

## **FORT MONMOUTH ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION PLANNING AUTHORITY**

Minutes filed by Kathryn Verrochi as Assistant Secretary on Behalf of the Authority Members of actions taken at the Special Public Meeting of The Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Planning Authority, held at the Tinton Falls Municipal Building, 556 Tinton Avenue, Tinton Falls, New Jersey 07724 at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, May 19, 2008.

### **Present:**

Chairperson and Public Member Dr. Robert Lucky  
Vice Chairperson and Commerce Commission Designated Member Virginia Bauer  
Eatontown Mayor Gerald Tarantolo  
Oceanport Mayor Michael Mahon  
Tinton Falls Mayor Peter Maclearie  
Public Member Laurie Cannon  
Public Member Rosemarie Estephan

Absent: Monmouth County Freeholder Director Lillian Burry, Public Member Joseph Colfer and Garrison Commander COL Stephen Christian had previously advised the Authority.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lucky who led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance. The Special Public Meeting was convened at 7:05 p.m. in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

Chair Lucky welcomed and thanked the participants for attending. He explained the meeting format of listening to the public on Affordable Housing concerns. He noted that all realize the need for affordable housing and that the challenges of accomplishing this goal, the costs associated and the impacts on all, especially the host communities will be discussed.

### **Affordable Housing Issues Relating to the Reuse and Redevelopment of Fort Monmouth:**

David Banisch, Banisch Associates, Inc. gave the following presentation. (Exhibit A)

Dave Gibbons, Oakhurst questioned the dividing by 5 instead of 4 to 1 in the presentation. Mayor Tarantolo explained that for every 5 units there is a 20% set aside for affordable housing which amounts to 4 to 1. Joel Davies, Tinton Falls, asked how they arrived at the 2005 date. Mayor Tarantolo said that August 2005 was the date of the BRAC Commission and that they were using that date as a base to work with the numbers. Adam Gordon, Esq., Fair Share Housing Center, Cherry Hill, inquired about a special role for Fort Monmouth. Mayor Tarantolo noted new regulations looking at Fort Monmouth as a region and that a new regional provision has been added permitting municipalities to work with regional entities, such as Fort Monmouth, to address regional obligations.

### **Public Comments on Agenda Items:**

1. Phil Welch, Lincroft, thanked the Board for holding this special public meeting on Affordable Housing, distributed a hand out to the Board regarding Affordable Housing which highlighted the following suggestions: a wide variety of types of Affordable Housing tailored to the needs of different households; moderate densities of 5 – 10 units per acre (in order to make best use of land and other precious resources); mixed-use development (housing over retail space/office space, public buildings, etc.); and mixed income housing (a reasonable mix of housing for all income levels, including low, moderate and above average incomes).
2. Bill Nordahl, Long Branch, wants the state, county and municipalities working together regarding affordable housing, suggested a statewide school tax and asked that available land and structures at Fort Monmouth be used for affordable housing.

3. J.J. Mistretta, Freehold, noted that the face of affordable housing has changed; suggested that mixed use housing take into consideration variations of salaries and lifestyles; and asked that revitalized buildings be green using solar and geothermal power.
4. Mary Ann Christopher, Monmouth County Human Services Advisory Council, Freehold, advocated for affordable housing for direct care workers in health industries, schools and transportation; asked for a balance at Fort Monmouth between economic revitalization and public welfare.
5. Rev. P. Susan Mamchak, West Long Branch, said the financials of affordable housing will change, as with planning, there are always changes.
6. Adam Gordon, Esq., Fair Share Housing Center, Cherry Hill, wants to cooperate and produce affordable housing at Fort Monmouth; noted uncertainty in COAH concerning obligations and asked for a clear understanding of the affordable housing process and timetable, and for an explanation of the decision-making process on COAH and NOIs as they pertain to Fort Monmouth.

Chair Lucky explained that the land use plan is due September 8, 2008 to HUD and the Army and that the legal agreement with HUD is that signed contracts with homeless providers must accompany the submission of the plan. The host communities review the plan to be submitted for 45 days once received and the Governor also reviews and must approve prior to submission.

ED Cosentino stated that the Army is concerned with the overall feasibility of the plan and the value aspect. Regarding housing, the Army leaves that to the discretion of the Board and the host communities. The BRAC rules are clear regarding the value of the plan and the workability. He emphasized that the plan is a living document that will evolve as it has historically throughout the country.

DD Harrison explained that the components of the HUD application are a conceptual land use plan, a homeless assistance submission and a summary of public comments regarding both documents. The Homeless Assistance Submission includes information about homelessness, the homeless NOIs, Legally Binding Agreements, a balance statement and documentation of Outreach efforts and activities undertaken. All must be presented at a public hearing and a summary of public comments must be included with the submission. Data has been gathered, site visits have been conducted and the Social Services Advisory Committee will make recommendations based on the needs identified and uncovered. The Evaluation Committee will use the Evaluation Criteria Check list to individually rate the 14 NOIs and a structured financial evaluation has been analyzed. Final recommendations will be provided to and approved by the Board.

Public Member Estephan concurred with DD Harrison noting a Social Services Advisory Committee meeting will held tomorrow. She explained that they have clarified the needs and are presently evaluating the NOIs.

7. Tom Mahedy, Wall, wants the plan to be a vision of healing, to provide housing, to utilize Pine Brook for housing and for the brainpower at Fort Monmouth to stay in the area.
8. Clare Neary, Monmouth Beach, noted that as housing costs rise the towns lose a sense of community and asked for the inclusion of affordable housing.

Chair Lucky stated that the plan's objective is to have a real sense of community for people to live, work and play in the community and that affordable housing is a part of it.

9. Pat McDonald, Spring Lake, asked for a better understanding of the economic implications on the municipalities regarding housing.

Mayor Tarantolo estimated the current cost of 255 growth share affordable housing units, based on the COAH presentation, to be in excess of \$41 million and stated that over time, with inflation, the number will escalate. He reiterated that the host communities are committed to affordable housing but they need to have a balanced plan. The cost per resident for services has to be taken into consideration. It would not be fair to pass the responsibility on to their taxpayers.

Vice Chair Bauer left at this time.

Mayor Maclearie explained that his municipality has twice voted for an open space tax. He mentioned ~60 developable acres available after existing buildings are kept and environmental constraints considered. He

wants a proportionate number of affordable housing and expressed concern with sustainability, quality of life issues and taxpayer considerations.

Mayor Mahon echoed what each of the Mayors stated noting his municipality has similar obligations. The community is concerned with preserving the history of Fort Monmouth, preserving the environment and preserving the quality of life and affordability. He noted ~88 developable acres, after open space constraints and undevelopable land, and envisions ~800 dwelling units. The concern for all host communities is the impact on the community and the cost to taxpayers.

Having heard from both sides on this issue, Chair Lucky thanked all for attending and for bringing affordable housing issues to the attention of the Board.

Since there were no further comments or business, a motion to adjourn was made by Mayor Maclearie, seconded by Mayor Mahon and unanimously adopted at 8:45 pm.

FMERPA  
Affordable Housing Discussion  
May 19, 2008

NJ Council on Affordable Housing  
(COAH) Round 3c Growth Share;

NJ Council on Affordable Housing  
COAH

- Region 4 – Mercer, MONMOUTH & Ocean Counties - Low- & Moderate-Income 'Affordable Housing'
  - Moderate – more than 50%, but less than 80% of the Median Gross Household Income for the Region
  - Low-income – 50% or less of the Median Gross Household Income for the Region

## COAH's Round 3c Effective June 2, 2008

- 115,000 units of Affordable Housing Statewide Need for 2004-2018 (Round 3c);
- \$161,000 estimated cost of construction per unit; and
- \$18,515,536,666 estimated cost for Statewide need.

### COAH Region 3 Mercer, Monmouth, Ocean Counties

	*1.5 Person	*3 Person	*4.5 Person
Median	\$72,525	\$87,030	\$100,568
Moderate	\$58,020	\$69,624	\$80,454
Low	\$36,263	\$43,515	\$50,284
Very Low	\$21,758	\$26,109	\$30,170

\*These columns are for calculating the pricing for one, two and three bedroom sale and rental units as per N.J.A.C. 5:80-26.6(b) and N.J.A.C. 5:80-26.12(a).

### 3rd Round Growth Share (proposed rule)

- FMERPA plan identifies 375 units of affordable housing;
- Municipalities required to provide affordable housing as per COAH's Round 3c Growth Share Formula, based upon FMERPA Housing and Employment Projections:

- Growth Share:  
Residential Growth Share  
+ Nonresidential Growth Share  
Total Growth Share

## Round 3c Growth Share:

- Residential Growth Share:
  - 1 affordable unit / 4 residential C/O's issued during 3rd Round;
- Nonresidential Growth Share:
  - 1 affordable unit / 16 jobs created during 3rd Round.

## Fort Monmouth Growth Projections Round 3 Growth Share 375 - Affordable Units proposed

- Residential Growth Share
  - \*225 reused units (not subject to growth share);
  - \*900 new market-rate units (subject to growth share);
  - 375 affordable units
  - 1,500 Total units
  - \*1,125 units / 5 = 255 growth share units required

- **Nonresidential Growth Share**
  - Nonresidential Growth Share is based on net increase over August 2005 Civilian Government Workforce;
  - No growth share obligation projected.

- **FMERPA Proposed Plan:**

375 affordable housing units;

vs.

255 affordable growth share units required.