



THE UNITED STATES
CONFERENCE OF MAYORS



Written Testimony of

**The Honorable J. Christian Bollwage
Mayor, City of Elizabeth, New Jersey**

**On Behalf of The U.S. Conference of Mayors and
the National League of Cities**

**Before the House Energy and Commerce
Subcommittee on Environment, Manufacturing and Critical
Materials**

***“Revitalizing America Through the Reauthorization of the
Brownfields Program”***

September 27, 2023

My name is Chris Bollwage, I am the Mayor of Elizabeth, New Jersey. I have served as Mayor since 1993 and I am a Trustee for The U.S. Conference of Mayors, where I have served as Chair of the Conference's Brownfields Task Force for over 25 years. I have testified many times over the past two decades on the important topic of brownfields development and ways to improve the brownfields law. I am honored to be here today to give both The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities perspective on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Brownfields Program that was established in 2002 and reauthorized in 2018. Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I would like to officially submit my written testimony for the record.

I want to start by saying that brownfields can be found in just about every community in the United States - whether it is an old, industrial factory or just a corner gas station or dry cleaner that has been left vacant or underutilized. Brownfields redevelopment can play a crucial role in revitalizing a neighborhood or sometimes an entire community, creating jobs, additional housing and even assisting with local climate change mitigation and resiliency efforts. For city leaders, brownfields represent unrealized potential – an opportunity to create jobs, revitalize neighborhoods, increase the tax base and reuse and enhance already existing infrastructure in a more sustainable way.

EPA's Brownfields Program has consistently been one of the most useful federal programs that results in real change and I hope, like in the past, it continues to be one of the most bipartisan programs supported by Congress.

I want to sincerely thank this committee for listening to the recommendations that our organizations put forth during the last reauthorization in 2018 and incorporating them into the Brownfields law. These provisions included the creation of the multi-purpose grants and increasing the cleanup grant amounts. We are even more excited to see what results will be realized with the additional funding and higher grant caps that were included in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA).

Creation of the Brownfields Program

Since the early 1990s, local governments have made the redevelopment of brownfield properties a top priority. At that time, the Government Accountability Office estimated there were somewhere between 400,000 to 600,000 brownfield properties. Brownfields are defined as abandoned or underutilized property whose redevelopment is hindered due to real or perceived environmental contamination. In our research, we determined that every congressional district had at least one brownfield site, but most had many more.

In the 1990s, developers, business owners and banks were unwilling to touch these properties out of fear of liability. These concerns were the result of the joint, several and strict liability provisions in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), a 1980s law more commonly known as Superfund, which made an innocent developer or lender just as responsible for the cost of cleanup as the actual polluter. As a result, developers would seek out “greenfields” rather than take a risk on a brownfield property. This unfortunately contributed to urban sprawl, more air pollution due to increased vehicle miles traveled, and hundreds of thousands of abandoned or underutilized sites in just about every community in the United States.

Back then, we worked closely with Congress and EPA to formulate legislation and a program that provided some liability relief for innocent developers, as well as money to do assessments and cleanup.

I testified before the House and Senate numerous times between 1994-2001 on the importance of this legislation and was pleased that the bill had such strong bipartisan support. In 2001, the Small Business Liability and Brownfields Redevelopment Act passed the Senate with a 99-0 vote, was put on the unanimous consent calendar in the House and signed by President George W. Bush in 2002, demonstrating the vast bipartisan appeal of this program. And you can understand why - the program is a win for local governments, the environment, and the business community.

When the Brownfields Program came up for reauthorization, our local government organizations and others made a series of recommendations on how to improve the program. It took nine years to do so, but eventually Congress passed a reauthorization bill in 2018.

Overall, since the program’s inception, over 37,000 properties have been assessed, over 2,500 fully cleaned up and nearly 10,450 have been made ready for reuse. EPA estimates that the program funding has created over 270,500 jobs and leveraged \$39.7 billion in other investments.

Despite these successes, many communities have harder-to-develop brownfield sites due to either more complex cleanups or their locations face additional challenges that make them harder to redevelop. We are hopeful that the changes that were incorporated in the last reauthorization bill as well as IIJA will further assist with the cleanup and redevelopment of larger, more complex brownfield sites.

Brownfields Redevelopment in Elizabeth

Attached to my testimony is a summary of some of the most notable brownfield redevelopment projects in my community including the Harbor Front Villas, the Jersey Gardens Mall, the Midtown Redevelopment Area and the Elizabethport/Hope VI project that I testified about in February 2022.

All of these projects demonstrate the transformative nature that redeveloping brownfield sites had on my community. As a result of our efforts, my city now has a refurbished waterfront with new market rate and affordable housing, revitalized neighborhoods and long-term successful economic development activities throughout the city.

2018 Brownfields Reauthorization and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

The EPA Brownfields Program has a proven track record of leveraging private sector investment, creating jobs and protecting the environment. The original law provided some liability relief for innocent purchasers of brownfield properties and provided resources to conduct environmental assessments and cleanups. After the original law passed, the challenge that many communities faced is that while there were tools to help with the so-called “easy” brownfield sites that are most attractive to developers, there were not enough tools or resources to assist with the more difficult brownfield sites that are more complex to redevelop.

To assist communities with the assessment, cleanup and redevelopment of these more complex and challenging sites, our organizations and others worked together to advocate for a series of changes to the original 2002 law. The changes enacted in 2018 through the Brownfields Utilization, Investment and Local Development (BUILD) Act significantly improved the Brownfields Program. Among the changes, two are particularly important:

- **Creation of a Multi-Purpose Grant** – The 2018 reauthorization specifically authorized for the first time multi-purpose grants up to \$1 million. The way the program previously worked was that a city had to apply for a specific type of grant for a specific property. This process works in many cases, but for cities with multiple brownfield sites that have different needs, the process was not flexible enough for real market-place situations. For example, a city may have multiple developers and businesses who are interested in several brownfield properties and may need different tools. A multi-purpose grant allows a city to use the money where and how it is most needed. Communities could do an assessment on property *x* or clean up on property *y* without reapplying for a specific category of funding. It was a hindrance to apply for a specific grant for a specific site and then wait six months to a year to see if you were awarded the funding when there was a very good chance that a potential developer moved on or changed their mind on that particular property. The creation of this additional tool has increased local government efficiency in working with the private sector on these vital projects.
- **Increased Cleanup Grant Amounts** – The 2018 reauthorization raised the cap on cleanup grant amounts from \$200,000 to \$500,000, with the flexibility for EPA to award up to \$650,000 based on the anticipated level of contamination, size or ownership status of the site. As mentioned, many communities have been able to tackle the so-called “easy” brownfield sites. While that work needs to keep going, there are many additional

brownfield sites that are more complicated due to the level of cleanup that is needed, the current market conditions, the location of the site, or a combination of these factors. The increased cleanup grant cap is critical to that process.

While the 2018 reauthorization maintained the original authorization level of \$250 million annually, the IIJA provided a significant boost in funding with \$1.5 billion over five years, for which local leaders are extremely grateful. Given that historically only around \$90 million is appropriated every year for grants to local governments and nonprofits, the extra \$300 million per year will be extremely beneficial in funding a larger number of worthwhile projects. Rest assured, with the huge number of brownfield sites across the country and the tremendous success of this program, it will never be a bad investment to put more money into this program. We respectfully ask Congress to monitor how this new money is being utilized and examine what is accomplished with these additional resources.

Additionally, the IIJA authorized higher grant amounts for all of the categories of brownfields grants: cleanup grants (up to \$5 million); multipurpose, assessment and revolving loan fund grants (up to \$10 million each); and job training grants (up to \$1 million). We are hopeful that EPA will seize this opportunity to explore how higher dollar amounts can be utilized and assist in redeveloping some of the more difficult brownfield sites back into productive pieces of property.

However, we have yet to see EPA fully take advantage of the 2018 changes to the Brownfields law and the additional flexibilities provided through the IIJA. For example:

- In fiscal years 2018-2021, EPA's Brownfields Program awarded 22 multi-purpose grants, 20 of which were at \$800,000. A few of these recipients include Newark, New Jersey in 2019 and Salem, New Jersey in 2021 (a small community under 5,000 population). These projects include environmental site assessments and developing cleanup and reuse plans along the Newark riverfront, which is centered around a heavily industrialized area along the Passaic River, and Salem's historic Waterfront Industrial Zone. Other recipients across the country include Rochester, New York, Dubuque, Iowa and Lincoln, Nebraska.
- In fiscal years 2018-2021, EPA's Brownfields Program awarded 149 cleanup grants. Of these, 67 were awarded at the \$500,000 level, but none were awarded at the \$650,000 level to local governments. Some of these awards include large cities like Los Angeles and small towns like Walpole, New Hampshire (population under 5,000), and places in between like Tulsa, Oklahoma and several communities in New Jersey.
- In fiscal year 2022, EPA's Brownfields Program did not award any multipurpose grants. In fiscal year 2023, EPA's Brownfields Program awarded 18 multipurpose grants, but none were funded through the IIJA. Of the awards, 15 were at the \$800,000 level, of

which eight went to local government. These include the City of Sacramento and the Town of Killingly, Connecticut.

- In fiscal years 2022 and 2023, EPA’s Brownfields Program awarded 126 cleanup grants, of which 13 were awarded \$2 million and 22 were awarded \$1 million or more. The \$2 million grant awardees includes several large cities such as Atlanta, New Orleans, Las Vegas and Los Angeles, as well as several small cities such as Kake, Alaska, Keokuk, Iowa and Vinton, Texas—all with a population under 10,000. The Cities of Trenton and Camden, New Jersey were among the local government grant winners at the \$1 million level.
- In fiscal years 2022 and 2023, EPA’s Brownfields Program awarded 321 assessment grants, of which 23 were awarded \$2 million and 21 were awarded \$1 million or more. However, none of the \$2 million grants went to local governments, but rather state agencies. Of the \$1 million awards, Washington, DC and Anchorage, Alaska were the only cities that received funding.

The strong interest in the Brownfields Program demonstrates the vast presence of brownfield sites in communities across the country and the tremendous need for assessment, cleanup and multipurpose funding.

We know that, in the past, EPA has been somewhat hesitant in awarding larger grant amounts due to the fact that they only had \$90 million to distribute nationally and they wanted to help out as many communities as possible. However, with the increased funding and additional flexibility, we are hopeful that EPA will take advantage of this opportunity and utilize at least some of the new infrastructure money to provide larger grant amounts to communities with brownfields that need extra assistance. We have encouraged EPA to take advantage of the flexibility it has in awarding larger multipurpose and cleanup grants to communities. We urge Congress to encourage EPA in this regard and to examine the end results.

Local Government Priorities for the 2023 Brownfields Reauthorization

We asked our members what types of improvements they would like to see in the next iteration of the Brownfields Program. We received the following recommendations that I would like to share with the committee.

Higher overall authorization and appropriation levels, as well as higher per-grant amounts that were included in IIJA, especially for the cleanup and multi-purpose grants.

We have regularly asked Congress for higher authorization and appropriation levels and were thrilled that the IIJA delivered on both of these requests for the next five years. We believe that this new money will be well utilized and will justify higher authorization and appropriation levels for the longer term. We respectfully ask that higher funding levels be included in this new

authorization bill. Given that there are an estimated 400,000-600,000 brownfield sites in the United States, the potential for economic and community revitalization and the fact that EPA can only fund a small portion of the grant applications it receives, we strongly urge Congress to go beyond traditional funding levels and provide the same funding levels that were included in the IIJA, as well as the higher grant amounts.

We also want to make sure that this reauthorization will not interfere in any way with the money and higher grant amounts that were included in the IIJA. The potential that the IIJA has to assist with transformative projects is too great to be inadvertently impacted by this reauthorization bill.

EPA has a more restrictive view of the purpose and targeted area regarding multi-purpose grants than we originally envisioned and we urge Congress to urge EPA to expand its application.

As mentioned, we were pleased that Congress established a multi-purpose grant in the last authorization bill. However, EPA seems to have a more restrictive view of the uses of multi-purpose grants than we originally envisioned. We were hoping that a city would NOT have to identify exactly how they would spend the money or identify a particular neighborhood or site for where the money would be spent, but rather be able to use it more broadly, potentially even city-wide for any eligible brownfields activity. The intention of the multi-purpose grant was to have the resources to do assessments or cleanups as needed for multiple properties within a jurisdiction based on the needs of the community and market forces. Of course, the money would only be spent on eligible brownfield activities and a grantee would need to report how and where the money was spent. We respectfully ask Congress to direct EPA to expand their definition of the way a multi-purpose grant can be utilized.

Increase the administrative cost allowance.

The 2018 reauthorization allowed Brownfield grant recipients to use up to five percent of grant funding for administrative costs, such as for rent, utilities, and other costs necessary to carry out a brownfields project. This was an important improvement to the original law, which prohibited use for administrative costs entirely. This change is particularly important for smaller communities and nonprofits that previously may not have even applied for grants due to the cost burdens associated with accepting a federal grant. We are asking the committee to consider raising the administrative cost allowance to at least 10 percent to further support small communities.

Ability to apply for an additional cleanup grant for a specific property, even if a community has already received a cleanup grant, and the ability to apply for an assessment grant after a community has received a cleanup grant for a specific property.

As mentioned, some brownfield sites need additional support for revitalization and redevelopment, but EPA tends not to fund more than one cleanup grant on a property or allow for an assessment grant after a cleanup grant has been awarded. However, both of these additional flexibilities would assist with brownfields sites that are more complex than initially

thought by the community. For example, if a community has done some clean up but then discovers there are other concerns or contaminants an additional assessment may be needed; or if a community is doing a clean up and realizes there is more work to do additional clean up funds may be needed.

Require concurrence of local government.

Under the 2018 reauthorization, nonprofits became eligible to apply for cleanup grants. We respectfully ask that a requirement be added for some type of signoff by the city when a nonprofit submits an application for an EPA cleanup grant to ensure that the project is coordinated and in line with local government efforts. Many cities have comprehensive master plans that include economic revitalization, housing, parks, water and sewer projects, as well as climate mitigation and resiliency efforts. We want to make sure that any site that receives cleanup funding from EPA for a particular project does not conflict with the community's long-term plan.

We appreciate that the discussion draft includes provisions to address our concerns requiring concurrence with local governments.

2023 Brownfields Reauthorization Discussion Draft

In addition to our priorities and recommendations outlined above, we also offer comments and concerns on the 2023 Brownfields reauthorization discussion draft that was put forth by this subcommittee.

Private Sector Companies Becoming Eligible to Apply for Cleanup Grants

We have concerns regarding this addition and do not believe it is necessary or a good idea to allow for-profit companies to become eligible for cleanup grants for several reasons. First, there currently is not enough money appropriated, including at IJJA levels, to fund the current number of grant applications. Second, the private sector already can take advantage of money from the Revolving Loan Funds that are provided by local governments or the states. Third, when we first approached Congress about the creation of the Brownfields Program back in the 1990s, we initially got a lot of push back from environmentalists who were worried that private sector companies that were responsible for the contamination would be given money to clean up their own mess. Limiting the funding to local governments that did not cause or contribute to the contamination provided reassurance to the environmental community. Fourth, we believe it would be difficult for the EPA to monitor and make sure that private sector companies were not also responsible for the contamination. And finally, we believe Congress could help the private sector more effectively through reinstating the Brownfields Tax Credit, which allows the private sector to take a tax deduction for the costs of the cleanup in just one year as opposed to amortized over a number of years.

Inspector General Audits

While we understand the importance of monitoring and tabulating results of how the Brownfields Program money is spent, we would like to make sure that any audit requirements do not add additional or more onerous burdens on grant recipients, particularly local governments, that would make them hesitant to apply for funding. Federal grantees are already subject to strict reporting requirements and face the possibility of federal audits, which are already considered quite onerous and burdensome.

Technical Assistance for Small and Medium-Sized Communities

We have heard from many communities across the country that one of the biggest hurdles in accessing federal funding is the lack of staff capacity and resources to even apply. This is particularly true as more and more communities are interested in the many programs and new opportunities funded through the IIJA, including the Brownfields Program. The draft discussion's approach of providing technical assistance to five small and mid-sized communities is intriguing and we are generally supportive. We would like to understand, however, how this would impact EPA's current technical assistance program, and have the opportunity to weigh in on how applicants would be selected.

State Response Programs Authorization

The discussion draft leaves the authorization amount for State Response Programs blank. We ask that the States get the same proportional allocation as they have in the past based on the total annual appropriation. While some States are better than others in utilizing the money, we do not want to see them receive a larger portion of the money that we believe can be better spent at the local level.

Conclusion

The changes that Congress made in the last reauthorization bill improved the program significantly and the IIJA took that a step further by raising both the appropriation levels and the individual grant amounts for cleanup funds and multi-purpose grants. On behalf of both The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities, we strongly encourage the committee to incorporate the IIJA changes into your authorization bill. On the other issues that were discussed today, our organizations stand ready to work with this subcommittee to develop solutions that would improve the Brownfields Program.

I wish to thank the subcommittee for inviting me to testify today. This is a program that every member of Congress should be proud to support. It has a proven track record of creating jobs, cleaning up contamination and protecting public health. It is a pro-business and pro-environment law and I urge you to support reauthorization. Thank you again for this opportunity and I look forward to your questions.

APPENDIX

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT IN ELIZABETH

1. Elizabethport/Hope VI project

From a historical perspective, the City of Elizabeth's commerce depended heavily on its position as a port city. The majority of businesses that were located close to and along the waterfront focused on and complimented the shipping industry, supplying additional services such as the transportation and storage of goods. However, as Elizabeth expanded, evolved and changed, so did the vision and potential of the land once utilized primarily by these industrial companies.

Re-imagining Elizabeth's waterfront has included the creation of luxury housing on a former brownfield site, called Harbor Front Villas which includes a \$15 million townhouse development consisting of 55 market-rate units. Constructed in close proximity to the Arthur Kill waterway, the Villas have increased opportunities and contributed to the exciting renaissance occurring within Elizabethport.

Developments such as Harbor Front Villas were thought impossible by individuals, who could not visualize the possibility of such desirable property. Residents within these units benefit from both the amenities offered within their complex as well as the splendor of Elizabeth's surrounding open space and recreational facilities. Utilized as both a transportation and leisure waterway, large container ships, pleasure boats and vessels of all sizes travel along the Arthur Kill en route to Port Newark/Elizabeth. Providing a window into maritime commerce as well as breathtaking scenic views to admire, waterways enhance the viability and marketability of surrounding properties.

Revitalizing underutilized brownfields into remediated, active sites for development, has been occurring for years in the city's oldest neighborhood. The tremendously successful, federally-funded HOPE VI program has assisted in the removal of public housing complexes and replaced them with townhouses in Elizabethport. Individuals previously residing in the old, dilapidated facilities had the unique opportunity to become homeowners. Living in a new community-setting not only physically relocated residents, it positively altered their quality of life. Removing the stigma of public housing, the HOPE VI program assisted in instilling a sense of pride, self-sufficiency and homeownership in a residential neighborhood that included beautiful landscaping and open space.

In 1997, with an initial grant of \$29 million, the Housing Authority of the City of Elizabeth began administering the HOPE VI Elizabeth Neighborhood Revitalization Program. With assistance from the HOPE VI program, demolition began on the Migliore Manor public housing complex in 1998, followed by the demolition of the Pioneer Homes public housing complex in 2000.

In addition to new housing opportunities, the Revitalization Program sought to provide transitional services for relocated public housing residents. City officials worked with the Housing Authority to create partnerships and deliver essential services to residents. In order to ascertain the needs of the community, resident surveys were conducted. Once needs were assessed, additional funding sources had to be identified. The County of Union provided \$1 million in funding through the Home Partnership Investment Program, which enabled the creation of 20 home units.

Approaching the project holistically, Union County's Department of Human Services also provided job training services during the first phase to residents. Senators Frank Lautenberg and Robert Torricelli, former Congressman and now Senator Robert Menendez, Congressman Donald Payne, the Union County Board of Chosen Freeholders, Elizabeth City Council as well as the Elizabeth Development Company, also supported this project and helped to transform this vision into reality.

Through this program, hundreds of residents also participated in services including but not limited to: education for residents of all ages, resume and interviewing workshops, job training and placement, computer classes, youth-oriented programs, child care programs, business development and health care. Identifying neighborhood potential and implementing a strong vision made critical initiatives such as HOPE VI possible. This assistance was also a catalyst for the construction of five developments within Elizabethport, including: Portside Commons I, Portside Commons II, Westport Homes, Heritage Village and Marina Village.

With clearly defined goals and objectives, the next step in transforming the community was the introduction of mixed-use housing, with an emphasis on commercial space for economic growth and services. Business attraction and retention is critical to the vitality of a neighborhood. The City of Elizabeth recognized this factor and worked with government leadership and local agencies to foster economic development in the Elizabethport neighborhood. Ultimately, the Mills at Jersey Gardens Mall, AMC Loews Jersey Gardens Theater, multiple restaurants and hotels were developed minutes away.

2. The HOPE VI Project

Before Jersey Gardens, city officials had embarked upon an impressive renewal effort in the City's oldest neighborhood, which was located adjacent to the transformed landfill. Economic development expansion and citywide revitalization efforts inspired the removal of public housing structures and the implementation of new housing initiatives.

Hundreds of affordable housing units were completed, with a portion on former brownfields. The tremendously successful federally funded HOPE VI program assisted in the removal of public housing complexes and replaced them with new townhouses in Elizabethport.

Individuals previously residing in the old, dilapidated facilities had the unique opportunity to become homeowners. Living in a new community setting not only physically transported these low to moderate income residents, it transformed their quality of life.

Removing the stigma of public housing, the HOPE VI program assisted in instilling a sense of pride, self-sufficiency and homeownership in a residential neighborhood that included beautiful landscaping and open space. Through this program, hundreds of residents also participated in services including but not limited to: resume and interviewing workshops, job training and placement, computer classes, youth oriented programs, child care programs, business development and health care. Identifying neighborhood potential and implementing a strong vision made critical initiatives such as HOPE VI possible.

The HOPE VI program is administered by the Housing Authority of the City of Elizabeth through the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

3. The Mills at Jersey Gardens

Within the City of Elizabeth, the Jersey Gardens Mall was built upon a former landfill in 1999. Through strong private/public partnerships on the county, state and federal level, this innovative project transformed a former brownfield into a thriving shopping experience - with more than 200 stores and an AMC Loews movie theater located next door.

Conveniently located off Exit 13A of the New Jersey Turnpike, the conversion of this former eyesore into a shopping center had numerous positive effects on the health of the neighborhood. It created new employment opportunities, assisted in the stabilization of property taxes through a new tax rate and continues to improve the overall quality of life within the city.

Jersey Gardens Mall became The Outlet Collection - Jersey Gardens and was renamed The Mills at Jersey Gardens when it was acquired by Simon Malls in January 2015. The Mall continues to flourish after another successful year, with business up 10 percent and international visits up 37 percent - from top markets including Brazil, Germany and Israel.

In collaboration with Union County College, the Retail Skills Center, which has evolved into the Workforce Innovation Center, provides job placement, soft skills training and ESL education to residents - and is located within The Mills at Jersey Gardens. In addition, We Are One New Jersey-Union County, which is an initiative spearheaded by the County of Union, is located within The Mills and provides assistance to individuals as they prepare for the United States Citizenship Test.

The Mills at Jersey Gardens also features a 4.8-megawatt SunPower rooftop solar system. The project, which is among the largest rooftop systems in North America, broke ground in June 2011 and began producing power in February 2012. Consisting of more than 15,000 high efficiency SunPower panels, this project generates approximately the amount of power required for 564 New Jersey homes.

Adjacent to the Mall is an eight-story Embassy Suites Hotel with 82 rooms and an 87,200 sq. ft. restaurant. Additional hotels at this site include: Country Inn and Suites by Carlson, Elizabeth Courtyard by Marriott and Residence Inn by Marriott Newark/Elizabeth Liberty International Airport. Restaurants such as Ruby Tuesday and IHOP are also available on the property.

The IKEA Furniture store, which is also easily accessible from Exit 13A of the New Jersey Turnpike, also completed a \$40 million renovation, which included a reconfiguration of its operations and an increase in showroom space to help meet the growth of its business.

4. Area Surrounding Midtown Elizabeth Train Station

The Midtown Train Station is a designated New Jersey Transit Village and is located among brownfields. The City is seeking a New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Brownfield Development Area designation for the area within and around the Midtown Redevelopment Area, which includes 20-acres surrounding the Midtown Train Station. The Midtown Elizabeth Train Station is already a New Jersey Department of Transportation designated Transit Village.

NJ TRANSIT has committed \$70 million dollars for the design and reconstruction of the Elizabeth Midtown Train Station, which will include a new two-story station building with a street-level ticket office, waiting room as well as new office and retail space. The location will also feature new, extended high-level train platforms that will accommodate longer, 12-car trains and the platforms will feature covered, heated and air conditioned waiting areas for its users.

The Station will have new elevators and stairs, upgraded passenger information and security systems. The westbound plaza entrance will be highlighted by a marquee façade, new stairs and new vendor space. NJ TRANSIT and the City of Elizabeth are working together to incorporate art into the design of the station. The project will be funded through a combination of state and federal sources.

Enhancements to the Midtown Elizabeth Train Station are not limited to the current facility. These additional brownfield properties surrounding the Station have also begun the revitalization process. New housing, retail and offices will complement a modern train station and provide the services residents, commuters and visitors expect and deserve.

5. Harbor Front Villas

The City of Elizabeth's waterfront underwent a transformation, creating luxury housing on a former brownfield site. Harbor Front Villas is a \$15 million townhouse development that features market-rate units, which would attract the most demanding buyer.

Homeownership coupled with luxurious amenities and a waterfront view is what Harbor Front Villas offers its clientele. Located minutes away from Exit 13A off the New Jersey Turnpike, the site is easily accessible from major roadways and is minutes away from New York. From master bathrooms, cathedral ceilings and fireplaces to granite entrance halls, central air conditioning, terraces and private parking, this new townhouse community provides the comforts of home with a beautiful view on the water.

With wide market appeal, Harbor Front Villas offer an exciting alternative to individuals who work in the tri-state area and are looking to immerse themselves in the beauty, culture and community of an urban municipality.