Resolution of the Demarest Governing Body

Resolution No. 059 -24

February 26, 2024

Council Member	Motion	Second	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Jiang			✓			
Fox			✓			
Marks	✓		✓			
Slowikowski			✓			
Reiss		✓	✓			
Collins			✓			

TITLE: RESOLUTION OF THE BOROUGH OF DEMAREST, COUNTY OF BERGEN, OPPOSING ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 4/SENATE BILL NO. 50, WHICH PROPOSES TO OVERHALL THE FAIR HOUSING ACT ("FHA") IN A WAY THAT IMPOSES UNREALISTIC OBLIGATIONS WITH UNREALISTIC DEADLINES BASED UPON ONEROUS STANDARDS.

==========

WHEREAS, in 1983, the Supreme Court decided a landmark case, commonly referred to as Mount Laurel II; and

WHEREAS, Mount Laurel II and its progeny generated substantial litigation culminating in the enactment of the New Jersey Fair Housing Act in 1985 ("FHA"); and

The Fair Housing Act of 1985

WHEREAS, the Legislature enacted the FHA to restore home rule, to bring the fair share numbers back to reality and to reduce the burdens of Mount Laurel compliance; and

WHEREAS, more specifically, the FHA sought *to restore home rule* by imposing a moratorium on the builder's remedy and by providing an administrative process that municipalities could voluntarily pursue wherein they would be insulated from developers seeking builder's remedies to try to compel them to capitulate their zoning demands; and

WHEREAS, the FHA sought *to bring the fair share numbers back to reality* by among other things defining the prospective need as the need "based on development and growth which is reasonably likely to occur" and by calling for the fair share to be adjusted to a number lower than the fair share formula generated if the municipality lacked sufficient land to satisfy the obligation generated by the fair share formula; and

WHEREAS, the FHA sought *to reduce the burdens on municipalities* by prohibiting any requirement for municipalities to expend their own resources to comply; and

The New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing

WHEREAS, the FHA created COAH and conferred "primary jurisdiction" on COAH to administer the FHA and to implement the affordable housing policies of our State; and

WHEREAS, all acknowledge -- even Fair Share Housing Center ("FSHC") -- that COAH functioned just fine in Rounds 1 and 2; and

WHEREAS, COAH did not adopt valid regulations for Round 3 despite multiple efforts to do so and made no efforts to cure the bottleneck the third time COAH voted 3-3 on Round 3 regulations; and

Mount Laurel IV

WHEREAS, in 2015, the Supreme Court issued a decision, commonly referred to as Mount Laurel IV, in response to a motion to transfer the responsibilities of COAH back to the courts in light of COAH's failure to adopt valid regulations; and

WHEREAS, in Mount Laurel IV, the Supreme Court returned the task of implementing the doctrine back to the Courts because COAH had failed to do its job and made no effort to cure the roadblock when it voted 3-3 on the third iteration of Round 3 regulations; and

WHEREAS, notwithstanding the foregoing, the Court emphasized that it preferred the administrative remedy created by the FHA to a judicial one and hoped that COAH would be effective so that towns could comply once again through the administrative process created by the FHA; and

WHEREAS, the Court process proved to be far more expensive than the COAH process and was ill-suited for resolving comprehensive planning disputes over affordable housing matters; and

WHEREAS, the Round 3 process was a disaster with judges pressing municipalities to comply before even establishing the obligations with which they must comply; and

WHEREAS, ultimately, on March 8, 2018, after a 41-day trial in Mercer County, Judge Jacobson issued an opinion in which she set forth a fair share methodology; and

WHEREAS, in that trial and in various other instances throughout the state, FSHC took the position that the Statewide obligation should exceed 300,000 to be addressed between 2015 and 2025; and

WHEREAS, municipalities, through Dr. Robert Powell, presented evidence that, in a best case scenario, the State could only absorb less than 40,000 affordable units and thus argued that FSHC's calculations was not grounded in reality whatsoever; and

WHEREAS, the Court, having been constrained by the Supreme Court to prescriptively utilize a formula from 1993, ultimately concluded that the Statewide obligation to be constructed between 2015-2025 was roughly 153,000 units; and

The 354 Settlements with FSHC

WHEREAS, FSHC reports that it entered 354 settlements in Round 3; and

WHEREAS, many municipalities are reeling under the burden of satisfying their obligations under those settlements entered between 2015 and 2023; and

WHEREAS, many of those Round 3 settlements will result in development during the Round 4 period; and

WHEREAS, Round 4 is set to begin on July 1, 2025 and there is no comprehensive analysis on the impacts of the 354 Round 3 settlements and over-zoning described above; and

WHEREAS, indeed, the A4/S50 Bill fails to consider the impact from affordable housing projects that were approved during the Third Round, but are still not yet under construction, as said projects, as well as additional future projects, will impact legitimate public concerns like infrastructure, the environment, schools, traffic, parking and open space; and

WHEREAS, the Round 3 process destroyed the balance achieved by the Fair Housing Act in 1985; and

WHEREAS, on December 19, 2023, against the above backdrop, the Housing Committee of the Assembly (a) unveiled the Legislation (A-4) – a detailed 69-page bill that the Chairwoman of the Housing Committee announced had been worked on for a long time; and (b) scheduled the bill for a vote at a hearing scheduled less than 24 hours later; and

WHEREAS, on December 19, 2023, the Administrative Office of the Courts wrote to the Legislature and made clear that it could not structure the bill in the manner set forth in the proposed legislation; and

WHEREAS, notwithstanding the foregoing, on December 20, 2023, the Housing Committee voted the bill out of the Committee and announced that the bill needed to be ready for signing by the Governor before the end of the lame duck session on January 8, 2024; and

WHEREAS, the perception that the Legislative designed was to adopt the bill before the public had an opportunity to review it and provide meaningful comment was as real as it was unmistakable; and

WHEREAS, consequently, the Legislature did not ram the bill through in the lame duck session; and

WHEREAS, instead, on January 29, 2024, the Housing Committee of the Assembly met to consider a new version of A-4 and voted to release it out of the Committee; and

WHEREAS, on February 8, 2024, as a result of comments, letters and resolutions challenging this new version of A-4, the Appropriations Committee of the Assembly announced a number of changes to the Bill; and

WHEREAS, one witness likened the summary presented to the public at the February 8, 2024 Appropriations meeting to that of an auctioneer; and

WHEREAS, the Appropriations Committee voted the bill out of the Committee at its February 8, 2024 meeting before the public had an opportunity to even see the changes, much less process their significance and comment on them; and

WHEREAS, the bill has been improved marginally as it has evolved from its initial version in December of 2023 to the current version voted out of the Appropriations Committee of the Assembly on February 8, 2024; and

WHEREAS, despite elimination of just some of the gross excesses of the prior version of the bill, the current bill released after the February 8, 2024 Appropriations Committee meeting is still severely flawed; and

WHEREAS, the Bill still creates a judicial entity made up of 3-7 retired Mount Laurel judges called "The Program", which, unlike COAH, is not comprised of an equal number of municipal and housing representatives, and is not made up of an equal number of Republicans

and Democrats, thereby depriving the citizens of our State of the carefully crafted COAH Board that included a diversity of interests and that was the centerpiece of the FHA adopted in 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Bill still does not require the promulgation of affordable housing obligations, or the adoption of substantive regulations, in a way that utilizes an open and transparent process that COAH used and that gave all interested parties an opportunity to comment and receive COAH's response to their comments; and

WHEREAS, as detailed below, the bill creates a patently unreasonable responsibility on municipalities by imposing an obligation on them to create a realistic opportunity for satisfaction of a fair share that is itself unrealistic; and

WHEREAS, the current version still details the methodology to be used for determining the fair share numbers of municipalities in Round 4 and in subsequent rounds; and

WHEREAS, the current version still presumes that 40 percent of all new households will qualify as low or moderate; and

WHEREAS, the current version still calls for the determination of the prospective need by subtracting the number of households reported in the 2010 Decennial Census from the number of households reported in the 2020 Decennial Census and multiplying that figure by 40 percent; and

WHEREAS, we calculate the statewide need number to be 84,690 based upon the formula set forth in the bill; and

WHEREAS, the current version of the Bill calls for 84,690 to be adjusted by the number of conversions and demolitions; and

WHEREAS, the statewide fair share would be increased from 84,690 to 96,780, if we assume the same number of demolitions and conversions used by Judge Jacobson in her formula for Round 3 that will apply in Round 4; and

WHEREAS, we can estimate the obligation of each municipality if we assume that the same percentage of the regional need in Round 3 for each municipality applies in Round 4; and

WHEREAS, we have widely distributed our estimates and invited input after acknowledging that we have done the best we can to formulate estimates in very limited time; and

WHEREAS, other than an analysis of the allocation factors by an expert for the American Planning Association (Creigh Rahenkamp) who identified problems with the allocation factors, nobody has accepted our invitation to review and comment on our rough estimates; and

WHEREAS, to the contrary, the Executive Director of Fair Share Housing Center testified that he did not have a calculation of the fair share numbers; and

WHEREAS, more importantly, no committee of the Assembly or Senate has identified the fair share obligations municipalities should expect based upon the formula set forth in the bill; and

WHEREAS, the 96,780 fair share number estimated for Round 4 compares to the roughly 211,000 COs issued between 2010 and 2020; and

WHEREAS, the 96,780 fair share number divided by 211,000 COs equals roughly 46 percent (45.867 percent to be more precise); and

WHEREAS, all municipalities should be able to cure any violations of the prohibition against exclusionary zoning with inclusionary zoning; and

WHEREAS, traditional inclusionary zoning ordinances generally require no more than 20 percent of the units to be affordable; and

WHEREAS, it is mathematically impossible to satisfy a 46 percent problem with a 20 percent solution and, therefore, the number generated by the statutory formula is patently excessive; and

WHEREAS, while this mathematical error conceptually may have existed at COAH, COAH utilized its discretion to reduce the statewide number to roughly 5,000 units per year in Rounds 1-2 (or lower for prospective need in its attempted regulations in 2014); and

WHEREAS, in addition, COAH's Round 2 regulations had flexible standards, Regional Contribution Agreements (RCAs), an achievable bonus structure, waivers and other flexible standards to further mitigate the problem; and

WHEREAS, had COAH not mitigated the problem, it is likely that the regulations would have been challenged by municipalities; and

WHEREAS, as detailed below, the Bill still fails to account for the enormous burdens on municipalities to comply with their Round 3 obligations before imposing very substantial additional burdens on those 354 municipalities for Round 4; and

WHEREAS, a representative of FSHC testified that it has entered into 354 settlements and that it would furnish those settlements to the Housing Committee, which it has failed to do; and

WHEREAS, we have pressed FSHC to advise how much development will take place in Round 4 as a result of municipalities implementing the 354 settlements reached in Round 3; and

WHEREAS, Adam Gordon on behalf of FSHC has indicated he doesn't know the answer to this question and no committee of the Assembly or Senate has even hinted at what the answer might be; and

WHEREAS, the Bill requires municipalities to create a realistic opportunity for satisfaction of a fair share without taking into account how many affordable units can realistically be achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning (where generally one out of every five units must be affordable); and

WHEREAS, we also sought to ascertain how many affordable units could be realistically achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning by urging the Legislature to do a market study since the strength of the housing market will determine the number of market units that can reasonably be anticipated that are essential to generating one affordable unit for every four market units constructed; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature has not furnished a market study in response to our repeated emphasis on the need for one to ascertain how many affordable units could be realistically achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning; and

WHEREAS, as explained below, the bill dilutes the protections to which a municipality is currently entitled as it seeks to comply voluntarily and even after it secures approval of its affordable housing plan; and

WHEREAS, current laws preserve a municipality's immunity in the absence of proof that the municipality is "determined to be constitutionally noncompliant", the proposed bill does not give municipalities seeking to comply voluntarily the same measure of protection the Supreme Court deemed appropriate; and

WHEREAS A4/S50 subjects municipalities to litigation not only as they seek approval of their Housing Element and Fair Share Plans, but also even after they secure approval of those plans; and

WHEREAS, more specifically, A4/S50 provides municipalities a "compliance certification" if the municipality secures approval of its affordable housing plan; however, that certification does not prevent an interested party from "alleging that, despite the issuance of compliance certification, a municipality's fair share obligation, fair share plan, housing element, or ordinances implementing the fair share plan or housing element are in violation of the Mount Laurel doctrine"; and

WHEREAS, the Bill suffers from a myriad of additional flaws; and

WHEREAS, under current laws, a municipality would have a right to rely on the fair share number that COAH provides; however, under the new bill a municipality would only have a presumption of validity that the number the DCA provides to the municipality is appropriate and FSHC, a deep pocketed developer or any other interested party could seek to overcome that presumption through litigation; and

WHEREAS, the A4/S50 Bill replaces a straightforward system by which a municipality could secure bonus credits up to a 25 percent cap with a highly complicated system for securing bonuses with many conditions attached to various forms of bonus.; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature previously capped the fair share of any municipality down to 1,000 in recognition that any obligation above 1,000 would be "onerous"; A4/S50 applies the 1,000-unit cap only to a component of the municipality's fair share -- the prospective need – and authorizes the imposition of an obligation that is onerous; and

WHEREAS, the A4/S50 Bill creates unfair requirements and ambiguity when it comes to the Vacant Land Adjustment process, which could lead to municipalities that lack sufficient vacant land being required to produce more affordable housing units than is practical; and

WHEREAS, the A4/S50 Bill includes many other provisions and changes to the FHA that are impractical and devoid of any consideration of the burdens created by the statute; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the facts set forth above, a bill that boasts of its effectiveness in reducing costs and litigation will clearly have the exact opposite effect; and

WHEREAS, in addition to all the concerns expressed above, a bill that so radically changes the affordable housing laws of our state still needs considerable work; and

WHEREAS, indeed, as the following facts demonstrate, the Legislature has yet to do the most fundamental due diligence before enacting a statute with such broad ramifications;

1. The Legislature has not and cannot inform the public of the fair share obligations the bill, if enacted, would impose on the public;

2. The Legislature has not and cannot inform the public of the obligations that municipalities will satisfy in Round 4 from the 354 settlements achieved in Round 3 before heaping substantial additional burdens on them for Round 4;

3. The Legislature has not and cannot inform the public of the number of affordable units that can realistically be achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning while imposing obligations on municipalities to create a realistic opportunity for a fair share that far exceeds any number a municipality can realistically achieve through inclusionary zoning; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the pronounced lack of due diligence, the bill will likely force taxes to increase dramatically and will foster serious overdevelopment creating unreasonable burdens on our schools, public services, roads, sewer and water infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature clearly can and should upgrade the affordable housing policies of our State; however, the current Version of A4 is not the answer and the most fundamental diligence can and should be exercised before adopting such a bill.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that for all of the above reasons, the Governing Body of the Borough of Demarest, objects to and opposes Assembly Bill No. 4/Senate Bill No. 50, and requests that the bill be tabled, re-written and re-introduced in way that imposes achievable obligations and facilitates the ability of the municipality to satisfy its obligations.

A certified copy of this resolution shall be sent to the Legislators in the State Assembly and Senate representing our District immediately.

APPROVED:

Mayor Brian Bernstein

CERTIFICATION

I, Julie Falkenstern, Acting Borough Clerk, of the Borough of Demarest, in the County of Bergen and the State of New Jersey do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution is a true copy of the original resolution duly passed and adopted by the Governing Body at the meeting on February 26, 2024

Julie Falkenstern, Acting Borough Clerk