



State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
101 SOUTH BROAD STREET
PO Box 800
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0800
(609) 292-6420

CHRIS CHRISTIE
Governor

KIM GUADAGNO
Lt. Governor

CHARLES A. RICHMAN
Commissioner

June 14, 2017

Frank Haines
 Legislative Budget and Finance Officer
 Office of Legislative Services
 State House Annex
 PO Box 068
 Trenton, NJ 08625-0068

Dear Mr. Haines:

This letter is written in response to Assemblyman Schaefer's correspondence to me dated May 5, 2017. In follow-up to my testimony before the Assembly Budget Committee, I am submitting this written response to questions raised by committee members.

Assemblyman Burzichelli

- During the committee's discussion of the Main Street Program, you indicated that the State no longer funds municipal participation in the "National Main Street Activity." What is the cost of municipal participation in this initiative?

The annual cost to a municipality to participate is \$350.

- Please provide a comparison of State funds provided to Atlantic City, Newark City, and Penns Grove Borough through State Aid and other financial assistance.

In FY 2017, the following State Aid was provided to Atlantic City, Newark City and Penns Grove Borough, respectively:

State Aid	Atlantic City	Newark City	Penns Grove Borough
Energy Tax Receipts	6,260,714	67,697,098	847,963
Consolidated Municipal Property Tax Relief	20,000,000	33,593,019	986,891
Transitional Aid	26,200,000	9,800,000	358,000
Total	52,460,714	111,090,117	2,192,854



Assemblyman Mukherji

- During the Committee’s discussion of the department’s efforts to end homelessness among military veterans, you indicated that data from the most recent count of homeless persons is not yet available. When does the department anticipate that these data will be available? Please provide the most recent available data on the number of homeless veterans in New Jersey.

The annual report on the Point in Time Count of the Homeless for the State of New Jersey is prepared by Monarch Housing Associates. DCA has not yet been informed when the 2017 data will be available; last year the 2016 Point in Time Count report was issued in late June 2016.

According to the 2016 Point in Time Count report, there were 559 homeless veterans statewide on the night of the Count.

Additional Questions

- For each of the last five concluded fiscal years what was the number of SRAP vouchers, available and awarded to New Jersey households?

Fiscal Year	# of Vouchers	
	Available	Distributed
2012	4,453	4,243
2013	4,592	4,048
2014	4,408	4,048
2015	4,344	3,867
2016	4,292	3,906

- What were the funding sources for SRAP in each of those five years?

Fiscal Year	Grant-in-aid Approp	Realty Transfer Tax Revenue	HMFA	TOTAL
2012	-	32,860	9,000	41,860
2013	21,000	22,161	-	43,161
2014	18,500	22,932	-	41,432
2015	18,500	22,336	-	40,836
2016	18,500	21,843	-	40,343

(in 000s)

- Does the department have a plan for new or expanded housing assistance programs to meet the affordable housing needs of the hundreds of thousands of state residents that currently lack affordable housing?

The Department continues to maximize the use of Federal and State resources to provide for the construction and rehabilitation of affordable housing. Over the past 7 years more than 26,000 new units of affordable housing have been constructed.

- It has been publicly stated that HUD may be reducing or cutting the utility assistance dollars in its budget, along with other cuts. Has the State any alternative provisions for this basic need? Is there any expectation of finding resources elsewhere to plug anticipated holes?

The impact of federal funding changes cannot be calculated until Congress enacts a Federal Budget.

- How would the elimination of the CDBG Program affect the State’s ability to fund local community development projects? What resource are available to the State to provide these services if the CDBG Program is eliminated?

The impact of federal funding changes cannot be calculated until Congress enacts a Federal Budget.

- Counties are required to comply with the lower tax levy cap determined under two calculations, the older 1977 cap calculation and the newer 2010 cap calculation. Frequently the older cap is more prohibitive than the newer cap. Do you think it is reasonable to require multiple county cap calculations? Do you think that two cap calculations cause public confusion about county budgeting and property taxes? Does the department believe there is a problem or fairness issue with cap banking in a county where one law’s calculation is the binding limit in one year and the other law’s calculation is binding I the next year?

Currently, two levy caps are calculated for counties -- one calculation is pursuant to the 1977 law and one calculation is pursuant to the 2010 law. Counties are required to apply the most restrictive calculation, which means that a county’s permitted levy cap increase is the lesser of the 1977 calculation or the 2010 calculation. The table below indicates the number of counties that were required to apply each of the respective levy cap calculations for the past five years:

Year	1977 Cap	2010 Cap
2012	19	2
2013	17	4
2014	20	1
2015	20	1
2016	21	0

Should the Committee have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,



Charles A. Richman
Commissioner

- C: Joyce Paul, Department of Community Affairs, Chief of Staff
- Gary S. Schaer, Assembly Budget Committee, Chairman
- David Ridolfino, Office of Management and Budget
- Aaron Binder, Assembly Democratic Office
- Christopher Hughes, Assembly Republican Office
- Scott A. Brodsky, Office of Legislative Services