Below are comments on specific items:

9. Believe the starting rate for sale of 0.416 acres should be minimum price of $98,000. Believe appraisers don't really teh value of land. Believe appraisals always come in too low.

11. Newark property - values to build on should have a minimum value of $99,000. Again, apprasial price set for auction minimum is far too low.

13. Cherry Hill - minimum selling price should be $100,000. Seems like the selling price of these lands doesn't even cover the cost of writing up the contracts. We simply cannot allow to sell taxpayer land for these cheap prices. Land to allow you to add on to your thriving business is always valuable, even if only to that property owner.

14. Newark - its a buildign lot. Minimum price should be $100,000. lets cover the cost of sale please. It costs taxpayers $20,000 to sell the land.

15. Cherry Hill - believe the plot should have a minimum selling price of $45,000.

16. Fairfield Twp Essex County - - minimum selling bid should be $125,000. Pio Costa is a wealthy land owner and contiguous land is always valuable to a property owner.

18. Vernon Township - farm lease by division of parks - division of parks mission is not to give farmers giveaways. That is the missing of the NJ dept of agriculture. Why aren't people prime or animals and plants prime on this land - that is more the mission of this site. It is not even covering the cost of the lease for $745 to allow Robert Baldwin to use this land. I oppose these leases. There is no value to the people of NJ. The taxpayer's of NJ did not buy this land so that this farmer could come along and get a giveaway like this on 20 acres. No such lease of taxpayers land should be given for ten years. The fact is the taxpayers get zilch out of these leases and it is a giant con game that our govt plays around with in playing for favors from agribusiness. I would like an investigation of whether these "lucky" farmers are big political contributors - tit for tat? With the taxpayers getting screwed. The DEP advertised in classified sections - who reads that? Nobody! You can't find the advertisements to lease land on the DEP website at any time. I check that website. Never have I seen such information to the citizens of NJ. Any taxpayers paying like mad for acreage would reject this lease. It is not good for taxpayers. Taxpayers would be better to leave the land vacant and not have it plowed. Leave it natural for its intended purpose. We do not have to turn our parks into low lease farms. The FSA rates are set for cheaper states in the union and have absolutely no relevance to the high cost of land in NJ. The FSA is not a good standards to use in NJ for NJ land which is in much demand. The FSA standard is not an appropriate standard for valuing this land. Deny this lease. Keep the land for its park purpose.

19. Trenton - rates established in 2009 are too low. There needs to be a re evaluation on the value of this land and use of building. No action should be taken until more information is obtained.

20. Stanhope Boroughed - - this is very broad information. What are the "recreational
FACILITIES’ THAT ARE SO SECRETIVELY DESCRIBED WITHOUT SPECIFICATION. DENY ON THE BASIS OF NO INFORMATION GIVEN TO THE COMMISSION.

21. LAMBERTVILLE - DENY - AGAIN NO SPECIFICATION GIVEN AS TO WHAT THE "RECREATIONAL" FACILITIES ARE. WHAT IS THE SECRECY HERRE? OUR STATE RECORDS NEED MORE SPECIFICATION THAN THIS.

22 CLARKS POND - WHY DID THE STATE OF NJ BUY CLARKS POND IF THEY INTENDED TO LEASE IT FOR ETERNITY? SINCE 1962 THE TAXPAYERS HAVE OWNED THIS LAND AND ALLOWED LOW RATES FOR LEASING PART OF IT? WHY? ALSO THE TOWN HAD PROBLEMS WITH OZKAN AKILLI. SEE REPORT IN STAR LEDGER OF JUNE 21, 2012. COUNCIL MEMBERS HAD PROBLEMS WITH THIS LESSEE. MORE INFORMATION SHOULD BE GATHERED ON THIS LEASE.

23. I AM DEFINITELY AGAINST SELLING 7 ACRES AND BUILDINGS IN DELAWARE TOWNSHIP. THE TAXPAYERS BOUGHT AND PAID FOR IT AND SHOULD KEEP IT ALL. SEE NO REASON FOR SELLING AFTER JUST BUYING IT. STRANGE GOINGS ON HERE - IS SOME POLITICIAN LOOKING TO BUY IT? WOULD LIKE ALL INFORMATION ON THIS. I DO NOT BELIEVE THE PARCEL IS "SURPLUS" AND BELIEVE IF IT SO SURPLUS THE TAXPAYERS SHOULD NOT HAVE BOUGHT IT IN THE FIRST PLACE. WHAT KIND OF PLAY ACTING IS GOING ON HERE. TAXPAYERS PAID THROUGH THE NOSE FOR THIS PROPERTY. DENY THIS SALE. I THINK THIS NEEDS INVESTIGATION.

24. BARNEGAT LIGHT - THE LEASE SHOULD INCLUDE THAT THE LEASE INCLUDES NO GUARANTEES FOR WHEN THE FLOODCOMES. NO GUARANTEES OF ANY KIND OF SAFETY ON THIS PROPERTY.

25. I CAN UNDERSTAND THE ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION NEEDS HIGHER GROUND BUT OPPOSE USING PARKLAND FOR THE SUBSTATION. LET THE ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION BUY PRIVATE LAND FOR THEIR NEW LOCATION, LEAVE THE PARKLAND ALONE. IT IS SAVED. LEAVE IT BE. DENY THIS CHANGE. WHY DO ELECTRICAL PROFITEERS ALWAYS SEEK TO USE SAVED PUBLIC LAND. THAT IS UNACCEPTABLE.

26. I OPPOSE 500 VOLT ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION LINE. NO NEED FOR IT.
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