducting corporate training which is generally consists of a desk, table and communication equipment. It is not the educational use or type of use that was of a concern that generated public outcry and council action in the past.

So the ordinance was tightly confirming corporate educational use which was something the business community had requested not something that we had sought. And that was basically, Mr. Mayor, I know at the round table for the business community and
their express needs of what they needed to be in Montvale.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
All right. A motion to close the meeting to the public.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: So move.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Second?
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: So move.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Mr. (Inaudible) do you
have any comments before we go to the Council?
MALE BOARD MEMBER: Before you start are we going to hear anything more than we've already heard? That's a serious question (inaudible).

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: I would like to hear the counsel.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Let him speak, please.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Thank you, Mike.
Councilman Weaver, Councilwoman Curry.
MR. SURENIAN: You have a difficult
decision. You have a situation that replicates itself all over the State where you're faced with a decision where there is a lot of concerns with the public.

And -- but this process has gone on for a long time. And it's pretty clear to me that this is the end of the road, that we have to make a decision.

We're going to put this through or not.
We're not manufacturing a false perception that there's a gun to our head. It's been made very clear. The developer has been very frustrated because he was now hoping to get a deal before. He's now hoping to get a deal again, that, you know, his lawyers are whispering in his ears saying fight, fight, fight, you can make more money. Okay.

So you're facing a very difficult situation where if you vote this down there is not any question in my mind that what, we're going to be in a different mode than we are now. They are going to be firing their guns. I'm not going to go into the detail of what you all know, more detailed letters and memos about the risk involved in the litigation. You know all that.

You have to understand. All that's been written to you, explained to you. It's not for me to say in the public.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Not, not in the level of details that you've heard it personally and in writing. And so the point of the matter is we're at the end of the road and, and for all the angst and I don't mean to minimize that. I can understand how
members of the public have legitimate concerns about a lot, $a \operatorname{lot}$ of this. The alternative is much worse.

And it's very clear what the alternative is.

And there's two roads for you, one road leads to litigation where the developer has to pull out all the stops and all the efforts, all the resources, all the energy is spent on trying to get the court to make decisions that you lose control of your community or you go down a road that you can control what happens on the site.

Is it perfect? Is it great? No, of course you would want it different. But you have some measure of control on this site and you have the opportunity to, to control your community.

My biggest fear is that you lose control. My biggest fear is that developers come in expensive real estate and start dictating to you.

Heaven forbid you lose your immunity. You know, you're an attractive community. It's a major concern.

So $I$ know this is a difficult decision for you but I, I still recommend that you put through the settlement and that you move on and we try to wrap up the other two pieces of litigation and put this behind us.

And all this angst, all this effort really does
need to be directed to the legislature but that's not going to happen before we need to decide this matter. The decision needs to happen tonight.

And, and so $I$ won't belabor it. There was a question raised, by the about the resolution.

And we suggest that you make one change to the resolution so that there's no question. And it's the last whereas before now therefore.

I would suggest that you insert into this last whereas the, the second line says agreement. I would insert the words which requires 53 total affordable units and, and $I$ (inaudible) it, it just makes it clear that it's 53 affordable units (inaudible) the RDP.

That's the clarification.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. Thank you very much.

Okay. Let's start with the Council President for some comments and then we (inaudible).

Council President.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CURRY: I thank you,
Mayor. I want to thank everybody for coming tonight and speaking what's on your mind, using the talents that you have been given to bring out what's on your mind. And to the point that was made, I believe it
was made about the public doesn't know what, what happens. And the public wasn't in that room tonight at the closed session when Mr. Surenian made it very clear, very clear that if we don't settle on this we will have other developers forming unholy alliances with Fair Share Housing. And I am just not willing to have that happen.

It will be irresponsible of me, as a council person, to vote no on this. There is so much at stake.

I want to keep control of the future development in Montvale. This is one we settle for. We work -the Planning Board works with the Hekemian developers. We get the best for the town and we move forward making sure that the next time we have a better idea, a clearer idea of what's going to be coming down the pike and not wait for seven years or eight years to start making those decisions. That's what $I$ mean.

So my vote is going to be yes.
Thank you all again for coming tonight and thank you, Mr. Surenian.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you. Councilwoman Gloeggler.

COUNCILWOMAN GLOEGGLER: First I'd like to thank everyone in town for coming here and talking to
us tonight. I appreciate hearing all the input.
You're friends and you're our friends and our neighbors and $I$ take everything you say very seriously and have listened to input from all directions.

The second thing $I$ would like to do is thank the Mayor and my fellow council members because whatever we decide here tonight there are no good choices here.

And for all of us, we're just doing our best to, to do what we think is best for Montvale and there's a few of us who would be in agreement that we don't like any of the choices that are here in front of us today.

And, $I$ certainly don't love this deal.
I stood here a couple months ago and voted no because of the density of this project. And since that time I still don't like the density of this project but I've also worked very, very hard in the meantime to listen, to ask for and listen to all of the experts that could be here and have listened very carefully to my fellow council members and to the towns members.

And as much as I don't like this deal I also want to make sure that $I{ }^{\prime} m$ being responsible to you, the people of Montvale, and make sure that we -- I don't get a worse deal for us as time goes on.

And so as we decide what our decisions are going
to be tonight and as we decide what our votes are going to be, we will all consider and think about what is best for the town and what is best for everyone here in Montvale.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
Councilman Lane.

COUNCILMAN LANE: Thank you, Mayor. I sat up here now going on 10 years and truly thought about this affordable housing issue every year that I've been on. Some of it was a little quieter because COAH was sort of AWOL and then, at other times, the situations would crop up where it definitely became a part of our consideration.

I've tried to come up with analogies that I could, you know, sort of try and grasp as, as I've tried to explain this to people.

First of all, do you any of you drive Mercedes and how come you haven't sold them yet. I'm just trying to lighten the mood a little because they're the real guys.

The fact is we didn't expect to lose Mercedes. We did. And we may not lose another company, we may lose, we may lose more. And every time that happens this raises a tet and it's something we have to consider.

You know, I've sent this to some of my colleagues on the Council. I sent this to - - I said try this out. I got this watching an American experience special on George H. W. Bush when he had to make an argument for Fair Housing in Houston in 1968. You could imagine what forces were aligned against him and it's a quote by Edmund Burke (phonetic).

It said, your representative owes you not his industry only but his judgment and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

That doesn't mean that your opinions are wrong. It doesn't mean that we know better than you. What it means is that we're charged with making a decision where we sometimes necessarily maybe not unnecessarily have more facts and also where we take a lone view.

You know, in, in some ways it's a little bit like -- we've all talked about, you know, this is a tough decision. It's lesser of evils. We don't, we don't like the situation we're in.

You know, in my view the Mount Laurel doctrine, the decision was about making great towns like this accessible to more people. That's certainly a notable cause. The way they've done it $I$ think is just backwards.

I'm a republican. I would have a different
mindset about the way to do it. But I'm not going to get political on it.

But make no mistake, they want to add kids to our schools. That's part of helping people achieve the American dream.

And on that issue alone, one of the reasons I'm supporting this is because just on the pure valuation of what 600 or 700 units would do to our schools, I'm not going to say a thousand versus what 350 would do, many of which are targeted at the older population, people who are retired, don't have kids, some people who are just starting out also don't have kids yet, who don't have the older ones; obviously, the kids have moved on.

I think we can manage the impact.
Many of you came up and talked about streets that you lived on that were actually the results of affordable housing mandate and settlement. And $I$ don't think any of you felt yourselves as being a recipient of an affordable housing development.

That's, that's not a statement of anything other than this is something we will adjust to.

We, as a town, we're a great town, we will integrate what we do here into the way Montvale will be for the next 20 years. I can guaranty you Montvale
will not be the same 25 years from now than it was 25 years ago. I also don't think Montvale is worse today than it was 25 years ago. I think it's better.

And so I look at this as something we can, we can handle, we can settle this issue, we can, as Councilwoman Curry said, retain control and then and move forward in a very proactive manner around the overall development of this town.

I still believe we have to control development but I do not, I do not think I can, it would be responsible for me to risk losing that control from this body. You may not be happy with this body and but and it over to the courts.

So I am going to support the, the ordinance.
And I promise you we will work our butts off to make sure that if you're gain for being involved, we will keep you involved.

Thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
Councilman Arendacs.
COUNCILMAN ARENDACS: The politician in
Trenton that (inaudible) hear the Assemblywoman's bill on affordable housing, the don't care. I voted this down in June because the scope of the density appeared unrealistic and unreasonable for our town.

You offered before us. It doesn't appear much different than what was proposed in June.

I want to continue, I wanted to continue discussions with Hekemian to come up with a realistic and reasonable solution that we can all live with.

We have to build. I know that. It's incumbent upon myself to expand responsibility, that the least impact as possible on the infrastructure.

Based on the overflow of the parking on Mercedes-Benz, I don't feel confident we can absorb that magnitude of development directly across the street.

There are too many projects going on in town at the same time. I don't want to make any impulsive decisions. I welcome comments or emails from residents advising what they thought, think was acceptable at that site.

I'm the voice of the people.
Hekemian is a taxpayer, a professional. I respect him. He needs to respect us in Montvale.

I would like to personally meet him which I didn't and continue discussions to come up with a reasonable and realistic solution that we can all live with.

I just learned about the current RDP of 70
tonight. We just learned parts of the settlement now, at this moment. I would have been happy to settle this as soon as possible on an agreement that's desirable to Hekemian and the residents of Montvale.

I don't want individuals that sought with committees to meet with him. I thought all of that needed to be with Hekemian and try to work this out. I just don't accept ultimatums. I don't accept residents being notified two days ago on a vote that could change Montvale as we know it.

I understand we can't please all of the developers or please all of the residents. We needed to work out a deal for everyone's best interests.

And I just found out tonight we're not being televised this evening.

I just met the court appointed master tonight.
As a councilman for three, four months, $I$ just thought maybe we can just talk to him a little bit more and, and all come to an agreement and shake his hand and that would be done with after he heard from all the people here in Montvale.

So you know how I stand.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.

Councilman Koelling.
COUNCILMAN KOELLING: Thank you. And
thank you for everyone's participation. Thank you, professionals.

We have heard all the, all the information so I'll be brief. But I agree with -- I haven't heard anything $I$ disagree with from anybody.

I definitely agree that we need to fight but we probably need to -- I have heard it, heard it here said a different way, just kind of redirect our energies.

And the last time we did this everybody said they were willing to fight to the end, to the bitter end.

And, again, $I$ think it would be smart to redirect our energies and come together.

And the gentleman said before asking us to go speak to the politicians and I'm sure we're all going to do that but you need to do that part, too, so it comes from every angle because this isn't wrong here in Montvale, it's wrong everywhere in New Jersey.

As for the deal that's in front of us, $I$ also agree we need to settle this and live to fight another day.

So I plan on supporting this resolution and fighting another day.

So, thank you.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
Councilman Weaver.
Nothing to say.
COUNCILMAN WEAVER: I have plenty to say. MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

COUNCILMAN WEAVER: I don't appreciate that comment.

First I'd like to apologize to the residents. We knew we were having this meeting and our arrangements weren't made for the meeting to be televised and Montvale won't see what happened here this evening and that's unfortunate.

MAYOR GHASSALI: It's being taped, by the way.

COUNCILMAN WEAVER: Video -- audio is much different than video. I think we can all agree to that.

And correct me if I'm wrong but a resident would have to request the audio and it's not going to be aired on Montvale access television.

MAYOR GHASSALI: That won't be (inaudible).

COUNCILMAN WEAVER: Okay. My apologies.
I would like to acknowledge Mr. Hekemian. I thank you for coming this evening. It would have been
very easy for you to not come.
And, and let us have this hearing and not hear what the residents had, had to say. I respect that. I appreciate it.

And, and I'm glad to have the opportunity to speak directly to you this evening. This is an opportunity $I$ haven't had for the last 18 months.

I don't have faith in, in individuals who have let out of negotiations. Not all, some.

So the fact that $I$ get to speak to you is important. I have shared some thoughts with the community today. I'll share some of those same thoughts again with some other --

For a variety of reasons $I$ believe it is important to continue negotiations with Peter Hekemian.

Let me be clear, $I$ have no interest in fighting with any developer, none of us do. We have heard that. We know the situation that we're in. We all want what's best for Montvale.

But there has to be a commitment to work together to create development that is not only reasonable and realistic but one the community will embrace. And we did sit in this back room a few weeks ago having settlement conversations and I admittedly
was for trying to reach an agreement at some of the numbers that were discussed.

And then $I$ attended the Planning Board meeting last week as the council liaison where we heard and made final decision on the KPMG campus that is, is currently under construction.

And, and during the closing comments Mr. Del Vecchio, who is the attorney for KPMG and also represents Mr. Hekemian, said something that has stuck with me for the last week in his closing comments.

And he said, I think we all have something, something to be proud of at the end of the day if this project puts a shovel in the ground because $I$ think it adequately and properly balances the needs of the corporate tenant with the needs of the community in a respectful manner. And I agree on that approach.

And for whatever reason, whether it's, it's personalities or otherwise, I, I don't know if, if we've gotten to that point.

I had a conversation with my son today before he went to his basketball try-outs and, and we were having an argument in the driveway and then whoever has seen me coach you know $I$ can be a little bit animated, especially with my son. And I told him you're a glass half empty person and you can't get out
of the negative. You are your own worst enemy. And research tells us if you look at the glass half empty it takes that much longer to get yourself into the positive.

It's like when the economy rebounds but consumer confidence doesn't or takes more time and lags behind.

I feel going back to the Wegman's project that we have been in a half glass empty mode with Peter and, and the work that he's done in town.

And it's taken us and is going to take us and we may never get to the point where we reach the positive and $I$ think that's unfortunate because I think Mr. Hekemian has a tremendous amount to offer to this community. And I think that development at Mercedes can be a, a, I think it could be the Rolls Royce but not in its current form.

I know that Mr. Hekemian believes in responsible development. I know how strongly you believe about school.

We, we've not gotten to specifics. We've danced around the topic all night. And if our legal counsel is going to put it on the table let's just ge to specifics.

You know, we talk about what's more. Eventually in a negotiation you have to get to a point where you
say what is the most important thing to this community. The most important thing to this community based on what $I$ have heard is height and density.

There isn't aversion to four to five stories. There is an aversion to 15 units to the acre.

I can tell you, if we could get that complex down to three stories and six to eight units to the acre I would, I would vote yes yesterday.

And the reason why I feel so strongly about that and why the residents feel so strongly about that is because there's going to be a domino effect on other properties.

And once four to five stories go in on Mercedes it's inevitable that those same heights and densities go in on other properties.

And I, I, I beg Mr. Hekemian to come back to the table.

Though, if $I$ were you, at this point $I$ wouldn't because after what I've heard from our own legal counsel, $I$ mean, the deal on the table right now is the best one we're going to get but it's not something the residents are going to love and embrace.

It could be the example for the community. It could be the example for future development.

We've heard working our butts off and
redirecting energies.
You know, I've read the Facebook comments. I read your emails. I listen to your concerns. And I cannot in good conscience approve any developments without addressing at minimum issues that we have in our own town.

The 2008 Master Plan recommended a community center based on, on lack of open space and current community need.

This development alone would add 1,000 residents. Our schools are already at max capacity in their ability to handle our recreational programs.

Do we have a community center? Yes.

Does it serve the, the needs of the community? No.

In the summer our, our children go to a rec camp and on hot day they hide under a tree.

In other communities they take cover in an air conditioned space with classrooms and gymnasiums and game rooms. Our children deserve that.

We've talked about downtown. It's been an ongoing conversation for years. At what point are we going to study the downtown? At what point are we going to address the traffic issue?

It's the only intersection that hasn't been,
major intersection that hasn't been touched with the Wegman's proposal and it will only get worse and more congested. Common sense dictates that.

Traffic on thru streets. How long did, did you come to council meetings and ask for something to be done on Akers? How long?

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

COUNCILMAN WEAVER: It shouldn't take that long, it shouldn't. If we had issues with traffic and speeding on our thru streets we need to do something about it.

How long have parents at the High School level been asking for subscription bussing. The school won't provide it. The Borough needs to step up and assign someone in our administrative offices to facilitate that. It needs to be done.

The MAL sent us an email the other day saying that we can't wait any longer for you to make a decision on whether or not you're going to rehabilitate the field so we're going to go ahead and, we're going to get it done while we have the monies available and open space to do that.

We've talked, we have had recommendations from our Economic Redevelopment Retention Committee on the need to hire someone to recruit corporate tenants,
hire an outside firm. We've been having that conversation for over a year and we have not acted upon it.

So when $I$ hear comments like we'll work our butts off and we need to redirect our energies, we've got plenty of issues that we have not given the time and address. What makes us think that anything is going to change. I'm not convinced.

Pressed to vote right now my answer is no. However, in a show of good faith $I$ would like to make a motion to table this vote in order to continue dialogue and negotiations with Mr. Hekemian.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: I second, I second that motion.

MR. WEAVER: I'm understanding that it may not be something that the developer wants to do. I would like the opportunity to sit across the table from him and have that conversation, something I haven't had the opportunity to do.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Who seconded?

MALE BOARD MEMBER: A motion to table it. MAYOR GHASSALI: We have a motion to table it to, to what meeting you said, Councilman?

What's your motion again?
MR. WEAVER: I would like to make a motion
to table this vote in order to continue dialogue and have negotiations with Mr. Hekemian.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Spend 24 hours in room and meet with him.

MAYOR GHASSALI: So we have a motion.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: I second that.
(Inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: All right. Based on the procedure we have to take a vote but before the vote I do want to make some comments before we do this one here.

Councilwoman Gloeggler, were you for it or against it?

COUNCILWOMAN GLOEGGLER: We didn't vote yet.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: We didn't vote yet. MAYOR GHASSALI: All right. So we have a motion and we have a second.

So we have a motion, we have a second to delay this vote.

Just a couple comments. We've been working with the State, we've been working with Assemblywoman Schepisi, Lieutenant Governor of the Economic Development team. We are on the RSP for Amazon.com. We went there and talked to them across the table and
we were all excited that we may have Amazon moving here until we saw that there is a thousand trucks that may be moving in and out of Montvale, with robots actually operating (inaudible) --

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) headquarters. MAYOR GHASSALI: Let me finish, please.

So we have been working with them to try and get some office space, maybe satellite offices.

I am highly encouraged talking to the other mayors who settled and have met with the Fair Share that they have gotten a really good deal. We are not there yet.

We were giving given an ultimatum to either vote on this tonight or else we go to court.

Just, just before coming here my son was doing -- he's a sophomore at Pascack Hills and someone asked him why is your father the Mayor and he said because he wants to do the right thing for this town.

This has been probably one of the most difficult times in office where we're talking about this and we're discussing it in good faith, on both sides, who are for it and who are not for it. They all mean well but $I$ can't do well with ultimatums to either do it today or else we are done.

Just to clear some confusion, we're the Mayor
and Council. We represent 9,000 people who live in town. We have to call the shots not the developer who comes in from outside and calls the shots in our town.

That was my intention. We sat through mediation for four hours today and for countless hours at prior. And, the development, the developer has not budged from the original numbers except for giving us the Grand View and the building on that. But the actual numbers we should be calling the shots how high they should be, how many units and we should go there. That, that's our job.

For someone to walk in from San Francisco and say I want to build this or else to me is not acceptable.

So you, you made my job very difficult if I have to break the tie again.

It was a motion. We have a second. Roll call, please.

Now this is to delay until our next meeting? FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: No. No. This is a motion on the table to go into further discussion. MAYOR GHASSALI: To go into further discussion with the developer.

Roll call, please.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: This is motion to
table the resolution.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: To go into further discussions.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Table, a motion to table the resolution to go into further discussion with the developer. Motion by Councilman Weaver, seconded by Councilman Arendacs.

Roll call, please.
SECRETARY: Councilman Arendacs.

MR. ARENDACS: Yes.

SECRETARY: Councilwoman Curry.
MS. CURRY: Can I ask Mr. Surenian for his input on this?

MAYOR GHASSALI: This is roll call, please.

MS. CURRY: Yes.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: I can't vote on this unless I -- if this is the same as a no vote and we go into litigation that's --

MAYOR GHASSALI: That's what this is.

Okay.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: It's, it's been clear that that's what this means.

MALE SPEAKER: Let me be clear. In
requesting the --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Let me be clear in explaining why I'm requesting the resolution.

There are six members of this council who have been voted by the public and the Mayor. There are seven or eight individuals who participated in negotiations. There are individuals who participated in negotiations who hold seats on boards in this town who I have no confidence in to negotiate in our best interests.

I am an elected official. I want the opportunity to sit across from the developer and have those conversations and $I$ have not had that opportunity.

My vote is not a no. MAYOR GHASSALI: Mr. Surenian, did you have any other comment for roll call?

MR. SURENIAN: Just so the record is clear, you heard the same that $I$ heard, Mayor, that this is our choice, the offer expires if it's not accepted.

So I don't discount that you would like to have further negotiations but there are consequences to, to putting this off. We've been told point blank what those consequences are.

So there's no ambiguity there.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay.
MR. SURENIAN: Councilman Weaver made a motion, Councilman Arendacs seconded that motion. It's a --

SECRETARY: The motion is to table the resolution and to go into further discussion.

Councilman Arendacs.
MR. ARENDACS: Yes.
SECRETARY: Council Member Curry.
MS. CURRY: No.
SECRETARY: Council Member Gloeggler.
MS. GLOEGGLER: Yes.
SECRETARY: Mayor Ghassali.
MAYOR GHASSALI: No.
SECRETARY: Councilman Lane.
MR. LANE: On the advice of the counsel, retained professional who's an expert in Land use Law in the State of New Jersey, who we brought in to enable us to try and manage this, based on his interpretation that this is effectively a no vote and that we're going to court tomorrow I cannot support this resolution.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Is that a no?
MR. LANE: Yes, it's a no.
SECRETARY: Councilman Weaver.

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: No. We're voting.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: It is a resolution.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Sir, sir.
(Speaking at the same time)

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: You can't talk.

MAYOR GHASSALI: You can come back after.

SECRETARY: Councilman Weaver.

MR. WEAVER: Yes.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Is it a tie again?

SECRETARY: There's a tie, Mayor.
Councilman Arendacs, yes; Council Member

Gloeggler, yes; Councilman Weaver, yes; Council Member Curry, no; Council Member Koelling, no; Council Member Lane, no.

So, Mayor, it is your tie vote.
MAYOR GHASSALI: And the Mayor votes yes.

All right. So this carries until --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Until we go to court.

MAYOR GHASSALI: We're asking the
developer if he wants to meet again. If he wants to go to court, we go to court.

MR. LANE: Can I make a motion?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Yes.

MR. LANE: I make a motion that we freeze
all spending in town until we understand the costs associated with the pending litigation.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Second to the motion to freeze all spending?

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: I just ask

Councilman Lane to explain what that means.
MR. LANE: My, if, if we are now proceeding on a litigation path we have serious financial issues with respect to the spending cap and we have to suspend any discretionary spending from this point forward until we understand what the financial impact on this town will be if we go to litigation.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Discretionary
spending?

MR. LANE: Anything that hasn't been approved in the budget that isn't already been --

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Been approved in the 2018 budget.

MR. LANE: In the 2018 budget because we absolutely cannot spend -- if we're going to go to litigation we absolutely cannot spend any money until we understand what that, the --

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay.

MR. LANE: -- the impact of this is going
to be.

MAYOR GHASSALI: So salaries is no -FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Anything that hasn't been put into our 2018 -- our 2017 - -

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. Second to the motion?

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: That would include the bill, the --

MR. LANE: Anything that has an economic impact on the town, yes.

MAYOR GHASSALI: That's in the budget.

MR. LANE: No, it's not in the budget. We
voted on it this year. It wasn't a budgetary spend, it's an additional spend.

MAYOR GHASSALI: It's a motion.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: So we get the
opportunity to vote?
MAYOR GHASSALI: Yeah.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: I'll second that.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Good point. How about
the KPMG tax appeal? That doesn't get paid?
MR. LANE: Nothing. Nothing.

MAYOR GHASSALI: All right. So there's a
motion to freeze all discretionary spending.
Second to the motion.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: I'll second.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Roll call please.

SECRETARY: Council Member Arendacs.

MR. ARENDACS: No.

SECRETARY: Council Member Curry. MS. CURRY: Yes.

SECRETARY: Council Member Gloeggler.

MS. GLOEGGLER: Yes.

SECRETARY: Council Member Koelling.

MR. KOELLING: Yes.

SECRETARY: Council Member Lane.

MR. LANE: Yes.

SECRETARY: Council Member Weaver.

MR. WEAVER: Oh my God.

SECRETARY: Council Member Weaver.

MR. WEAVER: Did we have comment on this?

SECRETARY: (Inaudible).
MAYOR GHASSALI: It's a vote for right
now.

MR. WEAVER: We never had comment? Isn't
that procedural to have discussion?

MAYOR GHASSALI: There was some discussion
going on.
(Speaking at the same time).

Everybody had the opportunity to speak.

All right. So make your comments first.
MR. WEAVER: No. It's kind of, now it's
after the fact.
MAYOR GHASSALI: You can make comments.
Go ahead.
MR. WEAVER: Now everyone else has voted
so Councilman Lane had the opportunity to, to possibly influence vote and not -- I have not had the opportunity to speak before anyone else voted.

MAYOR GHASSALI: All right. Counselor,
how do we handle this?
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Council Member
Weaver (inaudible) --
MAYOR GHASSALI: Certain members.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: Certain members of the
Council had spoken in comment and the vote again so it's in the middle of a vote procedure and the vote hs to complete.

MR. LANE: Procedurally is everyone entitled to the opportunity to speak before a roll call vote is taken?

MALE BOARD MEMBER: There was comments so it was open for comment.

MR. LANE: Procedurally how do we typically handle it when a resolution is introduced?

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: It's a motion on the paper for this motion, now you can't comment before you have asked. Yes, no or --

MAYOR GHASSALI: It's not a resolution. This --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: This wasn't on the agenda. I made a motion earlier, there was comment. Everyone had the opportunity to comment and a vote was taken.

We've had a motion made to stop funding anything including funding turf that's five years overdue. So we want to go back to the list from before of things that haven't been addressed.

Let's continue to not address the needs of the community. It makes perfect sense.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Councilman Weaver, that's not what I'm saying.

If we understand this is not going to be a major cost - -

Let me ask you this. How do we spend money we don't have?

MR. WEAVER: We can talk in spending cap.
I asked the Mayor about a presentation from our CFO on the spending cap. (Inaudible).

I have yet to see anyone put a hard number in
front of me as to what the spending cap is and where we are in terms of those numbers.

So we're talking about freezing monies before we even have the (inaudible). That, that's putting the cart before the horse.

MR. LANE: Well --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: We are going to stop funding projects.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: (Inaudible) safety. I don't want my kids on that field.

How many kids do we have running around the field?

COUNCILMAN LANE: Mike, Mike, we said to replace the turf.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Up to date and now we're going to table it.

MR. LANE: The work, the work on the turf would happen in the same period of time after we conduct this review.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Gentlemen. At the advice of counsel.

We are in the middle of a vote. You can make your comments and then you can cast a vote.

MALE SPEAKER: You have four votes so it passed.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: You can abstain. MAYOR GHASSALI: You can abstain, say yes, say no.

MR. LANE: No.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. All right. So
that's where we are.

MR. LANE: And, and I would recommend we move as quickly as possible to analyze the costs associated with the decision we made tonight. Maybe, maybe the redeveloper will enter into negotiations and maybe we'll go to litigation.

If we go to litigation we have to determine what that cost is going to be. It's not in the budget.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: And that money
(inaudible) appropriated in (inaudible).
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Can't hear you.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Going forward.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: We have heard from the Finance Chair that those monies are not going to be spent.

We have other needs, and we have other needs throughout town so either it is or it isn't. Which one is it?

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Money for the turf
field and the other funds have been appropriated already in the 2017 budget for the actual field turf. Taking that open space trust fund, that money is appropriated already.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: So are we building a turf?

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Yes.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: But, Councilman Weaver, we have to be responsible. We just made a decision in the town, to back that up that this is what we want to do, we have to be responsible for the finances. We do not have unlimited funds for any of this so we have to be responsible, sitting here on the bench about what monies can and can't be spent when we don't know what this is going to cost you.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: I agree with you 100 percent but we also have a responsibility to our residents and safety of the children who play on our fields and $I$ cannot, in good conscience, tell our residents that we're going to go -- it's bad enough we have to make them play on there this season. It's five, it's almost six years past due. It's, it's a child safety issue.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Can we just hear from Maureen that the money is available and that
would be something that would be spent?
What you're speaking of --

MR. LANE: Any discretionary spending
going forward.
(Inaudible).

We cannot, you know, we cannot allocate funds until we understand the impact. I heard -- you know, I heard a number, half a million dollars a year, that, that's not, that's, that's not even in the scope of our budget.

MAYOR GHASSALI: All right. How about we do this?

We'll take the next two weeks to do an analysis on the costs and then we'll do with the help of the Special Counsel and CFO.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: (Inaudible) our CFO.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Right. Okay. And then
we'll see how much that costs.
We'll take a two minute recess before we move on to the next agenda items. (The matter adjourns.)
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| 24:4, 24:9, 24:15, | 142:21, 142:22, | thinking [3]-32:4, | $8: 25,12: 22,32: 19,$ | 116:2, 117:15, |



| ```151:17, 152:18, 153:8, 153:16, 153:17, 153:21, 154:8, 155:22, 155:23 voted [14]-8:20, 9:2, 9:3, 9:11, 21:15, 32:18, 61:14, 79:21, 127:13, 131:23, 147:4, 151:13, 153:6, 153:9 votes [8]-5:6, 54:12, 72:24, 75:10, 106:22, 128:1, 149:17, 155:24 voting [4] - 79:13, 79:17, 119:8, 149:2``` | ```weeks [4] - 12:9, 75:25, 136:24, 158:13 Wegman's [13]-47:2, 48:2, 57:9, 57:10, 57:11, 57:13, 57:15, 58:24, 58:25, 59:23, 68:11, 138:7, 141:2 welcome [1]-132:15 well-poised [1] - 12:23 West [1] - 13:22 wheels [1]-66:22 whereas [3]-78:22, 125:8, 125:10 whispering [3]-39:7, 58:22, 123:7``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:2, 127:24, } \\ & \text { 131:2, 141:2 } \\ & \text { worst }[1]-138: 1 \\ & \text { wrap }[11]-7: 18 \text {, } \\ & 12: 20,12: 21,43: 9, \\ & 72: 6,78: 7,78: 8, \\ & 79: 2,124: 22 \\ & \text { wrapped }[2]-73: 24, \\ & 75: 11 \\ & \text { write }[2]-61: 15 \text {, } \\ & 116: 15 \\ & \text { writing }[1]-123: 23 \\ & \text { written }[2]-107: 4, \\ & 123: 17 \\ & \text { wrote }[2]-28: 19, \\ & 90: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W | Whole [1] - 59:7 <br> whole [11]-5:20, 7:5, | $\frac{X}{\text { XI00991 [1] - 159:18 }}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { wait }[4]-15: 16, \\ & 112: 14,126: 17, \\ & \text { 141:18 } \\ & \text { waiting }[1]-83: 13 \\ & \text { walk }[1]-145: 12 \\ & \text { wants }[14]-20: 8 \text {, } \\ & 59: 4,59: 5,64: 7, \\ & \text { 82:16, } 99: 1,100: 3, \\ & \text { 100:20, 116:5, } \\ & \text { 116:6, 142:16, } \\ & \text { 144:18, 149:21 } \\ & \text { war }[2]-7: 4,96: 16 \\ & \text { wasting }[1]-110: 2 \\ & \text { watched }[3]-62: 1, \\ & 62: 5,63: 3 \\ & \text { watching }[1]-129: 3 \\ & \text { waves }[1]-67: 19 \\ & \text { ways }[3]-28: 7,110: 9, \\ & \text { 129:16 } \\ & \text { weapon }[1]-26: 20 \\ & \text { weave }[1]-113: 8 \\ & \text { WEAVER }[15]-1: 12, \\ & 135: 4,135: 6, \\ & \text { 135:15, 135:23, } \\ & \text { 141:8, } 142: 15, \\ & \text { 142:25, 149:9, } \\ & \text { 152:14, 152:16, } \\ & \text { 152:20, 153:2, } \\ & \text { 153:6, 154:22 } \\ & \text { Weaver }[12]-122: 18, \\ & \text { 135:2, 146:6, 148:2, } \\ & \text { 148:25, 149:8, } \\ & \text { 149:13, 152:13, } \\ & \text { 152:15, 153:13, } \\ & \text { 154:16, 157:9 } \\ & \text { Weehawkin }[1]- \\ & 66: 13 \\ & \text { week }[2]-137: 4, \\ & \text { 137:10 } \\ & \text { weekends }[1]-105: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 11,83: 25,89: 22, \\ & \text { 107:24, 108:13, } \\ & \text { 109:10 } \\ & \text { wholesale }[1]-90: 9 \\ & \text { Wilentz }[1]-90: 11 \\ & \text { WILLIAM }[1]-1: 15 \\ & \text { willing }[7]-51: 3, \\ & 68: 16,68: 24,75: 4 \text {, } \\ & 87: 15,126: 6,134: 11 \\ & \text { win }[1]-65: 13 \\ & \text { window }[1]-108: 8 \\ & \text { winds }[1]-112: 4 \\ & \text { Windsor }[1]-13: 22 \\ & \text { wing }[1]-53: 19 \\ & \text { wise }[2]-67: 7,79: 21 \\ & \text { wish }[2]-10: 2,40: 6 \\ & \text { Wolfson }[1]-20: 18 \\ & \text { Wolfson's }[2]-20: 20, \\ & 20: 25 \\ & \text { woman }[1]-66: 9 \\ & \text { won }[1]-43: 12 \\ & \text { wonder }[1]-97: 10 \\ & \text { wonderful }[2]-58: 24, \\ & 61: 1 \\ & \text { wondering }[4]-62: 21, \\ & 62: 23,89: 23,118: 17 \\ & \text { Woodcliff }[3]-62: 21, \\ & 62: 24,116: 21 \\ & \text { word }[2]-39: 1,57: 1 \\ & \text { words }[4]-57: 22, \\ & 61: 15,64: 22,125: 11 \\ & \text { works }[6]-15: 1,16: 5, \\ & 69: 23,70: 18, \\ & 101: 16,126: 13 \\ & \text { world }[5]-8: 14, \\ & 61: 19,76: 6,77: 12, \\ & 82: 2 \\ & \text { worried }[1]-48: 8 \\ & \text { worry }[1]-82: 14 \\ & \text { worse }[6]-51: 1,76: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { year [15] - 21:13, } \\ 56: 11,56: 16,58: 15, \\ 62: 18,65: 6,67: 9, \\ 68: 17,114: 12, \\ 118: 14,121: 11, \\ 128: 9,142: 2, \\ 151: 13,158: 8 \\ \text { years [46] - 27:6, } \\ 27: 17,38: 11,50: 4, \\ 50: 8,50: 9,50: 16, \\ 50: 18,51: 14,51: 20, \\ 52: 12,54: 17,62: 6, \\ 62: 11,62: 13,63: 14, \\ 65: 15,68: 24,79: 5, \\ 84: 24,85: 15,87: 22, \\ 88: 6,88: 9,89: 16, \\ 91: 18,95: 10,96: 12, \\ 97: 18,116: 19, \\ 120: 4,126: 17, \\ 128: 8,130: 25, \\ 131: 1,131: 2,131: 3, \\ 140: 22,154: 11, \\ 157: 22 \\ \text { yesterday }[1]-139: 8 \\ \text { yield }[1]-44: 11 \\ \text { York }[2]-59: 6,94: 20 \\ \text { yourself }[2]-39: 11, \\ 138: 3 \\ \text { yourselves }[1]- \\ 130: 19 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

