CITIZEN COMMENTS MUNICIPAL COUNCIL MEETING FEBRUARY 2, 2021

JEFF FELDS - <u>hardwaredad@aol.com</u>

<u>Agenda Action Items</u> <u>Ordinances – Second Reading</u> Expanding Reock Street Redevelopment Plan (with Condemnation Powers) Ord. 1-2021

- 1. Are residents, taxpayers and interested stakeholders entitled to a prompt oral response to all pertinent second reading public hearing written and oral questions before the CC considers and takes official action on an ordinance agenda action item not subject to referendum challenge? See, Jeffrey S. Feld, v. City of Orange Township, A-3449-15T1 (Aug. 8, 2018) ("Feld XIV").
- 2. When will Attorney Feld receive a written response to all his prior written virtual remote questions submitted at the January 5, 2021 first reading and reflected in the proposed January 5, 2021 meeting minutes?
- 3. Does the template of this proposed Reock Street condemnation powers redevelopment plan ordinance prepared under the watch of the Nishuane Group depart from the template of Livingston (01-28-21) and Belleville (01-29-21) Star Ledger public notices prepared under the watch of other municipal planners?
- 4. Has the new planning board attorney reviewed and approved the form and legality of this proposed Reock Street condemnation powers redevelopment plan ordinance?
- 5. In light of the January 27, 2021 Orange Planning Board Expanded Main Street (without condemnation powers) Area In Need of Redevelopment Study Presentation, who determined and on what basis was it determined that the amended Reock Street Redevelopment Plan have condemnation powers?
- 6. Is there a list of all approved redevelopment plans, the dates of their original and amended adoptions and whether the plans are with or without condemnation powers?
- 7. Were all property owners located within this expanded Reock Street Redevelopment Area (with condemnation powers) provided 45 days written notice of the estoppel period to challenge the redevelopment with condemnation powers designation in a Superior Court prerogative writ action?

<u>First Reading</u> <u>Amending Legislative Research Officer Ord. 3-2021</u> <u>Related Legislative Research Officer Resolutions</u> <u>"Tabled" CY 2021 Legislative Research Officer Retention Res. 24-2021</u> <u>CY 2020 After-the-Fact Legislative Research Officer Retention Cap Change Order Res. 41-2021</u>

- 8. Who is the sponsor of this amending ordinance?
- 9. What is the urgency and purpose of the highlighted implicit one sentence "authorized to practice law in this State" ordinance amendment?
- 10. Does this proposed ordinance bear the form and legality approval signature of an inhouse attorney?

- 11. In light of my family's original Feld I allegations and the recent dispute between the City of Trenton Mayor and the local governing body regarding the validity of the Faulkner Act local governing body obtaining independent counsel, has the administration and the local governing body finally obtained a written legal opinion or memorandum regarding the validity of the legislative research officer position in a Faulkner Act municipality?
- 12. What State enabling statute authorizes this discretionary legislative research officer position?
- 13. What added value does this \$50,000 CY 2021 political patronage position provide to the community?
- 14. Will all disputes, if any, be adjudicated via arbitration or by the Superior Court?
- 15. Who monitors this law firm's work product?
- 16. Who approves all payments to the legislative research officer?
- 17. Is this an unnecessary CY 2021 line item expense that could be cut or reduced during the COVID 19 pandemic?
- 18. What is the purpose of a retention cap if the professionals always exceed the cap?
- 19. Shouldn't the professional bear the CY 2020 risk of loss here?
- 20. Should all professional fee requisitions be amended so that the professional discloses the amount of its cap and the amount paid to date pursuant to the professional services retention cap, such as under the federal bankruptcy code?
- 21. From whom has the local governing body received a post September 24, 2020 written legal opinion or memorandum regarding its discretion not to respond to agenda action item pertinent written or oral questions prior to taking official action on the posted discretionary non-ministerial agenda action item under State law?

Other Retention Resolutions

Nishuane Group CY 2021 Municipal Planner Consultant Retention Res. 71-2021

- 22. What metrics were used by the Planning Director to recommend the selection of this particular municipal planner consultant over the other applicant?
- 23. Since the elimination of an in-house municipal planner (Don Meisel) under the watch of Willis Edwards III, how much 1099 reported income has Orange paid the Nishuance Group?
- 24. Why the delay in producing the executed CY 2020 Nishuane Group municipal planner consultant retention agreement to Attorney Feld pursuant to OPRA?
- 25. Was the Nishuane Group implicated in any of the federal CY 2020 indictments or guilty pleas relating to Orange and/or Willis Edwards III?
- 26. On January 27, 2021, did CC Vice-President Tency Eason vote in favor of the local planning board's retention of a CY 2021 municipal planner consultant?
- 27. Over the years, who evaluated and approved the Nishuane Group's work product?
- 28. Based upon the January 25, 2021 Joint Municipal Land Use Board Meeting, does the Cy 2020 Amended Posy CY 2018 Amended Master Plan Zoning Development Ordinance need to be amended?

New Non-Agenda Action Item Questions of Public Importance

29. Based upon a January 27, 2021 Star Ledger public notice, why is the finance department seeking additional outside financial services?

- 30. What distinguishes these outside professional financial services from the professional services approved by the local governing body on January 19, 2021?
- 31. Since the arrival of our BA in or about August 2016, how much has Orange expended in additional outside financial services, including auditing and annual budget consulting?
- 32. Based upon a January 28, 2021 Star Ledger public notice, why the urgent need to conduct a citywide reevaluation effective CY 2022?
- 33. As we approach the fifth anniversary of Judge Christine Farrington's (February 2016) finding that our mayor and Willis Edwards III willfully disobeyed the law, what steps has Orange taken to collect all monies due and owing Willis Edwards III, including the forfeiture of all pension benefits accrued during his employment by Orange?
- 34. Based upon the January 27, 2021 Amended Main Street AINS (without condemnation powers) Presentation and the posted January 19, 2021 CY 2020 Annual Debt Statement, why is the former Bank of America building still vacant after Orange issued bond anticipation notes to acquire and to flip the property to a Rossi related entity in or about March 2019?
- 35. When does the Administration anticipate delivering the CY 2021 Budget to the local governing body for introduction and approval?
- 36. When will Attorney Feld receive written responses to his prior post Sept. 24, 2021 virtual remote meeting agenda and non-agenda action item written questions and comments?
- 37. When will the local governing body adopt and release special closed executive session minutes relating to the January 2016 decision to approve the acquisition of the abandoned environmentally contaminated YWCA property by ordinance and the October 2016 retention of a new police director related to the mayor without any public comment?
- 38. In July 2015, did a certain council member make certain false and misleading sworn statements about Attorney Feld and his family to the Local Finance Board?