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(Agenda)
MAYOR GHASSALI: At this point in the meeting we're going to move a couple of the resolutions up and then there will be some votes taken.

I would like to give the floor to our Special Counsel, Mr. Jeff Surenian, to give an overview of the Fair Share Housing Agreement and the three settlement agreements and then, after that, the Finance Committee Chairman, Mr. Tim Lane, will do some finance analysis and then we'll go through the resolutions.

Mr. Surenian.
MR. SURENIAN: Good evening. My name is Jeff Surenian. I'm an attorney for the Borough on the Mount Laurel. I represent municipalities all over the state, in affordable housing matters, in COAH matters in particular. This is all my law firm does. We represent municipalities more than any other.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Use the microphone.
MR. SURENIAN: Thank you. -- negotiated
more than any other two law firms involved.
So where we are in this case is the court, we had a case management conference with the court. As
usual situation, the court tried to impress upon us to move this along. And as I said the last time, I indicated that there was a lot of risk involved with litigation and it is very important, in my opinion (inaudible) in fact an unanimous opinion of all the attorneys of the Borough that it's important to the town to seize control over how it handles its zoning so that it doesn't find itself in a situation where developers have the upper hand and, and can decide the future of the community.

It involves painful decisions.
It is never an easy thing to settle a Mount Laurel case. It's not easy to kind of have to relinquish the kind of densities that we would otherwise prefer but the alternative to not settling cases is you run the risk that developers take control. In a community as desirable as Montvale, that's the last thing that you would want.

And what we have before you tonight is a series of four agreements where it's an opportunity to take control, resolve litigation, control what happens on sites that might be developed a lot more intensely but for the settlements and control over how you plan to satisfy your affordable housing responsibilities.

The next step should all these agreements be
approved is we would find ourselves in front of the court, we would be asking the court to approve the agreement.

Following that we would have an affordable housing plan that would embody these agreements and then we would be asking the court to approve that plan.

The result of that would be what's called a Judgment of Compliance and Repose and that Judgement of Compliance and Repose would be your way of insulating yourself from anyone that would try to sue you or try to leverage you up to that point until the year 2025 .

It is possible with this judgment as with any judgment that there might be changed circumstances that would call for a revisiting of what you say your obligations should be and we've anticipated that potential and we planned for that potential and how do we try to structure these agreements.

So, with that, I'll go through the agreements.
There's four agreements before the town.
There's an agreement with A \& P. There's an agreement with Hekemian that you are all familiar with. There's an agreement with Hornrock and then there's an agreement with Fair Share Housing Center.

What's significant about the agreement with Fair Share Housing Center is it took the position that it preconditioned with settling with us was because it wanted to see the litigation resolved between us and Hekemian and between us and Hornrock so that was an important -- it's important for us to satisfy those prerequisites so that we can have this agreement with, with Fair Share Housing Center that pins down many of the issues.

You may recall that the last time $I$ was here $I$ indicated that there are some overarching issues that need to be resolved to, to obtain this global settlement. We had hoped to be able to tell you by tonight that we had an agreement in principle with Fair Share Housing Center. In fact, we have a signed agreement with the Fair Share Housing Center and if the town is so inclined and it authorizes the resolution we can have a final agreement that's binding on both parties.

The first agreement, A \& P. The A \& P site is roughly 13 by (inaudible) and is being proposed to be developed at a relatively low density, very low densities compared to how it might otherwise be.

And we're talking about 8 units, the settlement contemplates the construction of 80 units on, on this
land of which 16 would be affordable, for low and moderate income households, a low income (inaudible) moderate income households. A division of Toll Brothers who is the contract purchaser is a very high end project. And in fact the language in the agreement, reflects that the developer has presented a concept plan as a kind of a high end concept plan for this site and, and that is the $A$ \& $P$ agreement.

The other agreement is the Hekemian agreement.
How many people were here last time? Okay. So I don't need to belabor this agreement.

And very roughly it contemplates 350 units on the Mercedes site and the Glen View site. There would be 308 units on the Mercedes site of which 44 would be affordable rental units. There would be 42 units on the, on the Glen View site of which nine would be affordable. The nine affordable units may be for sale or for rent on Glen View. The affordable units on the Mercedes site would be rental units.

There's a significant amount of, of non-residential development that would be part of this mixed use project and the, the significance of the Hekemian agreement is in a litigated mode there is a lot of risk involved instead of having a mixed unit project where the non-residential side of the project
would generate revenue they can insist on a fully residential project which would double or potentially double or even more than that increase the burden associated with the purely residential construction.

So the settlement with Hekemian avoids forcing the developer's hand to come after you in, in every way that he can and try to hurt you on what your number is in the first instance, what your adjustment is in the second instance, whether you satisfy, satisfy your adjusted number in the third instance.

What's left, that you don't have enough land to address what's called the unmet need. The developer could come in and make a lot of arguments to come in and try to make it different and greater obligations on what's called the unmet need.

This settlement resolves what happens on those sites. This settlement avoids those substantial risks in litigation.

I think the other thing that's significant about the Hekemian agreement is if we can get from the battle mode where we fought them and tried to get, we tried to get everything we could from them. If you go from the battle mode to the settlement mode I think that there's going to be a radically different climate than you have right now.

Right now we've been at logger heads. They've been making demands. We've been pushing back. We've been fighting. But the reality is once you get past the point where, where you're okay, you're settled is, it is in the interest of the developer to have a high end product. Because the better his product the more money he can make the better able he'll be able to rent the units.

So once you cross this river and get to the other side we're in a different ballpark. We really have common interest.

Is it going to be -- are there going to be no issues? I'm not telling you there's a Santa claus. But you're in a radically different position and you have the ability to work together to get (inaudible). There's a lot of a provisions in the ordinance that will enable your Planning Board to make sure the project looks and feels like something that you would like in (inaudible) Montvale.

Hornrock, Hornrock is next. Hornrock is roughly 7 acres on the Park Ridge/Montvale border and there's 7 acres, as you all know, I'm sure, in Montvale. The proposal for that project is for 185 units and that's what the settlement is for with 20 percent, 37 of those 185 being affordable to low and moderate income
households.
The typical set aside in a, in a rentals project is a 15 percent set aside. Montvale negotiated for 20 percent and was able to secure an agreement for the, for the 20 percent affordable family rental. That's value to, to you because to the extent you generate a surplus that enables you to insulate yourself against events that may come up down the line.

The -- there is a concept plan associated with the site. It's four units of residential over parking. And, again, the, the next step in signing the Hornrock agreement is there's going to be a negotiation over the form of the ordinance where we will try to make sure that there's provisions in the ordinance that, that empower you to make sure that it's the kind of project you want in your community. That would be the next step.

If that can't be achieved then we could find ourselves back to Square 1 but the, you know, the concept plan that we have a path to resolving that and avoiding having to have a litigation situation with Hornrock.

Last and absolutely not least is Fair Share Housing Center. Fair Share Housing Center, for lack of a better word, in the vernacular, can make the life
of a municipality a living hell. We know that because we litigated with the Fair Share Housing Center all over the state. They intend to push the envelope very far but we have an opportunity here to negotiate with them and to get them to accept some provisions that are very significant and very favorable to the community.

So I will let Michael Edwards go into some of the detail but in order to have and I'll just give you a big picture now but in order to have a path to finally resolve all issues you need to pin down certain things. You need to pin down what's the Fair Share number in a town that doesn't have enough land to meet its Fair Share number. You need to pin down what is the adjustment number that the municipality is entitled to and once you have addressed the number there's two parts that, that you're left with in the terms of art you're left with Realistic Development Potential, RDP, unmet need. The Realistic Development Potential represents the number of affordable units that could be theoretically constructed if every last available and undeveloped site was developed with the maximum practicable density with a 20 percent set aside.

What's significant about the Realistic

Development Potential is it's a hard number. You have to create a realistic opportunity for the Realistic Development Potential. So when you go into court and you say $I$ want an adjustment, you have to go through all these protocols to establish (inaudible) looks at every site and agrees on what's developed and what's not and come up with a number that is your Realistic Development Potential. So you have to pin that down in order to have a path to complete resolution.

The other thing you have to do is you have to have a mechanism that you can show creating a realistic opportunity for your Realistic Development Potential. So it's another key ingredient to a global resolution of your Mount Laurel issues. The, the Fair Share Housing Center settlement addresses that.

The third thing that's important is you need to quantify how much of your land or how much of your obligation don't you have enough land to address. So to say it another way, what is your unmet need? That's a much more discretionary, gray area.

And in that area you need to try to encourage redevelopment and you are generally required to adopt overlay ordinances and things of that nature to try to encourage redevelopment. So that, in reality, can be problematic or can be relatively controlled.

In this instance we have a way to control that and to, and to determine where this, where the lands would be that we would allow redevelopment and to control the kind of densities that are involved.

So those are the ingredients, those are the issues that are covered in the Fair Share Housing Center settlement.

And I think I'll turn it over to Mike for anything that he might want to, with regard to that settlement.

MR. EDWARDS: I'll be brief because (inaudible) in favor of your settlement, Fair Share Housing Center agreements for the project developer, Jeff has gone through.

But Jeff had kind of painted the primary and first units. We had an opportunity (inaudible) what do your Fair Share report on really affordable housing can provide. (Inaudible) there's also a prior round of Fair Share, there's no dispute as to that.
(Inaudible) your prior round obligation is 255 units.

The dispute really came with respect to your Round III obligation. Your own experts said it was fine, 538. The Fair Share Housing Center said it was 779. The negotiated number of 542 . That's a 30 percent reduction off your Fair Share Housing's number
end up being (inaudible) overlay the number of, you could have (inaudible).

As, as Jeff was saying, you guys don't have sufficient land to do, to do proper (inaudible) units.

You do have sufficient land to do 181 units. So you agreed to satisfy your prior, 235, and do an additional 181 units of real estate development potential which was a residual obligation of 185 -365 units.

As to how you meet your 255 prior obligation, there is no really new or novel mechanisms beyond what is proposed in the Round II plans. There is some modifications but (inaudible) Round II plan as to how you meet your Round III RDP is that 160 of those will be redevelopment, roughly 163 will be redevelopment we talked about in the bonus credits generated as a result of those three (inaudible).

Everything else goes in one small preliminary site (inaudible) everything else you have is already under construction or before the zoning board.

So we have three big ticket items, are Hornrock, Mercedes-Benz and $A$ \& $P$ and with those mechanisms you create a surplus of 44 units above and beyond your RDP and specifically that surplus would be (inaudible) mechanism so Fair Share Housing Center would be able
to say those 44 units apply to residual (inaudible) units.

We negotiated a provision that says expressly that those 44 units apply to change in circumstance. So if your (inaudible) unit obligation goes up as a result, as a result of some (inaudible) like Sony leaving or like Mercedes-Benz leaving or like A \& $P$ leaving, you don't have to zone that site for affordable housing (inaudible) now, you get to use that surplus as a cushion in the event of future redevelopment.

So, so that's how you get your 181 units, that's how you generate the surplus and that's a benefit of surplus. As a result of 364 unit residual obligation. There are two really primary (inaudible) addressing that. One is overlay zoning which I'll go through first and the second is (inaudible) set aside units.

So that's the overlay zoning. We are able to negotiate favorable density. We create two overlay zones, one over (inaudible) is commonly referred to as the Annie Sez site and one of the D1 District (inaudible).

There are two -- you know, each of these overlay zones would be (inaudible). Each one would be a maximum of three stories.

Annie Sez and the, and west of the train tracks will be a maximum of 12 units per acre and the other portion of the D1 Zone would be (inaudible) use. And then, you know, the second component, (inaudible) on the mandatory set aside ordinance, that simply says if the Borough would permit multi-family housing (inaudible) your set aside as a result of that.

You are in the driver's seat as whether you want to permit multi-family housing and you basically said you do (inaudible) affordable housing.

I would say those are the primary terms of the settlement agreement. (Inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
If you want to start from the beginning again.
There are some, some trying to take seats.
Next in the process what we will be doing is Councilman Tim Lane will be giving a preview of the finances of the tax revenue coming in from all these applications and then $I$ will have a brief statement and then we'll open it to the public where we will be limited to five minutes per person because it's a packed agenda.

And then we'll go to the resolutions where the council, where the council members will have a chance to speak at each of the resolutions.

So the chairman of the Finance Committee is Mr. Tim Lane who worked together with, with Councilwoman Liz Beth Gloeggler to work on the numbers with the CSO.

And we were supposed to use the screen but it is (inaudible) connections so we have to use the numbers that he has.

Councilman Lane.

MR. LANE: I just want to wait a second while they hand out a copy of the exhibit.

Sorry, guys, we're not electronically able to project it.

Make sure everybody has it.

Everybody good? (Inaudible).
Okay. This is a relatively simple exhibit. It, it shows the, it shows five properties that are um-um due to come on-line in the event of these settlements being accepted.

Obviously, the, the first one, Wegman's, is already in place. And it, it -- I'll walk you across the columns.

The first column just shows the current tax revenue that we had leading into this year for each of these properties. The second column is the projected tax revenue, total tax revenue for the same property
after development.
The third is the projected additional tax revenue so it's basically Column 2 minus Column 1. And then the, the next column is the projected municipal share.

So I've listed out the percentages that apply to, for each of the different categories as to where your tax dollars go. So any dollars that come in to town, 24.4 percent goes to the municipality for its projects, . 22 percent goes to the open space fund which is a small number but 1.62 percent goes to the library, that's statutory.

The County gets 11.76 percent and 62 percent goes to the schools.

So about a quarter of your dollars goes to the municipal budget.

If you take a look at the projected additional tax revenue for these five properties that column is, you know, the third column with numbers, you look at the bottom, the total is 4.3, almost 4.4 million. The municipal share that would be 24.4 percent or 1,069,547. These -- that, that is the additional amount that would be raised for the municipal budget from, from these properties as projected.

If, if the, if that dollar amount is used, this
is where it gets a little tricky, is used simply as tax relief so we don't do anything with it but, but actually use it to lower your tax bill actually we will collect less, right, because you're reducing the tax rate and so it's a little bit of, you kind of have to -- it, it, as it comes down it actually reduces the amount that you're, you're gaining from taxes.

But, essentially, that money is available to us for tax relief, for capital purposes, for, you know, fixing roads. The (inaudible) spending cap, there's a tax levy cap and a spending cap. The spending cap is, is, you know, relatively close to, to -- we're, we're up, kind of up against the cap. But if you have to provide services for, as a result of new construction that's exempted from the cap.

If you float the debt issue and you need to, and you're using it for capital, that's exempted from the cap. We have not -- you know, this is obviously not money that's even come in yet so we haven't talked specifically what it would be used for but the theory of this, that is the municipal portion that could come in. And typically you're going to look at theoretically some tax relief from this and some, some additional services that we, we want to bring in to the town and, and probably, you know, something like
$\$ 400,000$ additional to pave new roads.
If you then move your way over to the projected school share, the number at the bottom there is 2.7 million. Now the schools are also subject to a cap. And one of the issues that we obviously are concerned about as we look at affordable housing and the development of additional residences in town is the impact on the schools. The schools are not able to just raise their, their spending willy-nilly because of that cap.

I don't know -- I, I know the specifics as it relates to the municipal finance. I would have to defer to somebody who's more familiar with school budgets. But in the event the school did need to float a bond issue in order to either do new construction to build new facilities, I believe the 2.7 million could be utilized for that or if it's, if it's used for tax relief, if the school isn't allowed to use that and it reduces taxes, money is fungible so any subsequent bond issue would, would add on to your taxes.

So thinking of it simplistically, if that money can't be used for operating expenses but can be used to float a bond issue, that would represent a pretty significant capability over a 10 or 20 year period for
facilities.
I don't know enough about where the State is going to go with respect to these caps. There's been some discussion that the governor elect is going to, to make some changes on, on the issue of caps both on the municipal side and possibly on the educational side. But $I$ think the most important point is that subject to, subject to the, the, I'll say the assumptions we have utilized here, this is roughly what the financial picture looks like.

Obviously, the properties that are being replaced did not generate kids. They -- so the schools are the ones that we expect to have, you know, a differential impact versus corporate properties.

The only other revenue item I haven't included in here is in the event a hotel as proposed would get built on the Hekemian property that generates a separate and distinct hotel tax which goes directly to the municipality. It doesn't get shared with the schools or the County. So that's like, for example, the situation we face with the Courtyard. That money, that additional hotel tax, $I$ don't know if you stayed there or at any hotel you see it on your bill, that goes directly to, to the municipality and that's just a straight, a straight revenue item.

The expectation, obviously, as, as we look at, at the overall financial impact on the Borough is that we will incur additional expenses with, with additional development.

Some of the expense we're going to incur are, are going to be offset by some things we don't have to do if we're trading, frankly, corporate traffic at peak times with residential traffic.

But overall, you know, the top line is that probably the schools, you know, get the most expense hit but it and it does appear that there will be a financing mechanism through the additional properties that we're, we're talking about to finance some, some additional facilities.

But, again, $I$ have to caution, I'm not an expert in school finance. I would, I would want to talk to, to the administrators of both the, the regional district and the local district as to how they would go about being able to utilize the bond issue if they (inaudible) needed a new bond issue. It's pretty clear they are subject to 2 percent tax on straight operating revenue.

Mayor, I don't have anything else. If you have any added questions. MAYOR GHASSALI: As for the schools, we
are forming a functional committee between the two school systems, the council liaisons and our CFO to look at what can be spent, how can they spend it and what do they need based on the projection of the students that are incoming.

As far as the questions when the council gets the turn, if you have anything specific as to this we can give it to -- you can ask the Chairman.

At this point, there's a slight change in the process where I'm going to make a brief statement and then open it up to the public and then the council will have their statements and then we will go through each of the resolutions.

So it has been nearly two years, countless hours, expensive resources traveling across the state and meetings with local and state law makers. We have had (inaudible) dates, at times we did say things to each other we did not mean. And we had good feedback messages and some good and some not so good, having a police report on some of these messages. We hired the best of the best and everyone we talked to said to settle and we voted no. And then we voted to table one settlement agreement. We made it all the way to the chambers of the judge, the end of the line, and in Judge Toskos's words, it would be in your best
interest and the interests of everyone to settle, not to have me settle it for you. We made it very clear -- he made it very clear that we should settle.

When we spoke to the developers we, we also made it very clear to them we need buildings that fit our character, we do not want (inaudible) buildings or towers. So we talked, met for the past several months to ensure that we exhaust all options.

No one up here is happy about the unfortunate and, frankly, unfair the situation that the State, the legislature, the Supreme Court have placed us in. And I have not been shy to tell the courts and law makers that, that they created chaos and left us to the clean it.

And while we would have loved Mercedes to stay or hotels not to move in, we do not have the luxury of waiting for a miracle to happen. We have an obligation to take the steps that we believe are the best for Montvale in the face of an extremely flawed affordable housing process.

While all the developments up for a vote tonight might not be what $I$ would want for these sites in an ideal world, in my opinion the litigation against multiple developers and Fair Share Housing is a process that is weighted heavily against
municipalities simply possess an unacceptable settlement to our community. Hundreds of proposed units will quickly turn into thousands, hotels, restaurant and new office buildings will disappear from the developers' proposals.

If we were to lose our immunity, municipal control over architecture, layout and design would be non-existent. Our Master Plan would be determined for us. All local control over our zoning and planning would be taken away. Multi-family residential development in existing corporate zones would quickly migrate closer to and even into single family residential districts.

This is not fear mongering, my friends, it is reality and as elected official representing all residents of the Borough of Montvale, I simply could not, in good conscious, allow this to happen.

I know some of you would want us to continue to fight. You should know by now that $I$ am not one to run away from a fight but there are times when, after a long fight and the judge and the courts are not siding with you is when you stop and you analyze.

I believe we have negotiated a series of settlements that are in the best interest of the Borough and that we ensure the construction of high
quality developments that will reflect the standards that our residents expect.

So at this process there will be numerous opportunities for the public and board officials to provide input on proposed developments. I am confident that with the feedback from our residents and from our experienced board members that the final developments will be something that all Borough residents can be proud of.

It is our responsibility, as elected officials, to protect our town. We are on the edge of having immunity until 2025. This will give us a chance to breath and to plan for what's to come in 2025.

You should also know that about the $\$ 4,000,000$ that Councilman Lane just spoke about will be coming from these developments. This is money that we can use to invest in our roads, reduce our taxes and add services. We deserve it after all this hard work.

We have the school planning committee to work on the needs of the additional students and the committee to develop downtown.

I am content we have exhausted all our options and that by locking our town with these agreements would put us in a much better place.

I want to thank all Council members, the

Planning Board members, all the staff and professionals that worked very hard to protect our town and especially $I$ want to thank you all. You show that you care by you being here and all the other meetings that you have been here. It is even a bigger motivation for us to work extra hard seeing you here and hearing from you.

It is for us to protect what we have invested in this town, our homes, our schools and our way of life.

I will now ask for a motion to open the meeting to the public for comments from the public limited to five minutes.

COUNCILMAN LANE: So move.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Second.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Second.

MAYOR GHASSALI: All in favor?
(Aye).

Members of the public who wish to speak on anything we talked about on the agenda please step forward. And name and address, please.

Come once.

MALE SPEAKER: Jay Koester (phonetic)
(inaudible) Drive. It sounds like this is going to go through tonight. So $I$ think the least we can do for the town, make sure we can (inaudible). So the Mayor
mentioned immunity in this state and counsel (inaudible) I'm assuming that's (inaudible). MAYOR GHASSALI: Yes.

MR. SURENIAN: Yes. It's a very important concept and I should have mentioned it. I'm glad the Mayor mentioned it.

What immunity means is that you have the, you have protection from developers that sue you. That, that there are interested parties, developers are entitled to come to hearings and object and try to leverage you. But when you have immunity, you get the right to say $I$ control how $I$ satisfy my obligations not that developer. And, you know, and it puts you in a better posture when you're negotiating with developers.

That we have temporary immunity that the judge is going to revisit this month. In fact, I think like later tomorrow or the next day we're going to have a -- the judge has scheduled a case management conference by phone because he wants to know were we listening or weren't we listening when he called us down to strongly suggest maybe you ought to settle this case.

And so there is not any doubt in my mind that once he sees that we settle all these cases he's going
to be very happy and I don't think there's going to be any issues about getting immunity to the point where we have the hearings first on the agreements and then on the plan. And then what happens, once the judge approves the plan, it triggers another extension of immunity to 2025, July 2025.

So the, the, the mission of when you represent a municipality is to keep them protected. Right now they're protected.

To the extent that these agreements are, that they don't go through, we run the risk of the judge runs out of patience and says I'm not going to give you immunity any more and then, and then all hell breaks loose.

That happened in South Brunswick. Seven developers filed Builders' Remedy suits against South Brunswick.

So it's really important to preserve your immunity.

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) getting this consideration. It's been till 2025. Is there any way that immunity could be undone?

MR. SURENIAN: Well, you have to do what you promised.

```
                        MALE SPEAKER: So --
```

MR. SURENIAN: Okay. So if you, if you say I'm going to do $A, B$ and $C$ and you do $A, B$ and $C$, you're in good shape.

There's a five-year point where the court reexamines and says, you know, is this working or does anything need to be revisited. It's in the statute. And, therefore, it's reflected in the Fair Share Housing Center agreement. We can't avoid that so we'll cross that bridge at that time.

2020 is not really far off in the grand scheme of things so $I$ wouldn't expect anything dramatic to happen then. But as long as we're proceeding in good faith, as long as we're doing what we promised to do, we should be in good shape.

Now there might be changed circumstances. There might be a site that did not count towards the RDP. Now the RDP before from Round II that comes available for development. And that developer may come in and say, you know, you got your number adjusted from 550 down to 200 , just taking out round numbers. I can help you do more. Okay. And we anticipated that possibility and all these settlements they go through, we have a 44 unit surplus, right, 44 .

And, and what that means is that puts us in the driver's seat. Someone comes along and says, here I
am, you have to zone my -- we, we get to say two things. We get to say if we like it, okay, if we don't like it we get to say not okay.

We have a surplus. We're planners. If the court agrees with you that your site could generate an RDP, that it's a suitable site for a higher density and decides to give us a higher RDP, we have 44 units in the bank that we can apply against that.

And the other thing that we have, the other provision that's really important is if, let's say we exceed that 44, the developer doesn't just get to come in and leverage us. We get to decide how we satisfy any RDP over and above that 44 .

So if someone comes in and says I'm going to do, I can give you 90 units as opposed to 44 , we get to cut them in half out of the gate and then we get to say as to that additional 46 or whatever the number may be, we want to do it our way not your way. And, and we -- and it's a very unusual provision in a settlement agreement with Fair Share Housing Center.

They told us, you know, this is the first -- we really, we really had to push them to say, you know, we want the right to apply that surplus to this changed circumstance and they agreed to that as opposed to saying you got a big unmet need and apply
it to the unmet need.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Five minutes. We'll hear from everyone and then if there's more, you can come back. (Inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: Jeff, speak more, please. MR. SURENIAN: I'm sorry. I took up your five minutes.

MALE SPEAKER: Well, I just want to point out that the 44 units surplus respectively and RDP goes up so, two, (inaudible) actually more because (inaudible).

MALE SPEAKER: That's -- when you
mentioned change in circumstances (inaudible) so something happens, say worse case scenario (inaudible) and couple years, is that 44 unit surplus going to be enough to insulate us to, against liability.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Michael, could you please use the microphone, please.

MR. EDWARDS: Your vacant land analysis is predicated largely upon your project yield on Hekemian, on Mercedes, on Hornrock so you take 20 percent of that number, you know, of the total units and that's your RDP for those sites. On all the residual sites in town it's presumed 8 units an acre. So, you know, if you presume 8 units an acre with a 20
percent set aside that gives you a cushion of 44 units on, roughly 30 plus acres would have to become available in an inclusionary context for you to eat up your entire 44 unit surplus.

MALE SPEAKER: The possibility does exist to (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Absolutely. And, you know, you would have an obligation to the extent, you know, you ate up your surplus and generate additional RDP you, you would have an additional obligation to satisfy that additional.

MALE SPEAKER: Just to be clear this isn't a full and complete settlement (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: So you never -- it's -- if you're saying to the court $I$ need an adjustment, I can't do my full quota, it's always a limited settlement whether it's (inaudible) before coAH or any other context you are getting an adjustment, you are getting a lower number because of your lack of land so as land becomes available theoretically your adjusted number adjusts again upwards.

MALE SPEAKER: All right. (Inaudible) as a settlement but not necessarily the case (inaudible) not more, more than any other kind (inaudible).

MR. EDWARDS: No doubt because we're
seeking (inaudible) the right to apply the surplus to that scenario so most other communities, that surplus is going to be unmet need and (inaudible) we have a, an insurance policy. It's written to serve the 44 plus rental (inaudible) but it's, it's significant. And, and it's a risk that every town that lacks land would have to deal with.

The alternative is to have a, create a realistic (inaudible) with an unrealistic number of the unadjustment number.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Jeff, we need to move on so keep your questions and response short.

MALE SPEAKER: Just, just to be fair, I
thought we were settling this for the purpose of peace (inaudible) we don't have to worry about any further (inaudible) redevelopment.

That's not necessarily the case. From what I'm hearing that possibility still exists and we (inaudible) that might actually. MR. SURENIAN: You can sleep as peacefully as possible. A town that secures a vacant land adjustment always runs a risk because there's a Supreme Court case on it that Fair Share Housing Center litigated called Fair Share Housing Center versus Cherry Hill, that if a court approves a plan
based upon a certain set of circumstances and circumstances change, it could trigger an obligation or recalibrate the RDP.

We've done the most that you possibly can in that circumstance. We have created a bank for you so that you have a certain amount of leverage and a certain amount of peace.

Is it 100 percent, is it bullet proof? Is it possible that they could exceed that? Yes, it's possible. But you can't do better than, than what we've achieved here unless you find ways to produce more affordable housing and then eliminate the adjustment and that's where you don't want to go.

MALE SPEAKER: I just want to make clear that this is in fact a limited settlement not (inaudible) no matter how good a deal it is --

MR. SURENIAN: There's always risk. I'm not going to --

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MR. SURENIAN: What's that?

MALE SPEAKER: Represent a true settlement agreement.

MR. SURENIAN: It is a true settlement agreement and, and it's a settlement agreement that guards you, guards you against all the risks that you
have.

Part of the deal when you say $I$ don't have enough land to meet my obligation is you run a risk that there's a circumstance that changes.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Guys, guys. Just hold on. We went overtime.

Because there's many people, we'll come back to you. I promise you.

MALE SPEAKER: How long do $I$ have to wait before I come back?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Well, let's -- you have taken the whole time right now. Let's hear from the rest and then come back to you. I promise you.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening. First congratulations to our elected members.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Your name, please.

Just - -

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) Evans, Montvale, New Jersey, 45 years here (inaudible).

Congratulations to our elected members of Montvale, Councilman Arendacs and Councilwoman Curry making (inaudible) with wisdom and serving with courage, you and your families be blessed with this.
(Inaudible) regarding the resolution first I thank Councilman Weaver for his resolution and
majority of, allowing this additional time to discuss these matters with the developers (inaudible).

Third, my testimony tonight will be quite different. We had enough -- Governor Elect Murphy (inaudible) been elected because, as we know, his family foundation is a major contributor to Fair Share Housing so practically speaking (inaudible) direction, a little bit different had (inaudible) been elected.
(Inaudible) three different thoughts. Another one about the (inaudible) of these sites potentially provided for buildings (inaudible) and the last was that (inaudible) -- movie theaters. I turn your attention to (inaudible) street that confirm my prior statements about the demise, the lack of a need for a movie theater in Montvale. (Inaudible) continue millennials, movie theaters, the millennials have to develop (inaudible) even with the newly offered movie passes and subscription service for a Netflix cofounder (inaudible) service the 9.95 per month movie theaters (inaudible when possible.

No. 2, architecturally delightful, western contemporary, farmlike. I, I almost ran into may be ran over (inaudible) that excited, how very delightful the (inaudible) was in the Wegman's area. I only hope that he, what he did there will be the same in the new
development and I'm thinking of something farmlike. I'm sure that will create an architectural (inaudible) created passionate.
(Inaudible) Montvale taxpayers regarding these developments, regarding opposition (inaudible) with passion.

In response before I'm making a statement passion (inaudible) such a passion extends from that. Citizens here before then absolutely (inaudible) before tonight asked for or crossed (inaudible) analysis without, until tonight, any produced, that request which is a fact and that fact was ignored until tonight. In fact, $I$ wonder why we are so excited like getting something like $\$ 800,000$ and the County gets half of it and our roads are in deplorable condition as you well know.

Regarding passion in Americans' history (inaudible) until now the passion that came in the nation as well as (inaudible) outrage James Madison educated in (inaudible) and father of the United States Constitution was provoked (inaudible) his justifiable anger, his passion based upon fact, let him run for political office for passion (inaudible) is not purely emotional, it's springs (inaudible) known facts (inaudible) that. (Inaudible) has anyone
criticizes what they only see as passionate, disrespect or understand(inaudible) such a case. (Inaudible) it does not take a majority, irate minority (inaudible).

I close, may this culture (inaudible) fact and oppression. (Inaudible) have kind respect in this chamber so that such freedom we have fought for protected and handed over to, to our children and childrens' childrens. Thank you. MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you. Good evening. MR. PAULSEN: Brian Paulsen, 25 Eagle Ridge, Montvale.

A couple quick questions. First off, is this -are these proposals basically the same as what we heard at the last meeting? (Inaudible). MAYOR GHASSALI: Each one of them was different. The Mercedes one was different. The Hekemian one, the, the very first one that we voted no to, we were supposed to get the Glen View property and we would build it at our own expense and it would be for 69 units affordable housing. That would cost anywhere from 10 to 15 million dollars.

The follow-up plan was now is they, they will build it and it will be inclusionary so it will not all be just affordable housing.

MR. PAULSEN: Sorry. (Inaudible) just from the previous meeting that we were at.

MAYOR GHASSALI: The one we tabled?

MR. PAULSEN: The one that we tabled, yes.
MR. SURENIAN: I think that the answer to your question, if $I$ understand you correct, the numbers are the same, how many units. I think that there's language in the ordinances themselves that talk about some control over architecturals and visuals and things of that nature. And, you know, I think, as I indicated, I think if this goes through, that those discussions will continue and $I$ think you're going to get a, a pretty project for lack of a better term.

MR. PAULSEN: But these are basically
(inaudible) Hekemian project still basically rentals not (inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: Correct.
MR. PAULSEN: The next question, do we have a time line on these projects or because I'm wondering in terms of (inaudible). If, if we accept this tonight our taxes, we don't (inaudible) get 1.6 million tonight.

MAYOR GHASSALI: No.
MR. PAULSEN: What's the time line on
this?
MR. SURENIAN: I don't know about the revenue but in terms of when the development starts, there will be a requirement to adopt the ordinances.

In essence, what we're giving in this negotiation is rezoning. So we're going to have to adopt the ordinance. It's going to be a fairness hearing where the ordinance, where the agreements needs to be approved and then the developer is free to make a development application and that takes time. You know, it's going to take time to process those applications.

The public is going to have a lot of concern, how does this look, how is this going to be developed and once the developer gets approval then, then they're off. I think market forces may impact on how quickly things get constructed.

MR. PAULSEN: So is it fair to say, is they're saying (inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: Easily because we have to submit the plans to the Planning Board, the plans have to be approved, public hearings, easily a year, two years.

MR. PAULSEN: And then in terms of we talk about (inaudible) houses or families coming into

Montvale so they risk building the projects.
People mentioned the schools. Again just we have to spend 25 million or whatever the number is after these are all built, you know, because the kids are already going to be here and (inaudible) we're going to have to do some construction and building of our own as they're doing the building. So what's the plan on where all these revenues are coming from?

Are we going to increase the taxes then or do we have a surplus to cover all that potential?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Well, the school committee has to determine how many students are coming based on their formulas between the High School, between the $K$ through 8. So the school, the two superintendents (inaudible) the committees, our committee have to figure out how many students are actually coming in and what the needs are and what the kind of extension, if there is any and wherever they go. So that's a year, two years also until that's all figured out.

MR. PAULSEN: And what about other essential municipal services, police, fire (inaudible)?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Yeah. That's also we have to work on that.

MR. PAULSEN: May $I$-- yes and no, the plan is you build that as the builder is building not wait until he's done and then you start?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Don't forget, there were 4, 000 employees when Mercedes and $A \& P$ and Sony were there. Between deliveries, employees, over 4, 000 employees so our roads afford those number of people. The sewer system, we were looking to see if our sewer system need to change now because it was built for that many people.

So the systems are in place and as soon as we see the plans coming in, what kind of requirements they need, we have to plan for that.

Okay. Thank you very much.

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) two questions.

The projected revenue chart, it's for what period of time, every year?

COUNCILMAN LANE: It's annual.

MALE SPEAKER: Annual.

The second quick question, the 2025, that's a date which obviously someone (inaudible).

Can you explain basically what happens (inaudible) --

MR. SURENIAN: Yes. The way the Mount Laurel doctrine is set up is there are housing cycles.

We're now in the third housing cycle. And to counsel on, the legislature enacted the Fair Housing Act, created COAH, charged COAH with the responsibility of establishing the rules for each housing cycle.

So we're -- since COAH walked off the job, the Supreme Court in 2015 gave the job to the trial courts to do COAH's functions to figure out what the rules are. So they're establishing rules that will cover us for the third housing cycle that will expire in July of 2025 .

By that point, there will be the fourth housing cycle and we're going to have to deal with this again. And at that point there will be however much land there is, whatever vacant land adjustment you are entitled to today presumably you would be entitled to an even greater adjustment then as land gets developed.

And the other thing that $I$ would find to be surprising is that there would not be significant changes to the Mount Laurel doctrine by the year 2025 .

I mean this doctrine has been primed and ready for reset and it's hard to imagine that there won't come a point in time where, where the doctrine gets reexamined. We're not there now. I would have thought that it would have happened over the last
administration. It did not.

What happened was COAH walked off the job instead of creating rules that were favorable to municipalities.

Thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Anybody else? The gentleman in the back.

Good evening.

MALE SPEAKER: Good evening. I'm
(inaudible) I've been a resident for 49 years. I'm trying to get my head around the numbers. It seems that I'm guessing that there will be a 20 percent increase in business and I'm (inaudible) at 20 percent increase I'm (inaudible) facility taxes. It just doesn't make sense to me.

MALE SPEAKER: That, that 20 percent
increase is paying --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: I'm saying
additional --

MALE SPEAKER: Just off those properties?

MALE BOARD MEMBER: 70 percent of the
total tax.

MALE SPEAKER: Of the town?

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Of the -- yeah. MR. SURENIAN: No. No.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: No. Only as it relates to these five properties. The town's tax revenue is over 10 million so it's, it's -- yeah. MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Anybody else?
Okay. Going once --
MALE SPEAKER: Hi. (Inaudible) I just
have a few questions (inaudible) this conversation.
(Inaudible) the 44 acre units and (inaudible) based on the settlement of 30 acres (inaudible).

How does the work plan if we build on a much smaller scale (inaudible) property opened up and put (inaudible) units on there, how does that -- if we get 10 units (inaudible) COAH housing, how does that impact where we're at?
(Inaudible) how does additional, how does that impact, will that --

MR. SURENIAN: I'm not sure I'm following your question.

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

MR. SURENIAN: Let's, let's -- let me just
try to get the setting clear. So we're approved -- is that what you're positing.

MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. SURENIAN: We're approved and now
something happens?
MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. (Inaudible)
revisiting after five years something happens.

MR. SURENIAN: Let's deal with, let's deal with $I$ think the 584 issue is kind of a different issue.

So let's say that someone comes along whose site is developed now and, and so they don't count towards this Realistic Development Potential, comes along and they say $I$ want to develop my land, I want to redevelop my land.

Is that, is that what you're suggesting?
MALE SPEAKER: Correct. And saying here are our numbers. We have immunity. You say you can do (inaudible) per acre. (Inaudible) They say okay.

MR. SURENIAN: Okay. Let me play that out for you.

Okay. So the developer comes along and the developer says, you know, they're not going to come in at a low density. They're going to come in at a high -- the way it works is, is --

MALE SPEAKER: I'm trying to save some time. I'm saying (inaudible) to you, saying this is (inaudible) 50 units, 10 are affordable housing. How does that impact what we're doing because it doesn't
count for more for our bonus, does it allow us to strengthen our position (inaudible)?

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Are you saying would do more than what we're doing now?

MALE SPEAKER: So if you permit --
MR. SURENIAN: Let's say if you have a 10 acre site come on line, that's going to generate, you have to presume 8 units an acre, right, so to the extent you're permitting 8 units per acre you're, you have a shortfall, treading water at that point. (Inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Sure. So if it is 8 units an acre and you capture a 20 percent set aside, you're ahead of the game. You create more credits because of bonus points.

MALE SPEAKER: Assume we settle tonight and assuming everything gets (inaudible) how do you have full control in doing, saying we want to build it this way, build $X$ here and $Y$ here. That just keeps building up?

MR. SURENIAN: Yes.

MALE SPEAKER: So anyone else comes in (inaudible) listen so we play by the rules. We're (inaudible) here's what we have. Our numbers are even higher than what it is.

MAYOR GHASSALI: We have the surplus and we don't need you. That's what we say.

MR. SURENIAN: Any additional surplus creates any additional leverage for you, yes.

MAYOR GHASSALI: If someone comes on-line now after we sign this, if we sign this and say (inaudible) we don't need you. If we have surplus, if it's bigger land or multiple lands and it's a bigger surplus, I guess, Jeffrey, if it's above the surplus, if it's --

MR. SURENIAN: If it's above the surplus you get to decide.

So now a guy comes in, you have spent your surplus, the next guy comes in and says, okay, I want to develop 8 units an acre with a 20 percent set aside. The court looks at this. Is the site suitable for that, not suitable for that. The court agrees it's suitable. Now you have a choice. You can say, okay, I have an additional obligation. I choose to satisfy that obligation by rezoning your site or $I$ hate your project, I'm not going to rezone your site. I'm going to find another way to do it and then, and the agreement gives you the latitude to make that choice.

MALE SPEAKER: So saying no come back
(inaudible).
MR. SURENIAN: Well, no. Under that circumstance what you would do is you would, presumably you would have an argument that the court would have to decide, you know, does the site generate an RDP or not and if the court concludes that it does then you would have the right to decide how to satisfy it. If it counts towards your RDP, they don't get to come back in 20 years, they don't get to come back ever because that's your right.

The rule is, once you have an RDP you get to decide how to satisfy your RDP and that's what empowers you to tell that developer to pound, to pound salt. Okay.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Councilman.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: One way to look at it, Jack, at a 44 with a bank of 44 and a 20 percent inclusionary, that's 220 total units. Right.

At a density of 8 units to the acre you would have to go north of 27 and a half acres becoming available before you would use up that bank. Okay.

So a way to think of it is, let's say a bunch of you in this room in one neighborhood decide say we're going to knock down our houses, aggregate land into some acreage (inaudible) and then say we're going to
go and -- that group would have to accrue more than 27 and a half acres, if nothing else was happening in town, before we would have to grant any, any kind of building because we would say we have a bank of 44 units which covers 220 at a 20 percent set aside and 8 units to the acre.

And, Mike actually said there is more credits there because if you, if we go up in number, it kind of works up. So somebody would have to accumulate 27 and a half acres of land before you would have to eat that.

## FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: I just have to

 follow-up.You're not allowed to leave yet. Sorry.
One, your point on what Jeff talked about and what might be upset so I think the question was -- so we have the surplus, we have 44 in surplus. Somebody else wants to come and build 20 units in a place that would be, the town would say that's a good place to build 20 units and they're going to give us some affordable housing with that. The affordable housing that they give with that is going to go into the surplus.

## Correct?

MR. SURENIAN: Well, no. So the, what
would end up in the surplus, if you have 8 units an acre - -

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: I'm not using 8 units an acre.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Any, any acreage. Anything above 8 units an acre.

Whatever you got in the bank at 20 percent you are treading water. Instead of generating the RDP you are filling up the hole with whatever you're getting. The bonus cap is what generates the surplus. So if it were rental and you got 20 percent set-aside you, what you would get in setaside would really be bonus credits.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Good question. Good question.

Anybody else?
MALE BOARD MEMBER: You're excused.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Good evening.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Ferrara (inaudible). I live in Montvale. I just came from a ten hour meeting myself and I've been negotiating a deal for a year and a half (inaudible) motion and I'm fighting.

And $I$ have to continue to thank the Mayor and Council for their hard work on the negotiations for the past eight months but also express my
disappointment in our professionals for not fighting for us more.

I think that as the Mayor and Council you are all arguing the very best that you can. There's a lot of facts. There's a lot of information and you have to rely so heavily on the information that is given to you. And I'm not, you know -- I don't feel that this was done right from the git-go.

The attorney mentioned the mess that we're in or we have gotten ourselves into and, you know, the question that is on my mind is how did we get into this mess to begin with, how it started years ago.

I think everyone is doing their best with what they're left with and $I$ thank you so much for your hard work on this and $I$ really do believe that you guys are doing your absolute best for us.

In terms of where you go from here, I have not seen a settlement agreement. It hasn't been posted publicly. So I don't know how we're supposed to give you input on an agreement that we really haven't been able to read.

You mentioned Cherry Hill and the problems that they face there because their settlement agreements aren't properly drafted so there's exposure out there. Your job (inaudible) limit out exposure and tighten
that language until it is perfect so that we are not left exposed instead of saying there's some contingencies that $I$ can't negotiate (inaudible).

If, if you are aware of that it's you're job to not make that mistake so that we're protected and that's how we learn from case law, that's how we learn from mistakes of South Brunswick and Cherry Hill, usually wind up with something better but in this case it just sounds like concessions. It doesn't sound like we're getting much back. It wasn't the same agreement from a long time ago.

In any settlement agreement somebody has to give something up, I haven't heard them give something up. But, you know what, in their defense (inaudible) they were given these promises long ago and it doesn't sound like they had any reason now to want to settle. The judge and every judge --

MAYOR GHASSALI: Excuse me. Excuse me.
Sorry. There were no promises. Don't make accusations without any facts.

Sorry. There were no promises. Don't make accusations without any facts. No one had to give them any promises. There's nothing that's been promised to anybody.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Well, $I$ mean, with all
due respect, Mayor, these are my comments, right or wrong, (inaudible) heard to make a decision on but much like, you know, we can tell people to go scratch it, we have 44 surplus. That's not true and we all learned that right after last (inaudible) all of a sudden we have (inaudible) and there are contingencies that the public doesn't yet know that we're not really immune, that there's really still exposure until, again, every comment could -- I could go back and forth with this all day long. You know, 44 surplus doesn't protect anybody either 100 percent.

So, again, that was in my opinion, and $I$ want to be heard and, you know, $I$ 'm going to go down swinging on this. I think this is the biggest issue I imagine I'm going to see, you know, in the 30 years I plan to be here.

You know, the judge had said, which every judge says, and $I$ have to listen to it every single day in my career, that you have to settle, you have to settle, you have to settle. He comes and tells me what a terrible case I have. He comes and tells me what terrible case he has. That's what happened. This is very typical, this is very ordinary and the judge is telling us he has to settle but he's telling him, too.

But the question becomes, we just seem to give a lot more and we don't get anything in return.

So when the judge says everyone needs to settle, he doesn't just mean Montvale.

So, anyway, since we can't read the settlement agreement that everyone is prepared to decide on without the public knowing what it says, are there any conditions included in that settlement agreement about the plan or procedure from here assuming that any of this gets approved tonight?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Then it would go to the Planning Board once this is settled and introduced --

There is one more session after this where the ordinance will be introduced and voted on and the public will be heard again.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Are there any conditions in the settlement agreement about the process, procedure, time lines or anything that involved the Planning Board procedure (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: Yes. If the settlement gets approved, the next step is the adoption of the ordinance. After the adoption of the ordinance the developer can file a development application.

You can come when they -- when the ordinance is up for adoption you can be heard, you can come. When
the site plan application is filed, you can be heard.
You can come to the fairness hearing. You can be heard. You can come to the compliance hearing. You can be heard.

FEMALE SPEAKER: But that wasn't the question. Okay.

My question is, is there anything in the settlement agreement about the Planning Board procedure (inaudible) if this gets approved?

For example, are there -- you know, was there anything, is there a time line on this -- is there anything in the settlement agreement about what's going to happen from here with the Planning Board?

MAYOR GHASSALI: There is no time line commitment in the settlement agreement.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. Is there anything (inaudible) procedure with the Planning Board (inaudible)?

MAYOR GHASSALI: It's a typical application. They have to file -- there is nothing, there is nothing there.

FEMALE SPEAKER: There's nothing in the settlement agreement about the Planning Board?

MR. SURENIAN: Well, the agreement envisions the adoption of an ordinance and when an
ordinance is adopted the developer, like any other developer in any other situation needs to file a development application and the Planning Board process is in development application in accordance with the ordinance.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Why haven't the --
MAYOR GHASSALI: Sorry. Hold on. Hold on. Hold on. Hold on, please. Five minutes are over. We're going to hear some more and then if there's time left, you can come back again.

I know you have more questions on this.
Let's hear --
FEMALE SPEAKER: Can that question be
answered? Why isn't the settlement agreement available for review?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Because this was fluid until the last minute. Once it's voted on, it will be available right way.

FEMALE SPEAKER: So the public can't see it until after it's all over?

MAYOR GHASSALI: No. We went through it. The resolution is, is available. The attorney went through it before you came in, in the beginning and he explained what is in it.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Can you, can you bond for
school money without any public input?
MALE SPEAKER: No.
MAYOR GHASSALI: That's.
MALE SPEAKER: That has to be voted on by referendum. The school can't bond.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I mean isn't this
important information that the public needs to know so the public can say no, we don't want to put any monies into the schools. Figure it out.

MAYOR GHASSALI: If the public said that then that's what's going to happen. If the public said that we are going to make it happen.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Well, again, isn't that something we should know before (inaudible) 20 million dollars is --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: (Inaudible) what I'm saying is that that money is either going to go to (inaudible) or it's available, it's (inaudible)debt service if the bonding is voted on. I don't know the last time the budget was voted down.

FEMALE SPEAKER: For $\$ 20,000,000$ ?
MALE BOARD MEMBER: We, we voted a \$40,000,000 bond.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay.
FEMALE SPEAKER: I'm just (inaudible).

MALE BOARD MEMBER: The public should know that. I think that's (inaudible).

The public doesn't vote on Board of Education (inaudible) any longer. Back when there was, the 2 percent cap was implemented, districts had a choice whether they could go with the 2 percent tax or maintain the election for the school budget. So the overwhelming majority of the districts decided to implement the 2 percent cap knowing that they didn't have to have it approved by the public any longer.

So you don't any longer vote for the school budget. But if the school wanted to bond (inaudible) via referendum then the public would be asked to vote on it. And the school board can only bond money if the public wants to (inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
Anyone else? Coming once -- one more. Chris.

MALE SPEAKER: Chris (inaudible) 5 Mark
Lane.

This isn't a question but (inaudible). FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: I can't hear you, Chris.

MALE SPEAKER: Sorry. (Inaudible) The Hekemian Group redo the Parkway area there?

If the Parkway decided to take over that part of the site for, through eminent domain because they want to put an exit ramp or an entrance ramp (inaudible) I believe that's supposed (inaudible) everything is (inaudible) before shovels in the ground. What happens if it's (inaudible). What happens if (inaudible)?

MR. SURENIAN: Well, if the State decides to use its condemnation powers it has that right. I think that what you would find is it would be very expensive for the state to do that. But if they chose to do that then we would be back here by renegotiating the agreement. They would have whatever land they would have left. They would want to do whatever they want to do.

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: No. I mean this agreement envisions a development on a piece of land. If that land is cut in half or quarters or third or anything then we're going to be back to see --

Well, you know, both sides are going to have an interest in what they would want under that scenario.

So, you know, that, that would be another circumstance that we'd have to come back and, and deal with.

MALE SPEAKER: As far as the sale, that sale would be (inaudible) affordable housing or rentals(inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: The way the agreement is structured now is that the affordable units on the Mercedes site are rental and the affordable units on the Glen View site are either going to be for sale or for rent. They want the flexibility to go left or right and that was a provision we negotiated.

MALE SPEAKER: As far as the other 300 units (inaudible) as far as --

MR. SURENIAN: The marketing --
MALE SPEAKER: The sale or rental --

MR. SURENIAN: The project on the Mercedes site is going to be a rental project of which 15
percent would be affordable. Well, of which 15 percent of overall would be affordable.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
Miss Carey Evans.
FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) questions.
When you post those agreements on line so we can read them, I believe you also post (inaudible) based on hearings and can you do that?

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Yes.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Getting back to the
budget. When I looked at it, No. 1, regarding the 2 percent cap, I don't know but Governor Elect Murphy, who has he chosen for his transition team for education. I trust that the 2 percent cap (inaudible) so that we would be able to vote on a budget. I'm just advocating -- (inaudible) getting back to the budget again, I look at the, I look -- I have been in opposition with the County share for many years and fought for the consolidation of the Bergen County Sheriff and Bergen County Police Department that's supposed to save $\$ 17,000,000$ and there have been candidates who have run on a platform of doing away with County government.

And as I look at what our County Government does, I look at the last thing that they do for this, half of what we get in municipalities, the County parks, roads and bridges, our roads are deplorable and they just spent a huge amount of money on the golf course and $I$ don't know how many of them (inaudible) we have a number of the Bergen County Board of Chosen Freeholders who live in Montvale and $I$ want to know if you can or if you have worked with them to formally attend these meetings.

They are all Democrats, our governor elect is Democrat. I propose that we incorporate more

Democrats into what we want to do in this state.

For the most part, here in Montvale, unlike any other counties, unlike any other municipalities (inaudible) vote for Republicans and (inaudible).

So I mean looking at this being a political issue as well as a practical issue, as I said, my testimony would be different, it would not (inaudible) dealing with, they would be appointing judges who would work towards more fairness in many different ways which $I$ don't believe Governor Elect Murphy will be electing the types of judges that would understand the burden that the Fair Share Housing poses to us in suburbia.

So anything you can do as a, as a body, incorporate your democratic friends into, yes, you know, and there are many of us who have democratic friends into addressing these issues. It is political, it is social engineering. It doesn't seem right and (inaudible) we contend with a lot of things that (inaudible).

So $I$ can't see giving 15 percent to the county. I don't see where they really work towards helping us and where they get half and we get -- what are they going to do for us (inaudible) they deserve 50 percent of what we get from the (inaudible) share.

And I don't understand, $I$ don't intend to be silent about it with you, but I tend to think that what the councils have to do a far better job integrating themselves, immersing themselves in politics above the town because it does matter.

Working with -- somebody asked me if, you know, I was going to be working with Governor Elect Murphy on education. He doesn't need me now. I'm not needed now. (Inaudible)so there are people (inaudible) listen to. I just encourage Democrats in this room to speak to Governor Elect Murphy about this so he knows our concerns. And I look forward to (inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: The County, the County has been very cooperative with us. They pay to clean the (inaudible) Park. They continue to do some work at (inaudible) Park, very expensive work. They'll be getting a half million dollars and the County Executive is very pleased to see that money but in return we want some grants, we want applied to some of the grants for county roads so for the county roads in the Borough and for some of the things that we need like the Magnolia Bridge. We want to fix that. That's a County (inaudible).

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) don't you agree?

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Yeah. They move very slow. We move very slow.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I mean we can all
(inaudible).
MAYOR GHASSALI: Noted.
FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) situation and participate in any (inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: Noted. Thank you. Thank you.

Anybody else?
MALE SPEAKER: Real quick. (Inaudible) the point we were discussing, I'm not trying to be unfair, what is that thing $I$ just want to make sure everybody is clear on, that this is a settlement agreement but as we all talking about (inaudible). With some change in circumstances that may occur (inaudible) doing the home in 2025. Okay.

The true settlement agreement would have the opposite (inaudible). This doesn't happen and I understand why but can we do -- (inaudible) make modifications but is there any way where we make a few changes now rather than seven years from now and to include us and revisit us in 2025 versus rather than having to reopen it again and allow (inaudible) are (inaudible).

MR. SURENIAN: I think the best way to answer your question is everything is context. You're not coming to this where there's not a well-established body of law. You're coming to this where there's an extremely well-established body of law and you have to do your best within that context or, or try to change the law. And if you try to change the law, the odds of changing the law is you're going to spend a fortune and it's a very low probability.

So -- no. No. No. No. No. I have to finish because you're making all these loaded statements. And I'm not saying you're doing it deliberately but you're doing it because you're not recognizing what the context is and you're not recognizing the benefits of this settlement.

The context is if, if you have an obligation, you have two choices, you satisfy that obligation or you get an adjustment. There's no way we can satisfy an obligation of 550 which is what our expert says it is. So we're seeking an adjustment.

There's no choice. They have to seek an adjustment. They don't have enough land to meet their obligation of, of 550 .

So the context, the starting point is not what
we want it to be. The starting point is we have an obligation. It's adjusted. And there's an adjusted obligation and there's an unmet need obligation.

So how do you do your best within this context? What we have done is something that is unusual, extremely unusual. Fair Share Housing Center never agreed to this before. We generated a surplus and we have the provision that empowers us to take that surplus and use it as a hedge against developers that are trying to leverage you.

Do we still have some potential risk over and above that, that cushion? Yes. But that's a risk that we began with unless we were willing to say, you know what, we're going to satisfy our obligation which we couldn't say.

MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. (Inaudible) but now you have a settlement agreement. We don't --

MALE BOARD MEMBER: So just to be clear, we can't contractually say, you know, supreme Court, Cherry Hill doesn't apply. Cherry Hill is the Supreme Court interpreting your constitutional obligation. We can't contract that away. There's no way around that.

So there are three things --
MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MALE BOARD MEMBER: Right. So there are
three things we can do to protect ourselves against future redevelopment and there are only three things which we did. We can generate a surplus which we did. We can have widespread overlay zoning at densities we are comfortable with which we did and we can include risky sites as part of that 181 unit RDP which we did. There's no other way to, to mitigate against future effects of redevelopment.

You're an attractive community with a high number, with high redevelopment potential.

MALE SPEAKER: And I get that. I just want to make sure everybody here, through counsel, understands that this is not lock, stock and barrel.

How that's exactly -- now matter how you dress it up that's --

MR. SURENIAN: But you're suggesting that it is something less than it is. It is a settlement that resolves everything as best you can given the framework.

MALE SPEAKER: Unless there's a substantial change in --

MR. SURENIAN: That's part of the reality.

MALE SPEAKER: That's because
circumstances (inaudible).
MR. SURENIAN: Yes. Yes. And any
circumstance where a municipality says I don't have enough land to satisfy my obligation they have an unmet need that they have to deal with in the absence of changing 20 years of what COAH has done since 1994 when they adopted regs on the unmet need.

MALE SPEAKER: The 2025 date, when do we have to start learning that there's time limits, (inaudible) July 2025. MR. SURENIAN: Well, I'm presuming that between now and that date there's going to either be, the Council on Affordable Housing is either going to be reconstituted and they're going to tell us what the rules are or they're not going to be reconstituted to tell us what the rules are and then you'll have trial judges telling us what the rules are.

In seven years there's a lot that can happen. If nothing changes then the courts that are deciding what your obligations are today, will decide what your obligations are for 2025.

MALE SPEAKER: So you get a new quota. So you get your quota right, nothing has changed (inaudible) completely (inaudible) you do any big, rotate out RDP, you have some changes circumstances. You are still going to have 44 units surplus if nothing changes. (Inaudible).

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody else?
Going once, going twice.
Motion to close the meeting to the public.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: Second.
MAYOR GHASSALI: So move.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Second.
MAYOR GHASSALI: All in favor say aye.
(Aye)
MAYOR GHASSALI: Now we'll hear from the Council. And then we'll do it for the resolutions and take a break after that.

We'll start with Council President, Councilwoman Rose Curry.

COUNCILWOMAN CURRY: Thank you, Mayor. I have nothing to say at this time.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
Councilwoman Gloeggler.
COUNCILWOMAN GLOEGGLER: Okay. I want to
thank you all for coming out tonight. I wish that this was about saying no to 350 units and 185 units so that we could get less but this would be about saying no to 350 units to get 600 or 700 units.

With the risk of losing our immunity and fighting against high density projects all over town.

I couldn't agree to five stories. I wanted three stories. But we got it down to four stories.

And I don't love it. I don't even like it. But I will agree to it.

And the reason $I$ would agree to it is because we will be getting our agreement with Fair Share Housing. And then we can meet our housing obligation and we can lock in our numbers till 2025.

And $I$ worked very hard with the COAH Committee and with the Court Appointed Master and with all of our lawyers to get to this place where we have an agreement. We've pushed it as far as we can. We're at that place and it's time to settle.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
Councilman Lane.
COUNCILMAN LANE: I think Councilwoman Gloeggler said a lot of the way I felt about it.

I, $I$ do feel we have retained an expert in, in the, in the field of Fair Share Housing. And Mr. Surenian is associated with Mr. Edwards. I feel every, everyone who has talked to us about what we should do has recommended the settlement course. None of this comes as a surprise.

You have come to these meetings. You have heard what it says.

I have heard one comment on the politicization on this and I'm a Republican and I'm not particularly proud of my party, what it's done here or lack thereof.

We have had a governorship for eight years. They did nothing. They got rid of COAH and left us with this mess.

So I'm going, I'm going to basically say we have plenty of blame to go around.

Now going forward, I will get really political.
Ask Josh Gottheimer how he feels about this. It may be a federal issue but he should have an opinion on this. This should be something he's looking at. He should have an opinion on whether this is the right kind of public policy because he'll sure opine on anything he is asked.

Ask Governor Murphy, ask Holly Schepisi and Jerry Cardinale and Bob Auth. All of them have had a role to play in this and candidly they haven't done enough.

And, and $I$ know people, they -- this is a grave problem $I$ haven't seen any tangible action on from the political side of the house. The only way to address this is probably through Constitutional amendment. Okay. It is not -- it is a decision of the supreme

Court.
We are left as we are in so many cases as a locality trying to figure out what to do. I do think that it doesn't sound like a lot but 44 -- a bank of 44 which translates into 220 units which translates into 27 and a half acres, that would have to come around before we would have to do anything is significant.

Because what $I$ don't think was maybe clear, not through any fault of Mr. Surenian, we did take into account that risk properties, that is part of this process. We have looked at the town.

Can something happen that we're not anticipating? Yes. But properties that we think are at risk of, of switching over have been factored into our RDP.

So I think this, this has been a very long and tortuous process. I really, I really think that regardless of whether you're Republican, Democrat or Independent, please be engaged and direct it to Trenton. Get them to do something. And maybe not Washington but at least from the perspective of public policy.

With that said, I'm supporting this as I have said it through this two meetings.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you, Councilman Arendacs.

COUNCILMAN ARENDACS: Thank you, Mayor.
Now this is about being a concerned resident of Montvale and to do what $I$ believe is right for the town.

I have a responsibility as a public official backed by the residents, the voice of the people.

Progress has been, $I$ believe, for these past several months. I believe that we are getting closer to a better settlement. However, the right deal for Montvale $I$ don't believe is still there. We're very close but we're still not there.

I am comfortable with setting this as a -actually, I'm not comfortable saying this as a precedence for the future. So looking ahead in 2025, I feel it would be worse starting it at these unrealistic numbers so builders can take advantage of us.

We have to work with these developers through their projects. I was hoping they could work with us with the planning, the density, the rentals, maybe a certain percent of owner apartments.

In New Jersey, State of New Jersey, Trenton found a way that gives these developers, builders way
too much power for their own personal and financial gain with what they put on the infrastructures, schools, public safety and way of life in jeopardy.

This is legal. This is legal, yeah, sure, but it should be illegal.

At 3:15, 5:00 today, just a few hours ago, I received revised settlements. This stuff takes time to review the documents. This isn't just something, you know, we could look at within hours, minutes. This all happened too fast, appears to be a rushed deal.

I know we lose immunity November 30 th. However, there's no reason to believe that the courts won't extend our immunity any further since we have negotiated immunity $I$ believe in good faith thus far.

I mean take a look at Hornrock's site, Park Ridge, didn't accept 15 units per acre in the beginning. We're settling 185 units on 7 acre averaging 26.4 units per acre.

Looking forward, if these deals are approved, I will make every effort advocating responsible development and aggressive negotiation with developers.

Also being part of the newly formed Mayor's Advisory Group along with residents, professionals,
have a wealth of knowledge in this field so we will not be in this situation again.

I do want to commend each and every resident that took part in coming to these meetings in this legal process and to the Mayor, again Mayor and Council, putting this, this amount of time and energy into Montvale over their own personal life and family.

This, of course, is a very difficult decision.
As an invested resident, taxpayer and your councilman, $I$ will not support any of these, all of these settlements since it is not in the best interests of this town.

That's what $I$ have to say.
Thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Councilman Koelling. COUNCILMAN KOELLING: A very brief
comment. I think it's -- we have all heard the experts. We have rushed out a lot of the information, I wouldn't say all the information. We have heard from the pros and the cons, the fors and against and I think it's time to settle this.

And I agree, I think everybody knows which way I'm going to vote and $I$ intend to support this and continue on with our strategy so we're in a better, stronger position in the next round.

Thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
Councilman Weaver.
COUNCILMAN WEAVER: Thank you, Mayor.
I think I'm, I'm numb. I think I'm sick to my stomach. I'm depressed and I think it's disgusting and all of this development is happening in the name of affordable housing when the people who need it are only getting 15 percent.

I mean I'm not sure what $I$ can say that $I$ haven't already said. And, and I apologize to the residents but $I$ 'm not in favor of this project.

Thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. At this point
we'll go through each of the resolutions. We'll start with the A \& P.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: Just as a procedural matter, Councilman Weaver made a motion to table this issue at the meeting on the 26 th.

So at this time $I$ think you should entertain a motion to remove the issue from the table to allow the votes to proceed.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. Motion to remove to allow us to proceed.

MALE BOARD MEMBER: So move.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Second.

FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Second. MAYOR GHASSALI: Roll call, please. THE CLERK: Council Member Arendacs. COUNCILMAN ARENDACS: Yes. THE CLERK: Council Member Curry. COUNCILWOMAN CURRY: Yes. THE CLERK: Council Member Gloeggler. COUNCILWOMAN GLOEGGLER: Yes. THE CLERK: Council Member Koelling. COUNCILMAN KOELLING: Yes. THE CLERK: Council Member Lane. COUNCILMAN LANE: Yes. THE CLERK: Council Member Weaver. COUNCILMAN WEAVER: No. MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. It passes. MALE BOARD MEMBER: We're good to go. MAYOR GHASSALI: Resolutions for the A \& $P$ property 216-2017.

The resolution approving the settlement agreement was expected to be here for Two Paragon Drive, LLC to partially resolve the role of affordable housing.

Motion.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: So move.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Second.
FEMALE BOARD MEMBER: Second.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Discussion?
Roll call, please.
THE CLERK: Council Member Arendacs.
COUNCILMAN ARENDACS: Yes.
THE CLERK: Council Member Curry.
COUNCILWOMAN CURRY: Yes.
THE CLERK: Council Member Gloeggler. COUNCILWOMAN GLOEGGLER: Yes.

THE CLERK: Council Member Koelling. COUNCILMAN KOELLING: Yes.

THE CLERK: Council Member Lane.
COUNCILMAN LANE: Yes.
THE CLERK: Council Member Weaver.
COUNCILMAN WEAVER: That's for A \& $P$,
correct?
THE CLERK: Yes.
COUNCILMAN WEAVER: Yes.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. That passes.
The next will be the Mercedes-Benz Hekemian
property Resolution No. 214-2017, resolution approving the settlement agreement with intervenor, with the $S$. Hekemian Group, LLC to partially resolve the Borough's affordable housing declaratory judgment action.

Motion.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: So move.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Second?
MALE BOARD MEMBER: Second.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Discussion?
Roll call, please.
THE CLERK: Council Member Arendacs.
COUNCILMAN ARENDACS: No.
THE CLERK: Council Member Curry.
COUNCILWOMAN CURRY: Mayor, I would like
to voice my vote with this statement, that $I$ do
believe that the Mercedes-Benz property is going to be a good thing for Montvale. And $I$ do believe that the developer will do his best to make it the jewel in his crown as $I$ had said from the beginning.

I will not get political about this but I am doing this, $I$ am voting this for the benefit of Montvale because $I$ do have the best interests of the residents of Montvale at heart.

And that is my vote which is going to be yes.
Thank you.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you.
THE CLERK: Council Member Gloeggler.
COUNCILWOMAN GLOEGGLER: Yes.
THE CLERK: Council Member Koelling.

COUNCILMAN KOELLING: Yes.
THE CLERK: Council Member Lane. COUNCILMAN LANE: Yes.

THE CLERK: Council Member Weaver. COUNCILMAN WEAVER: No. MAYOR GHASSALI: That passes.

Next is the Hornrock property for Sony, Resolution No. 215-2017, resolution approving the settlement agreement with intervenor Hornrock Property, LLC, NPR, LLC, in connection with the affordable housing declaratory judgment action authorizing a request to the trial court to hear a fairness hearing concerning the settlement agreement.

A motion.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: So amove. MAYOR GHASSALI: Second. MALE BOARD MEMBER: Second. MAYOR GHASSALI: Discussion?

Roll call, please.
THE CLERK: Council Member Arendacs. COUNCILMAN ARENDACS: No.

THE CLERK: Council Member Curry. COUNCILWOMAN CURRY: Yes.

Mayor, and my statement is, with my vote is that this, although it's not a perfect situation it is,
once again, to protect the town of Montvale, the future control over the development.

My vote is yes.
THE CLERK: Council Member Gloeggler. COUNCILWOMAN GLOEGGLER: Yes. THE CLERK: Council Member Koelling. COUNCILMAN KOELLING: Yes. THE CLERK: Council Member Lane. COUNCILMAN LANE: Yes. THE CLERK: Council Member Weaver. COUNCILMAN WEAVER: No. THE CLERK: The vote carries, Mayor. MAYOR GHASSALI: Carries.

The last one is the Fair Share agreement that encompasses all of these resolutions, No. 217-2017, a resolution approving the settlement agreement with Fair Share Housing Center to resolve the Borough's affordable housing declaratory judgment action.

A motion.

```
MALE BOARD MEMBER: So move.
```

MAYOR GHASSALI: Second.
MALE BOARD MEMBER: Second.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Discussion?
Roll call, please.
THE CLERK: Council Member Arendacs.

COUNCILMAN ARENDACS: No.
THE CLERK: Council Member Curry. COUNCILWOMAN CURRY: Yes.

THE CLERK: Council Member Gloeggler.
COUNCILWOMAN GLOEGGLER: Yes.
THE CLERK: Council Member Koelling.
COUNCILMAN KOELLING: Yes.

THE CLERK: Council Member Lane.
COUNCILMAN LANE: Yes.
THE CLERK: Council Member Weaver.
COUNCILMAN WEAVER: I just want to preface my vote by saying that $I$ appreciate President Curry's comments.

And I believe, as a council, we need to, we need to figure out a way to work together, not to say that we haven't. But it's going to be all the more important now.

And my vote is no.
MAYOR GHASSALI: And that carries.
THE CLERK: That carries.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you very much for all these.

Thank you, Jeff and Mike, Darlene and the amazing group for helping us on this.

We'll take a five minute break.
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| quarter [1] - 18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recommended }[1] \text { - } \\ & 72: 22 \end{aligned}$ | Repose [2]-5:9, 5:10 represent [5] - 3:17, | restaurant [1]-25:4 | $63: 12$ |
| quarters [1]-61:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reconstituted }[2] \text { - } \\ & 70: 12,70: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 3:20, 20:24, 29:7, | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { result }[7]-5: 8,14: 17, \\ 15: 6,15: 14,16: 7, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { runs }[2]-29: 12,34: 22 \\ & \text { rushed }[2]-76: 10, \\ & 77: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| $23: 6,34: 12,39: 13$ | recording [1] - 86:3 <br> redevelop [1] - 47:11 | representing [1] -$25: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { retained }[1]-72: 18 \\ & \text { return }[2]-56: 2,65: 19 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 15, 46:8, 58:11 |  |  |  |  |
| 20,2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { redevelopment }[10] \text { - } \\ 12: 22,12: 24,13: 3, \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { revenue }[13]-8: 1, \\ & 16: 18,17: 23,17: 25, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { quick }[3]-39: 13, \\ 43: 20,66: 11 \end{gathered}$ | 12:22, 12:24, 13:3, 14:15, 15:11, 34:16, 69:2, 69:8, 69:10 | represents [1] - 11:20 <br> Republican [2]-73:2, | 18:3, 18:18, 21:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { safety }[1]-76: 3 \\ & \text { sale }[5]-7: 17,62: 1, \\ & 62: 2,62: 7,62: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| quickly [3] - 25 |  | Republicans [1] - 64:4 request ${ }_{[2]}-38: 12$, | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 25,22: 22,41: 3, \\ & 43: 16,46: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| - | redo [1] - 60:25 |  |  |  |
| quite [1]-37:3 | reduce [1] - 26:17 | $82: 12$ | revenues [1] - 42:8 | salt [1] - 50:14 <br> Santa [1] - 9:13 <br> satisfy [15] - 4:24, 6:6, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { quota }[3]-33: 16 \\ 70: 20,70: 21 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reduces }[2]-19: 6, \\ & 20: 19 \\ & \text { reducing }[1]-19: 4 \\ & \text { reduction }[1]-13: 25 \end{aligned}$ | required [1] - 12:22 <br> requirement [1]-41:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { review [2]-58:15, } \\ & 76: 8 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  | revised [1] - 76:7 | 8:9, 8:10, 14:6, |
| R |  | $43: 12$ |  | 9:20, 50:7, 50:12, |
| radically [2]-8:24 | $44: 24$ | reset [1] - 44:22 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:18, 67:19, 68:14, } \\ & 70: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:14 } \\ & \text { raise }[1]-20: \end{aligned}$ | reexamines [1] - 30:5 referendum [2]-59:5, | $\begin{gathered} \text { resident }[4]-45: 10 \\ 75: 4,77: 3,77: 9 \end{gathered}$ | revisiting [2]-5:16, 47:3 | save [2] - 47:22, 63:11 |
| 18 | - | residential [8]-7:21, | rezone [1] - 49:21 | save [2]-47:22, 63:11 <br> scale [1] - 46:12 |
| ramp [2] - 61:3 | rred ${ }_{[1]}-15: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 25,8: 2,8: 4,10: 10, \\ & 22: 8,25: 10,25: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rezoning }[2]-41: 6 \text {, } \\ & 49: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { scenario }[3]-32: 14, \\ & 34: 2,61: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| ran [2]-37:22, 37 |  |  |  |  |




| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:3 } \\ & \text { waiting }[1]-24: 17 \\ & \text { walk }[1]-17: 20 \\ & \text { walked }[2]-44: 5,45: 2 \\ & \text { wants }[3]-28: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 8,66: 22,70: 4, \\ & 70: 16,73: 5 \\ & \text { yield }[1]-32: 20 \\ & \text { yourself }[2]-5: 11, \\ & 10: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Washington [1] 74:22 | Z |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { water }[2]-48: 10,52: 8 \\ & \text { ways }[2]-35: 11, \\ & 64: 10 \\ & \text { wealth }[1]-77: 1 \\ & \text { WEAVER }[8]-1: 13, \\ & 78: 4,79: 15,80: 16, \\ & 80: 19,82: 5,83: 11, \\ & 84: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { zone }[2]-15: 8,31: 1 \\ & \text { Zone }[1]-16: 3 \\ & \text { zones }[3]-15: 20, \\ & \text { 15:24, 25:11 } \\ & \text { zoning }[6]-4: 7, \\ & \text { 14:20, 15:16, 15:18, } \\ & \text { 25:9, } 69: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Weaver [8] - 36:25, } \\ & 78: 3,78: 18,79: 14, \\ & 80: 15,82: 4,83: 10, \\ & 84: 10 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ```Wegman's [2] - 17:19, 37:24 weighted [1] - 24:25 well-established [2] - 67:4, 67:5 west \([1]-16: 1\) western [1] - 37:21 whole [1]-36:12 widespread [1] - 69:4 willing [1] - 68:13 willy [1] - 20:9 willy-nilly [1]-20:9 wind [1] - \(54: 8\) wisdom [1] - 36:22 wish [2] - 27:18, 71:20 wonder [1] - 38:13 wondering [1] - 40:21 word [1] - 10:25 words [1] - 23:25 works [2]-47:21, 51:9 world [1] - 24:23 worry [1] - 34:15 worse [2] - 32:14, 75:17 written [1] - 34:4``` |  |
| X |  |
| XI00991 [1] - 86:18 |  |
| Y |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { year }[9]-5: 13,17: 23, \\ 20: 25,30: 4,41: 22, \\ 42: 19,43: 17,44: 20, \\ 52: 21 \\ \text { years }[15]-23: 14, \\ 32: 15,36: 19,41: 23, \\ 42: 19,45: 10,47: 3, \\ 50: 9,53: 12,55: 15, \end{gathered}$ |  |

