

## Re: Legality of Lease Agreement

From Natasha Joly <njoly@bhpsnj.org>

Date Tue 8/12/2025 10:22 AM

To Scott Salmon < ssalmon@imslawvers.com>

Liza Viana «Iviana@bhtwp.com»; Dr. Kim Feltre «kfeltre@bhpsnj.org» «kfeltre@bhpsnj.org»; NJ21st Team «team@nj21st.com»

## Good morning all.

I'm a bit confused. Is the lease agreement that was entered to in March a lease or something else "stylized" as a lease? And if it is a lease, what are the applicable regulations? My understanding that an actual lease for a 25yr term was required in lieu of actual ownership to receive certain grants. Not something "stylized" as a lease.

Note: These are my own personal thoughts and opinions and do no reflect the opinion of the Board of Education.

Thank you, Natasha

On Aug 12, 2025, at 9:59 AM, NJ21st Team <team@nj21st.com> wrote:

Thank you again for responding. I just wanted to confirm we're on the same page — the lease agreement referenced in the shared services agreement was passed by resolution at the two March meetings. There appears to be an actual lease in place that was approved by resolution, while the shared services agreement seems to be the measure that's been stylized. Given the public interest in how leases are approved — and the controversy surrounding this agreement — addressing the issue now may be the wiser course. I added Natasha (a BOE member) and Dr. Feltre to this chain so they are aware. Thanks again, and have a great week. Laura

From: Scott Salmon < ssalmon@jmslawyers.com > Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 9:30 AM To: NJ21st Team < team@nj21st.com > Cc: Liza Viana < lviana@bhtwp.com> Subject: RE: Legality of Lease Agreement

Hi Ms. Kapuscinski, not a problem. You're correct that the addendum is tied to and related to the lease agreement. But just because we're referring to it as a lease agreement doesn't mean that it falls under the statute that you identified. Even if it's not formally labeled as a Shared Services Agreement, it still is one in function, which is why we tried to clarify it in the addendum.

As to whether a challenge would have any impact, we do not believe it would. Courts, in our experience, tend to look past the labeling of things like this and at the substance and merits of it. Even if it were challenged, however, the Council would be able to simply "cure" the issue by ratifying it with a Shared Services Resolution. Feel free to reach out with any further questions.

Scott D. Salmon, Esq. | Shareholder | He/Him Jardim Meisner Salmon Sprague & Susse 30B Vreeland Road, Suite 100 Florham Park, NJ 07932 973.845.7634 (direct) 908.312.2124 (cell) 973.845.7645 (fax)

www.jmslawyers.com

From: NJ21st Team < team@nj21st.com> Sent: Monday, August 11, 2025 4:32 PM To: Scott Salmon < <a href="mailto:ssalmon@jmslawyers.com">ssalmon@jmslawyers.com</a>> Cc: Liza Viana < <a href="mailto:lviana@bhtwp.com">lviana@bhtwp.com</a>> Subject: Re: Legality of Lease Agreement

## **EG** Technology

Warning: Sender @team@nj21st.com has never sent any emails to your organization. Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

Report Phishing Remove Banner

Hi Mr. Solomon,

Thank you for responding.

I had a chance to rereadthe May 20 resolution and the Shared Services Agreement. While it was clearly adopted under the Uniform Shared Services and Consolidation Ac it still seems closely tied to the original Lease Agreement.

The agreement says it's there to satisfy certain lease contingencies (14(e)-14(g)).

The term runs for the length of the lease, except for the tennis courts after termination.

Some obligations, like tennis court access, are "consistent with the terms of the Lease Agreement."

That makes it feel less like a stand-alone shared services arrangement and more like a piece of the lease that's been reframed under the shared services law. I get your point that the process isvalid under N.J.S.A. 40A:65-5, but I'm wondering — if the lease were ever challenged or changed, would that have any impact on this agreement?

It seems that the term lease agreement is a bit more than just a stylized characterization.

Thank you for your response Laura et <u>O</u>. utlook for Android

From: Scott Salmon <ssalmon@jmslawyers.com>
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2025 3:23:58 PM
To: NJ21st Team <team@nj21st.com>
Cc: Liza Viana <lviana@bhtwp.com>
Subject: RE: Legality of Lease Agreement

Hi Ms. Kapuscinski, I apologize for the delay; I've been in a trial for the past few weeks and have not had an opportunity to respond. While the agreement was initially stylized as a lease, it is, for all intents and purposes, a Shared Services Agreement, which may be authorized by resolution under N.J.S.A. 40A:65-5. That was, in part, why the amendment subsequently made in May was stylized as a Shared Services Agreement and explicitly adopted under those laws. What you are referencing is really intended for when the Township leases its land to other (non-governmental) entities for profit.

Scott D. Salmon, Esq. | Shareholder | He/Him Jardim Meisner Salmon Sprague & Susser 30B Vreeland Road, Suite 100 Florham Park, NJ 07932 973.845.7634 (direct) 908.312.2124 (cell) 973.845.7645 (fax) www.imslawyers.com

From: NJ21st Team < team@nj21st.com > Date: Thursday, July 24, 2025 at 11:11 PM

To: dkhanna@bhpsnj.org <dkhanna@bhpsnj.org>, sai-board <sbhargavi@bhpsnj.org>, tforegger@bhpsnj.org <tforegger@bhpsnj.org>,

Natasha Board

<a href="mailto:sqp:adillon@bhpsnj.org"><a hre

Subject: Re: Legality of Lease Agreement

Hi Everyone-

Can I please get a response to my questions?

Thanks, LK

From: NJ21st Team

Sent: Saturday, June 14, 2025 2:59 PM

To: <a href="mailto:dkhanna@bhpsnj.org">dkhanna@bhpsnj.org</a>; sai-board <a href="mailto:shargavi@bhpsnj.org">shargavi@bhpsnj.org</a>; <a href="mailto:treeger@bhpsnj.org">tforegger@bhpsnj.org</a> <a href="mailto:treeger@bhpsnj.org">tforegger@bhpsnj.org</a>; <a href="mailto:treeger@bhpsnj.org">tforegger@bhpsnj.org</a>; <a href="mailto:treeger@bhpsnj.org">tforegger@bhpsnj.org</a>; <a href="mailto:pstanley@bhpsnj.org">pstanley@bhpsnj.org</a>; <a href="mailto:pstanley@bhpsnj.org">pstanley@bhpsnj.org</a>; <a href="mailto:pstanley@bhpsnj.org">pstanley@bhpsnj.org</a>; <a href="mailto:pstanley@bhpsnj.org">pstanley@bhpsnj.org</a>; <a href="mailto:pstanley@bhpsnj.org">pstanley@bhpsnj.org</a>; <a href="mailto:bhpsnj.org">pstanley@bhpsnj.org</a>; <a href="mailto:bhpsnj.org">

<kfeltre@bhpsnj.org>; adevanney@bhtwp.com <adevanney@bhtwp.com>

Subject: Legality of Lease Agreement

Hi Everyone,

I'm reaching out as part of our ongoing reporting on the turf field project at Lower Columbia.

As you likely know, under N.J.S.A. 40A:12-5, municipalities are required to approve leases of property through an ordinance, not a resolution. From what we can tell, the Township approved the lease with the Board of Education by resolution only (No. 2025-I-31, adopted March 4), with no ordinance introduced or adopted to authorize it.

Likewise, the amended lease was approved by resolution at the special meeting on March 25.

This isn't just a technical issue. Ordinances require proper public notice, public hearings, and multiple readings. Resolutions don't.

That means a long-term lease involving public land and taxpayer dollars appears to have been approved without the public visibility, comment, or procedural safeguards that the law is designed to ensure.

It also raises a few practical concerns:

If the lease wasn't properly authorized, it could be challenged or invalidated. Any public money already spent could be called into question.

It may create legal or financial risk going forward—especially if additional funding or insurance depends on having a valid lease in place.

Can someone please confirm:

Whether an ordinance was ever introduced or adopted to approve the lease?

If not, does the Township intend to address the issue?

We're preparing coverage on this and would appreciate a response by Tuesday, June 17 so we can include your input.

Thanks, Laura Kapuscinski Editor

https://nj21st.com/

<image001.png>