1	JOINT HEARING BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS AND					
2	GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND					
3	STANDING COMMITTEE ON HOUSING, CONSTRUCTION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT					
4						
5	PUBLIC HEARING:					
6	TO EXAMINE HOW CODE ENFORCEMENT ACROSS NEW YORK STATE CAN BE ENHANCED OR ASSISTED					
7	STATE CAN BE ENHANCED OR ASSISTED					
8	Newburgh Armory Unity Center					
9	321 South William Street Newburgh, New York					
10	Date: May 23, 2019					
11	Time: 9:30 a.m.					
12						
13	PRESIDING:					
14	Senator James Skoufis, Chair NYS Senate Standing Committee on					
15	Investigations and Government Operations					
16	Senator Brian Kavanagh, Chair NYS Senate Standing Committee on					
17	Housing, Construction, and Community Development					
18						
19	PRESENT:					
20	Senator Allesandra Biaggi					
21	Senator Neil D. Breslin					
22	Senator David Carlucci					
23	Senator Liz Krueger					
24	Senator Zellnor Myrie					
25	Senator Julia Salazar					

			2
1	SPEAKERS:	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2	Jonathan Jacobson	11	28
3	Assembly Member Ken Zebrowski	11	20
4	Assembly Member New York State Assembly		
5	Robert Magee	47	50
6	Corporation Counsel City of Albany	1 /	30
7	Laura Felts	71	79
8	Homeless Prevention Program Coordinator United Tenants of Albany	/ 1	79
9	Condon Wasan	0.5	102
10	Gordon Wren Retired Firefighter Citizens United to Protect	85	102
11	Our Neighborhoods Representative		
12	Michael Acevedo President	124	132
13	Rafael Rivera Spokesperson		
14	Orange County Landlord Association		
15	Joseph Donat City Manager	160	166
16	Jeremy Kaufman Assistant Corporation Counsel		
17	Michelle Kelson Corporation Counsel		
18 19	Bill Horton Assistant Fire Chief Alexandra Church		
	City Planner		
20	City of Newburgh		
21	Catherine Johnson Southern Deputy Commissioner of Health	202	212
22	Rockland County Department of Health Also, Rockland Codes Initiative		
23	,		
24			
25			

2
3
_

			3
1	SPEAKERS (Continued):	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2			~
3	Michael Specht Town Supervisor Dennis Lynch	224	232
4	Town Attorney Town of Ramapo		
5	Richard Thomas	266	277
6	City Mayor Chantelle Okarter	200	277
7	Commissioner of Planning Also, Executive Director,		
8	Urban Renewal Agency Theodore W. Beale		
9	Fire Commissioner Omondi Odera		
10	Housing Inspector Kim Knotts		
11	Housing Inspector City of Mount Vernon		
12	John Addario	295	305
13	Director, Division of Building Standards and Codes		
14	Matthew Fernandez Konigsberg Special Counsel for Ethics Risk		
15	and Compliance Department of State		
16	F.J. Spinelli	339	363
17	Deputy Fire Chief, Hartsdale Fire District		
18	Jerry DeLuca Director of Program and Outreach		
19	Joe Sauerwein Chair, Standards and Codes Committee		
20	Travis Dawley President, NYS Fire Marshals and		
21	Inspectors Association FASNY		
22			
23			
24			
25			

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Hey, good morning, everyone.

I want to welcome you all to this joint hearing between the Senate Investigation and Government Operations Committee, which I'm fortunate enough to chair, alongside Senator Kavanagh, my colleague who chairs the Senate's Housing Committee.

Welcome to "housing day" in the city of Newburgh.

We have this hearing, and then later this afternoon, Senator Kavanagh will be chairing a hearing on the housing and rent-control issues that we're debating at the end of session here in Albany.

I want to welcome my other colleagues, and thank them for being here. I know we'll be joined by a couple of others as we proceed.

To my right, I have Senator Zellnor Myrie from Brooklyn, Senator Allesandra Biaggi from Westchester and The Bronx, and to my left -- or, to Senator Kavanagh's left, we have Senator David Carlucci from Rockland County and part of Westchester as well.

This is the first code-enforcement hearing that I'm aware of ever taking place out of the Legislature.

This is an important issue.

It's timely, given the conversations that are taking place up in Albany.

And, you know, a lot of people view code enforcement as some esoteric issue that, quite frankly, is more an annoyance for people who have to deal with it than anything else.

But as we've seen here in the city of

Newburgh, in the town of Ramapo, even just in

today's "Journal News," where two girls almost

drowned because of a violation at a house where

there was no proper secured gates leading into a

pool, this can be a matter of life and death.

And so we want to get this right.

We've been investigating this issue in four municipalities, in Ramapo, Newburgh, the city of Albany, and Mount Vernon, for the past four months.

Our team has been gathering findings.

We've been speaking with all sorts of officials, elected officials and otherwise; stakeholders, such as FASNY, firefighters, who will be testifying later today; and gathering all sorts of information: what's working, what's not working; and what we as a state should be doing better, what municipalities, quite frankly, should be doing

better.

And -- and, look, you know, there's been a lot of interest throughout the state in what we're looking at here.

We've received calls, our team, from county executives throughout the state, actually asking to be investigated because they feel this is such an issue in their county.

But I think that what we find in the report that we issue, which should be forthcoming shortly, will be able to be applied throughout the state, not just in these four municipalities that we're looking at.

And so we have a -- a -- a robust list of witnesses who are going to be providing testimony today. I want to thank all of them in advance.

And before we get to our first two witnesses,

I want to turn it over to my co-chair today,

Senator Kavanagh.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Senator Skoufis.

And thank you all for being here.

And thanks to the other members of the Senate, the respective committees that are co-chairing this hearing today.

This is the fourth hearing this month of the Housing Committee.

We have one additional hearing, as has been mentioned, later today, right here in this room in Newburgh, beginning at 2:30.

And then a final hearing on the other major topic we've been focusing on this month, which is the rent-regulation laws and various tenant protections, and that will be in Greenburgh, at Greenburgh Town Hall, on Tuesday -- this coming Tuesday, from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.

But we're very happy to be here.

And I do want to just begin by thanking my Co-Chair of this hearing, Senator Skoufis; and the Investigations and Government Operations Committee, and the staff of that committee, for really putting this issue of how code enforcement is working in various localities around the state, front and center in our conversations this year about what we can do differently to support the notion, that I think we all agree on, that everybody deserves a decent place to live.

We are on a parallel track having these very in-depth conversations about the rights of tenants vis-a-vis their landlords, around regulations of

rent, and the ability to continue to live, and whether -- under what circumstances people can be evicted.

But we know that -- from lots of experience over many years, that the ability of our governmental agencies to set basic standards, and then to enforce those standards, not just for the tenants that are most active or most organized or have the best lawyers, but just as a general standard in -- that our society agrees to adhere to in our housing.

So it's -- this is a very important part of this conversation.

And, again, I -- the -- Senator Skoufis and the Investigations and Government Operations

Committee have really led the way, and we're very happy to be partnering with them on this.

I do want to acknowledge Nick Rangel, the counsel to the Housing Committee is here, as well as my chief of staff, Shana Mosher, and,
Cleveland Stare who is on my staff, and also serves as clerk to the Housing Committee.

And they've been a very important part of this as well.

So, thank you, and, without further ado, I'll

turn it back over to Senator Skoufis.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you,

Senator Kavanagh.

And before we jump in, I do want to acknowledge and thank Bill Kaplan for allowing us to be here in the Newburgh Armory.

For those of you who are not from Newburgh, it wasn't that long ago that the place that we're sitting in right now was a derelict, unused large building.

And as you can see, it's been transformed into, really, an incredible space.

And if you come here on a Saturday morning, you'll see 600 kids taking part in all sorts of learning activities.

And it's really been transformative here in the city of Newburgh.

So thank you, Bill Kaplan, for allowing us to be here.

I also want to thank my staff for, not only their support at this event, but also my investigative team -- our committee's investigative team, for the work the past four months on this issue.

So with that, we'll get started.

Our first two witnesses are Assembly Members.

One, Assemblyman Jonathan Jacobson from where

we are here in the Newburgh area, and

Assemblyman Ken Zebrowski.

And, you know, if I may, Senator Kavanagh and

And, you know, if I may, Senator Ravanagh and I have chosen to -- to use the authority sort of vested in our committees, under Section 62-A of the legislative law, to swear in each witness today, so that the testimony that you all provide will be under oath.

So, if you may, just raise your right hand, and, do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but truth, so help you God?

ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: I do.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: I do.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. Thank you.

So let's get started.

Jonathan Jacobson.

ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: Thank you.

Thank you, Senator Skoufis and

Senator Kavanagh, for having these hearings today on code enforcement.

James Peterson, Robert Richardson, and Jewell Cummings, this is why I'm here today.

You might have known them, or even heard of 1 2 them. Mr. Peterson lived at 53 Lander Street. 3 Mr. Richardson and Ms. Cummings lived at 4 55 Lander Street. 5 Lander Street is not far from this hearing. 6 The three of them died within a two-week 7 period in March of 2015 due to carbon monoxide 8 9 poisoning. 10 Their rented apartments in the buildings 11 which are -- did not have -- because they rented 12 apartments in buildings which did not have carbon 13 monoxide detectors as required. 14 Those three deaths prompted my run for 15 office, and, eventually, election to the city 16 council in 2017, and, currently, in the Assembly. 17 Code enforcement is basic to quality of life. 18 Proper code enforcement leads to stable, safe 19 neighborhoods. 20 Proper code enforcement helps everyone's 21 property values. 22 Children learn better when their homes are up 23 to code and their neighborhood is up to code. In order to have successful code enforcement, 24

a municipality requires two things: First, a

25

commitment; and, second, resources.

Otherwise, it is merely wishful thinking.

Older cities, such as Newburgh and Poughkeepsie, which I represent, do not have the resources.

There must be a commitment by the State of

New York to provide the resources for municipalities

in order to do code enforcement.

The State should develop a CHIPS program for code enforcement so that all municipalities will have the resources necessary.

CHIPS, for those who do not know, is one of the programs that the State has to provide funds for repair of streets and roads.

That's a commitment that's made every year, it's in the budget.

We should do the same for code enforcement.

We must also consider the law as it stands.

Often, an overworked building department will not know about the problems until they're big problems.

Tenants are reluctant to complain for two reasons:

First, they are fearful of retaliation and eviction.

Second, they're afraid that if code enforcement does inspect the property, the property will be condemned and they will have no place to live.

One solution, and this is just a step, would be to have a requirement of a new certificate of occupancy when any property is transferred. This should at least apply to multifamily residences.

When I started practicing law many years ago, we had this requirement in the city of Newburgh:

Banks would not close on loans if there was a no -if there was no new certificate of occupancy.

This requirement should be a state requirement.

I believe this would pay for itself, because there would be a charge from the local code-enforcement people, that would pay for the -- the people to come by for the inspection.

And this way -- this way, we don't just wait at the end, till the roof is falling down, where, at least, each time we do things.

Sometimes they'll be in better neighborhoods where the only thing is -- or -- or the house is fine, but we have to do sidewalks.

But at least by doing this on a regular

basis, we just don't wait till the end when the building is falling down.

Senators, I hope that when you finish these hearings and produce a report, you will recommend important reforms.

Code-enforcement problems are not -- as you know, are not restricted to any one part of this state.

I look forward to working with you and the Assembly to address this pressing problem.

Thank you for letting me participate in this hearing.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thanks, Assemblyman.
Assemblyman Zebrowski.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: Good morning, Chairman Skoufis, Chairman Kavanagh, to the other members, the senators, of the substantive and investigative committees.

Thank you for allowing me to be here today to share some of my thoughts and experiences as an Assembly Member who's been involved in these issues.

I've represented Rockland County for the past 12-plus years; specifically, the towns of Clarkstown, Haverstraw, and a few of the villages, and the town of Ramapo.

As you know, we have a system where local governments enforce the uniform fire prevention and building codes.

This locally-driven model requires that municipalities employ individuals who inspect buildings and issue violations, and the municipal court system adjudicates these violations.

The State has broad authority over the administration and enforcement of the code by local governments in Section 381 of the Executive Law.

The State provides for training and certification of code-enforcement officials, inspection procedures, and fees; however, code enforcement varies widely between municipalities, and the State rarely gets involved to ensure proper administration of the law.

I've seen a breakdown of code enforcement in Rockland County with a proliferation of illegal structures, including housing and schools.

There are hundreds of examples in Rockland County where the failure of proper code enforcement has led to situations, such as, 20 or more individuals living in a single-family home, schools without certificates of occupancy that are operating today as we have this hearing, housing

developments that are built significantly outside of the scope of site plans.

And many people in Rockland County look at these municipalities and ask, how did we get here?

And the fact of the matter is, it's a slow process where a culture of non-compliance is created and eventually becomes the norm.

There are two types of recalcitrant municipalities in terms of code enforcement: Those who lack capacity and those who lack a desire.

Some municipalities choose to bend over backwards to work with landlords and property owners who are in violation of the uniform code.

And although municipalities should work with some properties who are in violation to come into compliance, there must be an understanding that the municipality will pursue legal remedies, swiftly and strictly, to ensure safety and compliance.

Without enforcement credibility, there is widespread non-compliance in many municipalities.

Temporary certificates of occupancy can continue for years, court cases adjourned continuously until the property seemingly falls through the cracks.

A recent example in Rockland is a school that

was issued a temporary certificate of occupancy while they worked towards a permanent structure.

Their temporary CO expired, but they continued to operate on the property.

Literally, years went by, with little action by the municipality.

Finally, after pressure and media accounts, the Town petitioned the Court to issue an order to vacate the premises.

This is a tool local governments can use, obtaining a judicial order to vacate a premises until the property comes into compliance, and, let's understand, become safe.

Despite the Town obtaining the order from the Court, to this day there's been no action upon it.

Non-compliance continues, the culture of non-compliance is solidified, and there is sense -- there becomes a sense that it's easier to ask for forgiveness than for permission.

And while have I concerns countywide, I've worked extensively with the department of state over the past six years, asking for intervention in two specific municipalities: the town of Ramapo and village of Spring Valley.

I have written 13 letters to the department

of state, spanning two different secretaries of state, urging the department to use their authority in Section 381 to take unprecedented action to correct what I describe as a pervasive lack of code enforcement.

The department took a deliberative approach at first, by opening informal investigation, conducting site visits to municipalities, visiting specific properties, and interviewing local officials.

After their initial investigation, and finding such failures as, not conducting regular inspections, not maintaining proper records, other inappropriate conduct, including a building inspector convicted on criminal charges related to their official duties, the department issued orders to both the Town of Ramapo and Village of Spring Valley, citing deficiencies in their building departments, and ordering the municipalities to immediately cure the violations.

Eventually, the department appointed two state employees as oversight officers to each municipality to oversee their building departments.

While I initially celebrated this action,

I can testify today before your committees that the

State's intervention fell far short of my expectations, and the expectations of the firefighters and community activists I work with.

While they may have instituted better procedures, protocols, computer systems, they have failed to change the culture of non-compliance.

I'll give you one example.

My office and the Illegal Housing Task Force came across a group of trailers that were, literally, plopped on a piece of property in Rockland County and were being used as a school for several hundred students.

Water was being provided by a hose from an adjoining property, and electric was, literally, rigged from the next-door property as well.

To say these trailers were out of compliance would be a gross understatement.

Now, instead shutting this dangerous system down, working to ensure that these children are in other school systems, and treating it as the safety crisis it is, the monitors worked with the property owners to make sure that they -- what they met, what they determined, to be the bare-minimum standards.

The bare-minimum standards should not be good enough for children that are learning in this state

and in our county.

You know what the bare minimum included?

These trailers were supposed to have a sprinkler system to meet the code.

Because there was no sprinkler system, a fire hydrant was necessary to be in close proximity to the school.

The monitor worked with the property owners to install a temporary fire hydrant in order to meet this code; however, this fire hydrant was non-functional, as was found out by the local fire departments.

I believe it was because of pressure problems.

However, to this day, how a non-functioning fire hydrant can meet the code specifications, literally, shocks me as a legislator that has been involved in this issue.

If this is the type of enforcement landlords can expect, why would anyone spend the money necessary to build an appropriate school?

Just throw up the cheapest structure possible, and if you get in trouble, work with whoever is in charge to comply with the loopholes and some patchwork fixes.

Well, I can tell stories all day.

I do want my testimony to focus on some of the concrete bills and regulations that can be changed in order to tackle this issue, and I'll just run through a few.

It should mean something to alter a structure in a way that threatens the lives of residents and firefighters.

There's Assembly bills pending, 1797, 2128, 3343. They increase fines, they set minimum fines, and they create criminal penalties for behavior that create a hazardous condition that can result in injury or death to first responders or residents.

A1906, overhauls the school-inspection process.

Current rules and regulations go back decades, they provide no meaningful oversight, and allow unqualified people to conduct inspections.

A1976, properties that do not comply with zoning codes should not be allowed to have tax-exempt status by the municipality or the State.

A3800, the County of Rockland should be able to put unpaid housing violations on property tax bills to ensure compliance.

In an era of LLCs, changing ownership, the

property tax bill is the safest way -- is a failsafe way to get fines paid, and strict fines can lead to actual compliance, which is what we're looking for.

Many of these bills are sponsored by members of your panel, Senator Carlucci, Senator Skoufis, and others, but they've not gotten over the finish line yet.

I request your help in getting legislation like this to the top of our list in the Legislature.

I do want to touch briefly on the department of education, because, as I said, in my county, a lot of times we're talking about schools, where children learn, right now.

We've had a collaboration to overhaul the private-school fire-inspection process.

I want to commend Commissioner Elia and her staff who have taken this issue seriously and worked to improve an outdated and ignored system.

We started this process after a fire in Rockland County, one that, when the firefighters went in, deplorable conditions were found.

After the firefighters came to my office,

I asked for a fire-safety inspection report from the
school, which is something that's required to be
filed annually by all of these schools.

And what we find -- found out was, not only was this report not filed in the department of education, it wasn't conducted.

And, quite frankly, schools are either sending these reports up to the State, or they weren't.

They were either put in a filing cabinet, or they weren't.

There was, literally, no enforcement related to these type of inspections.

Because of this process and this instance, we have completely overhauled this process.

The department now tracks these reports.

They send out reminders and delinquency notices, and enforces non-compliance.

But what we need to do is to give the commissioner more teeth, specifically authorizing her to order the inspections when a school refuses.

As I said earlier, A1976 would achieve that.

And I believe Senator Carlucci is the sponsor of the bill in the Senate.

In conclusion:

This issue is complex.

Lax code enforcement can both ruin the quality of life of a neighborhood and also threaten

the safety of residents and first responders.

It preys upon vulnerable populations, and it rewards irresponsible behavior.

Landlords and building owners who skirt the building codes should be held accountable with specific enforcement action that results in meaningful penalties that include bringing the property up to compliance.

There are many critical players in the code-enforcement system, and a breakdown at one level, any level, can lead to this culture of non-compliance.

Oftentimes, multiple layers of enforcement can become lax. Everyone involved blames each other.

Buildings inspectors must diligently inspect properties regularly and cite violations.

Local prosecutors should be aggressively ensuring that dangerous conditions do not linger and that building owners are held accountable.

And even judges need to adjudicate cases quickly, and ensure that these cases are adjudicated in a manner that acts as a deterrent, and not just the cost of doing business.

Not just a \$250 compromise or order.

What does that do for a building owner when there's an unsafe condition?

And, lastly, I want to say, local elected officials must create a culture where code enforcement is a priority, and the culture and the municipality is one where non-compliance will not be tolerated.

Part of this can be fixed by legislation,

I mentioned above, and other bills we could draft
and work on together. But some of it can't be fixed
by legislation.

If those that are charged with enforcing the law, prosecuting the crimes, and adjudicating the cases do not push for a culture of compliance, all the legislation in the world will still leave a gaping loophole.

Some of you know that I'm running for district attorney, and I'm not here to talk about my candidacy, but one issue really is relevant to this discussion.

Many people do not realize that enforcement of these laws lies, actually, with the district attorney's office, and they deputize the municipalities in order to do that process.

I've pledged, and other district attorneys

around this state should do also, to no longer automatically deputize all of these municipalities to conduct these prosecutions.

There should be an annual review of the system and intervention where necessary.

The State of New York also needs to understand that the buck stops with them.

It may be difficult, it may take additional personnel, it will certainly lead to local controversies, but the state must properly assume its role in this process.

We need a robust process, where municipalities are properly trained, and properly investigating, to ensure the safety of the public.

I fear a day will come where we have a tragedy.

And, afterwards, there will be a big press conference, with calls for change in oversight.

But if that day comes, we will all know that we had the opportunity to prevent that tragedy, but we turned the other way.

I want to thank you, Chairman Skoufis,
Chairman Kavanagh, all the members that are here
today, because you're not turning the other way, and
you're giving this issue the attention it deserves.

I pledge my collaboration with all of you to 1 change the culture of compliance in New York State. 2 3 Thank you. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you, Assemblyman, for 4 that illuminating testimony. 5 6 I just have a couple of questions, if I may, 7 and then I'll turn it over to any colleagues that have questions. 8 9 You know, the department of state is here, we will be hearing from them later. 10 You touched on the fact there was a state 11 12 monitor sent to the town of Ramapo. 13 Did you have any interaction with that monitor while she was there? 14 Can you talk a little bit about, you know, 15 16 how that relationship worked, if it worked at all? 17 ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: Minimal, minimal. I envision, and the activists and the fire 18 departments envisioned, a robust collaborative 19 20 process, where complaints could be filed, there 21 could be collaboration, discussions, about what 22 they've seen. 23

We really have to rely on the first responders in our counties.

24

25

And, I don't want to speak for them. I think

some of them may be here later.

But I can speak for my collaboration, the meetings I had with them, and suggest to you that there was very minimal, if not any, real collaboration with the monitors there.

The only real meetings I ever had were meetings where the department of state would -- I can think of one in my office where they brought the monitors forward.

And that just led to a situation where, quite frankly, they were in the building departments, like I said, they made some changes, but there was not the type of, like, robust dialogue that would have been helpful in the county.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. Do you think the monitor was prematurely removed?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: Yes, absolutely.

I don't think that we could -- that you could pack up and say the problems were solved.

And, certainly, you couldn't do that without sort of having discussions with our local fire officials who are, literally, out responding to that whistle every day and seeing these conditions.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: You touched on another issue that, quite frankly, you know, I and we had

come to learn, just as part of this investigation, which is that DAs annually waive this authority, as you mentioned, to prosecute code enforcement.

I was pretty shocked to learn that.

Why do you think most, if not all, DAs, including the Rockland DA, waive that authority?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: Tradition.

It's historically how it's been done.

As you know, everybody is sort of pushed and pulled by budgets, and things like that.

And so it's just been something that has not been seen as under the purview of the district attorney's office.

However, they have the expertise, they have the logistics, and, really, they have the know-how in order to make sure that these cases are truly prosecuted.

As I said earlier, it's like it's not just the inspectors, but, like, after that, you have to have -- you have to have prosecutors and judges that are making sure that the cases just aren't adjourned for months and months, years and years; that the properties are, literally, what you're asking of the judge, is that they be brought up to compliance, not just a \$250 fine.

What does a \$250 fine do for a structure?

So I think that that is a key component, that

district attorneys across the state should sort of be having an annual review process.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And I appreciate that.

ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: And I just want to mention that most of the fines are, for example, \$250 a day.

And what we should make it, so that the rules for evidence and to prosecute are easy, so that if -- if the inspector goes there on day one, takes pictures and has proof, and then goes back on day 20, and nothing has changed, now it's 20 days.

Now it's a \$5,000 fine, plus to get it done.

But too often there's only the fine with, really, no teeth into making sure that the repairs are done.

So you have to look at both ways and make sure that the process works.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Well, what we found is that, you know, on the onset, it is a 250 -- up to a \$250 fine under state law, and then up to \$1,000 per day, subsequent, to not curing that deficiency.

But, you never see that actually implemented; right?

1 So we will talk a little bit more about that with other witnesses. 2 3 I'm good. Anyone else? 4 Yes, Senator Carlucci. 5 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Well, thank you. 6 7 Well, thank you, Assemblyman Zebrowski and Assemblyman Jacobson for the testimony. It's very 8 helpful. 9 10 And thank you to the committee for being 11 here. 12 So, a few things. 13 We talked about the judicial system, and I know that's been a frustration of ours for a long 14 15 time. 16 What type of recommendations do you think we 17 could make in terms of making sure we have more 18 accountability on the judges? Like we said, \$250 a day, \$1,000 a day, a 19 20 \$30,000 fine gets let go at \$250. 21 So there's no real incentive. 22 We found that maybe statute of limitations, a 23 requirement to speed up these cases.

Do you have any insight on that or thoughts on what we could do to try to hold accountability?

24

25

I know we have members from the Illegal Rockland Housing Task Force, and they sometimes go to the court to try to just put that presence and that reminder to the judge, that there's an impact, that there's a face to this problem.

Do you guys have any thoughts on that?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: Yeah, a few things.

Certainly, I respect the purview of judges and their role within the process.

I think there's some things we can do within the law, minimum fines, requiring that there be set structures for unsafe properties, so that there's, like, a given, sort of, road map that judges have to follow.

But also I think, as I said, the State needs to be looking holistically at these situations in these counties, and recognizing where properties are remaining in non-compliance for years, and, literally, step in and have much more robust oversight and input into this process, because, as I said, everybody sort of points the finger at somebody else.

The inspectors say, Well, I brought the violation, but the prosecutors didn't prosecute.

They say, Well, you know, the judges never go for that type of thing.

The judges say, Well, the prosecutors don't really ask for compliance. They only ask for the fines and they consent to the adjournments.

So it's really tough to figure out where along that line the truth is.

So I really think the State needs to have a far more robust process in terms of overseeing these municipalities and ensuring that doesn't happen.

ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: If the landlord looks at this as purely a business situation, it might be cheaper to pay the fine.

So I think we have to change the law, that would allow the State or the local municipality to come in, make the repairs, and then put that as a lien on the property.

Because we have to remember, the reason we're repairing this is not because we have a code.

We're repairing it because of the people that live there.

So I think, ultimately, we might have to have the power where you come in and step in and get it done.

Now, unfortunately, Newburgh or Poughkeepsie,

we don't have the money to go in and make the repairs, so now you are in a catch-22.

So you want to make sure that there is the authority to do the repairs, but that the State comes in, there's money to do it, so that the landlords know there's going to be this lien on the property. And then you can foreclose on a lien, and so forth.

But it has to be more than just the fine, and just making it that it's a business deduction for these landlords.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: You know, one of the things we talk about, and was mentioned, is about this culture; the culture of leniency, of not having strict compliance.

And we talk about the DAs around the state waiving this right to prosecute code-enforcement penalties.

And we've been talking about it, the committee very concerned about this issue.

And I think it speaks to the fact that this is not a priority, and we have to change that because it will be devastating. Right?

The DA will move in when there's a fire and someone was killed, but they weren't there in the

first place to prevent it from happening.

How would you feel about possible legislation restricting a district attorney's ability to unilaterally waive that right to prosecute code-enforcement penalties?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: I think you're on the right path.

We'd have to work with the district attorneys' offices and the county executives and the legislatures to ensure that the personnel is there and that the logistics are there, so that they do it.

But we should certainly be looking at the situation to figure out, how can we encourage the district attorneys' offices, either through a requirement or through increasing their ability, because I do believe that they have far more expertise in this process.

Like I said earlier in my testimony, sometimes it's lack of desire, sometimes it's a lack of capacity.

So sometimes it may just be assistance and logistical help to the town or village attorneys.

Sometimes it may be actual intervention and taking it over themselves.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And then, just last question: In regards to the monitor, and I know we've worked closely on this together, but, for the committee, would you be able to give us, if we were able to get the monitor back in Ramapo, what would be the recommendations in terms of how we can improve that process?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: Well, first off, I would suggest that we -- we need to ensure that they are meeting with, sort of, the Illegal Housing Task Force, with the fire departments, that there is a regular set of communication, weekly, biweekly, whatever works, taking into complaints.

We should almost have a checklist of these things we've talked about, everything from, how many temporary COs? how long are they on the books?

Let's get them down.

What happened to allow something to be operating as a school with a temporary CO for a year, two years, three years?

We need like almost a checklist, a road map, of where we're going and when we'll feel comfortable.

We need to involve the county fire coordinator, all the fire chiefs.

That's the type of process I envisioned on the front end.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Well, there's more transparency, with the public, with the stakeholders, to know, exactly, what is the monitor doing on the ground?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: Yeah, our first responders know the problems, they know the properties.

They're just not really being asked or collaborated with in terms of fixing those problems.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Chairman.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I failed to recognize that Senator Liz Krueger has joined us, representing Manhattan.

Do you have a question?

SENATOR KRUEGER: I do, thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, great.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you both so much for your testimony this morning.

And we had a different housing hearing last night in Albany, and the last group of people to come to testify were actually from Rochester, and they were describing a code-enforcement crisis,

literally, for themselves.

And now I come to Newburgh, another section of the state outside of New York City, and I hear you testify, and even your recommendations.

And I just want to say, not only do they ring correct, I think for the state of New York, I will tell you that these would matter in New York City as well.

When you pointed out, Assembly Member, that we really need to be able to use the property-tax section of law to collect fines, that is crucial in New York City as well, because everything is owned by an LLC. No one can figure out who's behind, or even a member of, the LLC.

So the ability of a city as big as New York, to figure out who you're penalizing for failing to meet our building codes and having violations build up, is enormous.

So, that makes so much sense for your communities right here, as well as it would for the city of New York.

I also want to ask, because I think the City does believe it has a building-code enforcement system in place stronger than most other parts of the state, we fund ours using federal

community-development block grant funds.

Do you know how your communities or counties are trying to fund their code-enforcement efforts, and are they eligible, possibly, to draw down on this source of funding as well?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: I believe they're funded mainly through local property tax and the local budget.

It's a good question, Senator, I don't know the answer to, whether or not they get grant funding from the federal government. And, if they don't, whether or not they should be availing themselves and applying for that.

That's a good point.

And if I could just add to your first point, it really is a statewide issue, and we should.

And we went through this process last year in the Assembly, and they granted authority to only a few municipalities to actually add the violations to the property tax bill.

And I found it patently unfair.

Rockland County was one of those that was excluded.

And, quite frankly, every municipality should be handling -- should be given that tool. It's like

a tool in their box.

And why some municipalities should allow that, and others, it just seems unfair to me.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: The City of Newburgh has attempted to have a landlord registry, and there was pushback on that.

And one of the reasons you need a landlord registry is, if you have a problem, you don't know who the owner is. And the fire department or the code-enforcement people need to contact the landlord, and you don't have a phone number.

And so that's something that could be done, that needs to be done, as well.

And it's -- it's -- the city of Newburgh is different than, say, in where have you towns where they don't think of code enforcement, because they think they're in suburbs and they don't have problems.

When you're in cities, you know you have problems.

And, here, it's really lack of resources.

I believe there's a commitment, but not as much. And it would be better when you have the resources.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

Senator Kavanagh.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'll be brief.

I just -- first of all, I had the great honor of serving in the Assembly for many years, and particularly serving with Senator -- with Assembly Member Zebrowski.

I did not overlap with Senator (sic)
Jacobson.

But welcome, both you, and thank you for testifying today.

Just -- I -- I just want to follow up on this issue of whether the government has the authority and the resources to make repairs directly.

I mean, New York City, as Senator Krueger mentioned, we have emergency repair program, where the City will go in in egregious cases, after attempting to get the landlord to do repairs in --you know, in egregious cases, and make them themselves, and then -- and then impose that as a lien on the property owner.

Are you aware of -- are there any localities in your jurisdictions or outside of New York City within the state, that you're familiar with, that

1 have that authority or that run any kind of program like that? 2 ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: To make the 3 repairs? 4 5 SENATOR KAVANAGH: To make -- to actually 6 make emergency repairs, and then, you know, try to get reimbursed for those (indiscernible). 7 ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: Oh, to step 8 in? 9 10 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes. 11 ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: No, I --12 I haven't heard of that. 13 I mean, it only happens at the very end, 14 when -- it will happen when the building is 15 abandoned. It will happen when the City takes it 16 over for taxes. 17 And then because there was such a problem with the City having to pay school taxes, we 18 established the land bank, and they will do things 19 20 before it gets resold. 21 But, generally, no. 22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: They're doing -- they're

doing -- at that stage, they're doing work directly

on the property, to shore it up, to make it

minimally safe, and then try to transfer it off

23

24

25

1 government ownership?

Is that --

3 ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: I don't

believe so.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: I mean,

I know that Chief Horton is here, and others from
the city of Newburgh. They can testify more.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: I think there's some tools within the condemnation process, for really unsafe, crumbling-type, sort of, structures, for lack of a better descriptive word.

I don't know if they have the tools within what we see sometimes with, you know, 10 or 12 apartments, attics, unsafe exits.

We've had in schools dead-bolted doors, and sort of things like that.

What their process is to go into those structures, which, literally, aren't like crumbling, but are set up in such a way that they are safety risks to the people that are occupants and to the first responders.

I'm not sure that they actually have that authority.

ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: I know on the city council we had a vote to take down buildings, because the building was going to collapse and destroy the building next door.

But, usually, it only -- it's only when it gets to that point.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Right.

So I think, you know, Senator Jacobson, you mentioned earlier, that one of the concerns that folks have, when they're seeking to have codes enforced in the places where they live, is that the result may just be, you know, that the place is condemned or there's an eviction order, and people need to be removed.

So I think, you know, I hope today, from, you know, witnesses we're going hear from, that we can talk about the question of how to keep people in place and keep their residences safe for occupancy, rather than, you know -- you know, more drastic means that end up, you know, hurting the very people that we're trying to help.

But I appreciate your -- the testimony of both you (indiscernible) today.

ASSEMBLYMAN JONATHAN JACOBSON: Because, when you don't have enough housing, where are you going

put people?

And so you're in a catch-22, and they say,
Well, I'd rather survive where I got 'cause at least
I have a roof over my head. I don't have to -- at
least I know where I'm going to live, I know where
my kids are going to be. But I don't know what I'm
going to do if they come in and say, yeah, the
building is terrible, get out.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: So, 100 percent, Senator.

And I believe a lot of these landlords actually have the funds and the money to make sure that they're code-compliant.

But, instead, they don't, because it's cheaper.

And you do see marginalized communities that are sort of preyed upon, and they're afraid to file complaints because they'll be retaliated against by the landlords, collecting cash, and just forcing people into deplorable conditions.

And if we all made this a priority, I think we would make a lot of people's lives better.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you both.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thanks very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEN ZEBROWSKI: Thank you so

much, Senator.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Next up, from the City of Albany, will be Robert Magee, corporation counsel.

As you sit down, if I may, you know, my team that has been working with these municipalities tells me that the City of Albany has been exceedingly cooperative, really above and beyond our expectations.

And so I want to thank you personally, and your city government, for your work, and viewing this as an opportunity to really demonstrate to us, what's working well, and how we as a state could be more helpful.

So, thank you.

And if you may raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.

ROBERT MAGEE: I do.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

Welcome.

ROBERT MAGEE: Thank you.

And I wanted to thank you and the rest of the committee, as well as Chief of Investigations

Mazzariello, Ms. DiBernardo, for all their help with

our participation in this investigation.

I want to thank you for the attention you're focusing on this issue; I think it's really important.

So, as you said, my name is Robert Magee.

I'm deputy corporation counsel for the City of Albany.

Before I was in this role, I was -- I served for three years as the director of buildings for the City of Albany.

And in the time I've worked in code enforcement, I've really seen our code-enforcement officers, the people on the street, enforcing the code on existing buildings, really doing some incredible things.

I mean, they're routinely called to act outside their job descriptions.

I've seen them shelter victims of domestic violence.

I've seen them help navigate the channels of bureaucracy for new Americans who have just come to this country.

They've resolved disputes between neighbors.

And they do this on a routine basis.

And the services that they provide as

code-enforcement officers are critical for the safety and health and well-being of New Yorkers, particularly renters.

I want to, you know, reference the landlord registration program that was just spoken about.

We've -- we implemented that in Albany in the late '90s, and since then we've actually seen a reduction of 50 percent of the instances of fire.

And that's a pretty, you know, solid statistic that you can point to, but that there's also a substantial benefit to letting tenants/renters know that they have someone that they can go to, who can put eyes on the conditions that they're living in, and be a neutral third-party witness in a court case.

And it is also, to a certain extent, a service to landlords who may not be able to see their property.

We are keeping an eye on their buildings, we're letting them know about problems, and we're working with them to get those problems resolved.

So I was very, very heartened to hear this investigation was happening, and I'm really happy to see this discussion is moving forward in the way that it is.

1 And with that, I'll close, and just open the 2 floor to questions. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, great. 3 4 Thank you. 5 Do you require, in your registration -- your landlord registry, to -- to sort of have LLCs 6 7 reveal who their owners are? How do you treat LLCs in the city? 8 9 ROBERT MAGEE: So the LLC, on their registration form, they'll need to appoint a 10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

property manager. There needs to be some individual that we can talk to.

So usually it will be, you know, the owner will be, you know, 12 Main Street, LLC, it's typical. And then you'll have, you know, Albany Property Management, and there will be an individual that we would contact, based on that.

And then, based on the information that's put on that form, that person becomes someone that we can provide formal notice of code violations, and provide that person.

And that becomes kind of a jurisdictional basis for the code-enforcement action that will come later.

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

ROBERT MAGEE: Yes. 1 2 SENATOR SKOUFIS: How often does your housing 3 court meet? ROBERT MAGEE: Once a week. 4 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Once a week? 5 6 ROBERT MAGEE: Once a week. 7 On the third Thursday of the month, it doesn't -- once a week, three times a month. 8 9 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Great. One of the things that we found is, you know, 10 11 some violations across the state, quite frankly, 12 sort of languish in court for a long time. 13 And, you know, there are motions to adjourn 14 after motions to adjourn after -- and violations can 15 languish for, when -- we've found, for years, 16 literally. 17 Can you speak to that issue in the city of Albany, and, perhaps, the scope of that problem? 18 19 And what, if anything, the City has done or 20 maybe you should be doing in that respect? 21 ROBERT MAGEE: Yeah, for the very difficult 22

code violations that we find, there's really, like, there's either the very obstinate owner that doesn't want to make a repair, or, it's an owner we can't identify.

23

24

25

So, for vacant buildings that's a big problem.

What we will do is, essentially, you know, we move each case to a trial.

The trial happens.

If a case gets to trial, we're routinely imposing, you know, ten to twenty thousand dollars in fines.

And then, the next day, the code-enforcement officer is back out there, sees it, and we start that process again.

Once we take the judgment from a given trial, though, you know, that gets filed as a lien against the property.

And then that individual also gets kind of blacklisted with the buildings department until the situation is resolved.

So, if you own multiple buildings, and you want to get a residential occupancy permit, which is something you need to rent property, or if you need to apply for a building permit, you can't get that at the buildings department until you've work out whatever the code violation you have on -- on your other building is.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: What's the largest fine in

recent years that has been levied? 1 ROBERT MAGEE: Three months ago we got a fine 2 of \$45,000 for a very large vacant building. 3 But I think the highest I've heard of is 4 \$80,000. 5 6 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. Thank you. 7 Senator Carlucci. SENATOR CARLUCCI: Thank you, Chairman. 8 9 And, Mr. Magee, thank you for your testimony today. 10 11 Now with those fines, was that -- did the 12 City of Albany collect the \$45,000? 13 ROBERT MAGEE: No. 14 As far as I know, no. 15 The way we manage enforcement in Albany, is 16 they actually get filed criminal fines, like a 17 speeding ticket. And the fine is actually owed to the court, 18 so the money would come into the court. 19 20 But, if they had paid the fine, I'm sure 21 I would have heard about it. SENATOR CARLUCCI: And with the landlord 22 23 registry, how have you found compliance with the 24 registry? 25 And do you have any teeth if you're unable to get an owner or a building manager?

ROBERT MAGEE: Yeah, we do have a lot of teeth, and I think it comes from two places.

We've had it -- we've had the process up and running so long, that our, you know, department of social services, and just the culture in Albany, they know that, if you're renting, you need that ROP, so people will ask for it.

But then, also, if a landlord wants to pursue an eviction against a tenant, our court will not let them do that until they've actually obtained an ROP.

So that's -- that's a good -- that's a good sticking point.

And then, also, if we know a building is being rented and they don't have an ROP, you know, it gets cited as a normal code violation and it will be subject to fines.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And what would you say is the biggest challenge in terms of code enforcement for the City of Albany?

Is it the resources?

Is it the culture?

ROBERT MAGEE: I think it's always resources.

I mean, you can always use more eyes on the street, that would be really important.

The problem that we have -- that our code-enforcement officers find, actually, most routinely, is being able to contact the owners, especially for vacant properties.

But it --

SENATOR CARLUCCI: The biggest problem, you're saying?

ROBERT MAGEE: Yeah.

So the situation with LLCs is finding someone who will actually answer when you pick up the phone or send a letter. That can be extremely difficult.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And so you're saying that it's not necessarily you're having a compliance problem on the actual apartments, but it's the vacant buildings where you're unable to get compliance with who owns this building?

ROBERT MAGEE: That's correct.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: So --

ROBERT MAGEE: I mean, when someone's -yeah, when someone's at the property, they're
invested in it, and you can talk to that person.
They usually have an interest in getting it
repaired.

It was vacant buildings that can be a little

more difficult.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay, so that -- so you -would you suggest legislation that would require
transparency in terms of LLCs, to know who owns
these actual properties, have some sort of contact
information?

ROBERT MAGEE: Yes, (indiscernible cross-talking).

SENATOR CARLUCCI: So even with the registry, it's still a problem, but particularly on the vacant properties?

ROBERT MAGEE: Yeah, that's correct.

And with LLCs, in particular.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And then how about, in terms of infrastructure, we know some municipalities, as the Assembly Members had talked about before, are using -- you know, they have the resources, some don't. It varies dramatically depending on priorities, depending on resources.

How do you track your cases?

Do you have the appropriate software?

Is that something that the State could help with in terms of having a universal software program, or helping municipalities to pay for that?

Could you talk about that a little bit?

ROBERT MAGEE: Yeah, so we actually implemented a software system while I was buildings director, and that was actually a huge boon to our productivity, and our ability to track landlords and properties across -- well, across -- track properties across landlords.

I think a program that would help municipalities do that, and a program that would, you know, standardize how things were done, would be extremely helpful.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: So you're talking about a standardization of the type of software used in these departments?

ROBERT MAGEE: Yes.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay.

ROBERT MAGEE: Yes.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And then

Assemblyman Jacobson had talked about a proposal, and I wanted to hear your opinion, being the counsel for the City, he had talked about this idea of not being able to sell a property or transfer a property until you have a CO.

Sounds good, but I know we would probably, in the city of Albany, maybe have some issues with that, with the amount of buildings that are vacant.

Have you thought about that proposal at all, or could you speak to that?

ROBERT MAGEE: I have not thought about that proposal at all.

I know that, you know, in Albany, anyway, most of our buildings were built before COs were issued. So that would be difficult in a lot of those cases.

But I know, informally, a lot of that happens.

I mean, we get a lot of inquiries from realtors, people looking to buy or sell buildings, looking to see if their building has a clean bill of health.

And I think, you know, a formalization of that process might -- would be useful.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And then, last question:
In terms of funding code enforcement, do you receive
any support from outside of the city taxpayers?

ROBERT MAGEE: Yes.

So we have one of our code-enforcement officers is funded through a block grant.

But, otherwise, the department actually is, it's a revenue-generating department for the city, through permit fees and our residential-occupancy

permit fee, and a couple of our other registration 1 2 programs. SENATOR CARLUCCI: And can -- can -- you can 3 verify that, that it's actually -- is it making more 4 than it's actually spending? 5 ROBERT MAGEE: Yes. 6 7 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. Thank you. 8 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Next will be 9 Senator Kavanagh. 10 11 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 12 I have a great many questions, but, given the 13 range of witnesses, I'll try to keep this brief. 14 Just, first of all, you said that, in Albany, 15 you require a residential occupancy permit in order 16 to rent housing to others; is that correct? 17 ROBERT MAGEE: Correct. 18 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Is that for any level, any 19 sort of size? 20 Like, if I have a single-family home and 21 I rent it out, I need a permit? 22 ROBERT MAGEE: Yes. 23 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 24 And you have high rates of compliance with 25 that?

ROBERT MAGEE: Yeah, I think, at any given time, we've estimated we have, probably, around 85 percent compliance.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: How does -- how -- what is -- what are the implications -- what are the consequences of renting housing without having a residential-occupancy permit in place?

ROBERT MAGEE: The concrete one is that, if you try to evict one of your tenants, you won't -- our City Court won't let you actually process that eviction until you've obtained the ROP.

But, also, it's something the tenants know to ask for.

So if you're looking to rent an apartment, often the tenant will know to ask for it.

And it's just a tool the tenants can use to ensure that, you know, the buildings that they're living in are in compliance with the building code.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

And the -- the 15 percent, roughly -- rough figure, that are not compliant, is that concen -- I mean, do you -- does it tend to be landlords that are otherwise not compliant, or is it just sort of spread (indiscernible) people?

ROBERT MAGEE: I think it tends to be lapses,

that would -- that -- that -- yeah, it tends to be people who have forgotten to renew it.

The way -- I mean, I wasn't there when it was passed, but, the renewal period is every 2 1/2 years, and that can be difficult for folks to remember, that they need to renew it.

But if they don't renew it, they get a reminder notice.

Usually they -- they'll come into compliance, eventually.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And is that -- and that's pursuant to local law --

ROBERT MAGEE: Correct.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- to the city -- to the city law?

Okay.

And just on the -- just to follow up on Senator Carlucci's questions, can you give us a sense of the scale of the -- of the spending on your code-enforcement operation, and the amount of revenue that's being generated?

ROBERT MAGEE: I can provide specific numbers later.

I want to say, we spend about 1.2 million per year, and I think we bring in around 1.8.

But I -- it's in our budget, I can provide 1 that information. 2 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. Yeah, we would appreciate more specifics. 4 5 And if there is any breakdown as to, sort of, 6 what the -- you mentioned various -- and you 7 previously mentioned various sources of that, if you could give us a sense of what the breakdown is of 8 the 1.2 and of the 1.8, that would be appreciated. 9 ROBERT MAGEE: Absolutely. 10 11 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Biaggi. 12 SENATOR BIAGGI: Oh, thank you, 13 Senator Skoufis. 14 15 Thank you very much for being here with us 16 today. 17 I want to, I think, start from the top. 18 And, you know, you listed lots of different 19 issues, and since you are the corporation counsel, 20 I think it's good to look at this from a legal 21 frame. 22 So if you could rank the issues in order of 23 priority for the Legislature, how would you rank

ROBERT MAGEE: Well, I'm -- I have to admit

24

25

them?

to not being fully versed on what's on the Legislature's plate right now.

But I think, in terms -- I understand that there's a lot of legislation that is out there, that will stabilize landlord rental relationships, some protections that tenants can have to stay in their apartments.

I think that's really important.

One of the things, the problems that we face in Albany, is that, especially in neighborhoods that have a high rental population, is there's a population turnover.

And there's a population turnover, so neighbors don't get to develop relationships with one another. They don't learn to advocate for themselves before us.

And I think anything that the State can do to help keep people in their homes will help us with code enforcement.

I think those two things are tied very, very closely.

I'm not sure to where to rank this, but

I think it would be great if the State of New York

had a statewide plumbing and electrical licensing

system.

Right now, that's done by municipality, and the result, I think, is just a lack of availability of electricians and plumbers.

And that's very critical when you're facing, especially in an unsafe/unfit situation, where you have identified faulty wiring.

So that's one of our -- the most common issues in which we'll issue an unsafe-and-unfit order, meaning, it's condemnation order, saying that people aren't able to live there.

It will be faulty electrical systems.

And those buildings will be out of commission for weeks because people can't find a licensed electrician to do the work.

So if -- you know, the more licensed electricians we can have, the better.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay, thank you.

You mentioned also that, you know, each year there's a whole host of LLCs that are unable to be identified.

And I think that that seems to be the common theme, and I will predict that it probably will be the theme throughout the rest of the day.

In Albany, how many LLCs per year do you estimate you're unable to identify an individual

that you can be in touch with?

And do you think that that is one of the reasons why there's such a large number of vacant properties that just stay condemned?

ROBERT MAGEE: Yeah, it's hard to even put a number on it.

But it would probably -- when you're talking about vacant buildings, probably on the order of, like, 150 to 200 --

SENATOR BIAGGI: A year?

ROBERT MAGEE: Yeah.

-- are owned by LLCs, so we can't reach them, can't reach -- you know, reach anybody.

Among rental properties, what we've done through State, the Attorney General's Office, actually, is we have access to a program called Building Blocks, and that's enabled us to use data to kind of suss out actually who's behind LLCs, in particular, by grouping them by their contact information.

So, if all these LLCs have a common PO Box, for instance, if we know who is responding at 12 Main Street, we'll know who will respond at 18 Main Street.

So, that's been helpful.

SENATOR BIAGGI: So what do you do when you 1 can't get in touch with an owner of a property; 2 3 what's the next step? ROBERT MAGEE: Well, we -- so, yeah, so we go 4 based on the tax information. 5 We send out the notice of violation. That 6 7 gets kicked back. If we -- then we do an informal search on our 8 records. 9 Sometimes someone's applied for a permit 10 11 somewhere else and used another address. And then 12 we go there. 13 Once we've exhausted our internal records, 14 we'll talk to our police department. They have 15 access to databases that we don't. 16 If they're not able to contact anyone, then 17 we have a private-investigator firm that we use. If they're not able to find anyone, we kind 18 19 of just start the process over again. 20 SENATOR BIAGGI: I mean, how helpful is it to 21 be able to access the tax records? 22 Because, presumably, the owner is paying 23 taxes on the property.

So if -- by accessing the tax returns on the

property, would you think that that's a good legal

24

25

mechanism?

ROBERT MAGEE: Yeah, I'm sure, if the taxes are being paid, absolutely.

I mean, one of the things we find with vacant buildings in particular, is the property-contact address will be that property.

So, I mean, it wouldn't be a silver bullet, but it would definitely be helpful.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay.

And last question, it kind of goes back to what you were talking about earlier:

You mentioned ROPs?

ROBERT MAGEE: Uh-huh.

SENATOR BIAGGI: And you said that tenants know about these, or they know to ask about these, from their landlords.

So I think one of the issues that I see, at least, in the district that I represent in The Bronx, mainly, is that a lot of tenants don't know their rights or don't really know what to ask for.

So why do the -- or, how, rather, I should say, how do the tenants in Albany know about this, and what have you done to raise awareness?

ROBERT MAGEE: Uh-huh.

Well, our code enforce -- I mean, our 1 code-enforcement officers are in the field all the 2 time, so they're talking to tenants and they're well 3 versed on it. 4 We're lucky to have really good advocacy 5 6 organizations. You're going to hear from Laura, 7 United Tenants; we have Legal Society of Northeastern New York; and a couple other 8 9 organizations, that are really out there in the community, telling people about these sorts of 10 11 things. 12 It's also -- you know, the information is available on our website. 13 14 Yeah, those are the main ways 15 (indiscernible). 16 SENATOR BIAGGI: That's helpful. 17 That was mainly a selfish question of how I can do better in The Bronx. 18 19 Thank you very much. 20 ROBERT MAGEE: Thank you. 21 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 22 And Senator Krueger I know has a question. 23 SENATOR KRUEGER: Oh, thank you so much,

This is a great hearing this morning today.

Senator Skoufis.

24

25

Thank you very much for having this.

So you mentioned, I believe, that, in Albany, you actually can stop landlords from eviction cases or over -- or, charging rent, unless they've met your requirements in code enforcement.

New York City also has that rule, although not nearly enough tenants know about it.

Were you able to do that through a change in city regulations?

Or, how did you put that into place?

ROBERT MAGEE: That predates me, but

I believe it came from an interpretation by our City

Court of our city code that the judges have upheld

since the program was put in place.

SENATOR KRUEGER: So, actually, so,

Senator Skoufis, for my colleagues, I think it's

important for all of us to realize that that is

another tool we can help our localities choose to

use for themselves, because, while I agree

completely about the importance of making people

register, actually Senator May has a bill that

requires, if we pass that, that a landlord must

provide every tenant with contact information of,

who are the owners of the LLC?

So there's -- as you're describing, they have

to register in the city.

They should register, but sometimes they don't.

But if you actually require it, or we require by law, that they have to provide that information to tenants, that's another important tool.

But I think it's critical -- and so thank you for bringing it up -- that, you know, it's a contractual relationship between a landlord and a tenant, whether it's residential or commercial.

And so, if one side isn't doing what they're supposed to do, you can't penalize people in the court system.

And so I do think that's an amazing tool, to remind localities, or build into state law, that we could ensure that every locality knows that they have that option.

Thank you?

Thank you for your testimony.

ROBERT MAGEE: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much for your testimony, and your assistance over the past many months.

Thank you.

ROBERT MAGEE: Everyone, have a good day.

O 4

1 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Next up will be United Tenants, represented by Laura Felts. 2 (Inaudible) testified yesterday as well in 3 Albany, so thanks for continuing to share your 4 5 insight. 6 If I can ask to you raise your right hand. 7 Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, 8 9 so help you God? LAURA FELTS: Yes. 10 11 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. LAURA FELTS: Thank you, folks, so much for 12 13 having me. 14 And to a couple of you, thank you for hearing 15 from me again. 16 Just 16 hours ago, I guess, I was seeing you 17 and speaking with you. So my name is Laura Felts. 18 I'm the Homeless Prevention Program 19 20 Coordinator at United Tenants of Albany. 21 United Tenants is a community-based, 22 non-profit organization that's located in the city 23 of Albany. 24 United Tenants formed in 1973 in response to 25 poor housing conditions and the lack of code

enforcement in the neighborhoods of Albany.

Code-enforcement issues in rental housing are of the utmost importance to the work that I do at United Tenants every single day.

I've been with the organization for four years, and in that short time I have attended court with over 1,200 households, to stand with them as they face the possibility of losing their home to eviction.

An overwhelming number of those families live in deplorable housing conditions.

The landlords that file the more than
5,000 eviction cases every year in Albany City Court
are predominantly not invested in the neighborhoods,
and as it stands now, they will continue to pursue
eviction every single time a tenant asserts their
right to a decent place to live.

I repeatedly watch landlords be granted warrants of eviction in housing court, only to see them walk down the stairs to appear or to pay a fine in codes court for failure to repair the same building from which they've evicted still another family.

I believe that if a landlord is not making repairs, they should not be eligible to receive a

warrant of eviction.

In the four short years that I've been with United Tenants, I've attended court with so many households cycling through the exact same horrifying substandard apartment, that I can recite the issues that are going to be on their code-violation report upon simply hearing their address.

It's the same issues for the family going through the same building.

I'm confident that the problem intrinsic to this disturbing cycle cannot possibly lie with the families that are renting.

More recently, in United Tenants' increased communication and collaborative efforts with our buildings department and our corporation counsel, have I been shocked by the overlap between the addresses on my caseload and property owners' material non-compliance with housing codes.

For far too many rental-property addresses that I read on violation lists or in codes court calendars, a family's lived nightmare of a housing situation comes to mind for me.

There is rain -- in people's bathrooms it's raining.

Ceilings are falling down.

There's lead paint, mold, rot, floors collapsing, boilers exploding, mice and rats and bedbugs every single day, CO2 leaks, no egress in people's apartments.

I can tell you one of my client's stories, but I've decided, instead, that I'll just tell my own.

I had insufficient heat in my apartment for two winters.

When I say "insufficient," half of my apartment hovered around 40 degrees.

I would get ready for work in the morning, walk down to court to help people dealing with the exact same issues that I was having, and my feet would ache so badly, and I wouldn't be able to really get warm until the morning was about done.

I had cut a substantial part of my index finger off at a job and had it sewn back on in Tennessee where I'm from.

I tell you this because the cold is pretty unbearable if you've had a laceration and sustained nerve damage.

Being home in the winter was awful.

I had squirrels living in my ceiling, digging holes into my dropped-ceiling panel.

I had a toilet that was like an ancient artifact, and the water would well up in it while I was at work or while I was asleep, and, you know, fill my bathroom floor, flood it.

I talked to my landlord about it, and he'd stop by.

He'd agree that it was mighty cold. He would jump at the amount of ceiling debris coming down.

He was obviously disturbed by the amount of damage sustained by my bathroom floor, and he would agree that it needed to be addressed.

I'll just say that nothing was ever done about this until he sold the building.

And in the roulette that a building sale is for a tenant, the buyer that came in, and he fixed it all. He still hasn't raised the rent.

God bless him.

But let me tell you what would have happened had I called code enforcement, and what, by the law, and the system as it stands now, you know, how it really would have gone.

Code enforcement would have issued an unsafe/unfit order due to the lack of heat, rendering me displaced.

At the moment now, the landlord is given

30 days to address that issue.

Maybe they'd give him an extension he'd probably be entitled to if he hadn't offended previously.

If he had a residential occupancy permit, or "ROPs," like we've talked about, it wouldn't be revoked. The law doesn't really allow for that right now.

The time would go by, and if I hadn't cut my losses yet and followed up, they might inspect again.

If nothing happened and no action was taken by the landlord, hopefully, the case would go to court, but a lot of them really don't.

At no point do I have the right to take my landlord to court to enforce my rights under our contract, where he's to provide me a habitable home.

But don't worry, he's lost none of his power to give me a 30-day notice.

He'll file for holdover, and maybe I'll claim retaliation.

I pay my rent early every month.

He'll say anything at all to rebut that presumption, and I'll be homeless, or, I could go the route of holding back my rent.

My landlord will then have the right to sue me for non-payment of that rent.

And if I'm given maybe a 15 percent rent abatement, the amount of attorney's fees that he's going to be granted for having sued me are going to outweigh whatever abatement I might win.

In the four years that I've been at United Tenants, not one of my clients has won a retaliatory-eviction case.

I can't ask for a rent abatement in a holdover proceeding. And if I ask for an injunction or an order for repairs by the court, I'll be completely ignored.

That's the story of my hypothetical call to code enforcement had I gone that route.

The code-enforcement process, as it exists now, is an underfunded, haphazard, systematically ineffective means for dealing with the exploitation by landlords of our decaying housing stock in our population that, in Albany, is 60 percent renters who face disproportionate levels of poverty.

Where code-enforcement cases do move forward, the repeat-offender landlords in Albany clearly see this process as a negligible cost of doing business.

United Tenants informs thousands of tenants

every year about their right to access the code-enforcement system, which was put in place, in part, to protect us from the very serious impacts that code violations in housing can have on our physical and mental health.

They find, again and again, that the system fails us.

The system fails to deliver a true sense of accountability to the entity in violation as any effective enforcement process ought to do.

Today, nearly 50 years have passed since United Tenants formed to respond to poor housing conditions in Albany.

Our work has not decreased.

As representatives of our communities, we hope you will do your part in implementing necessary measures to address issues with code enforcement.

For us to achieve what I hope is a universal goal of ours, to have fair and stable neighborhoods, a person's right to a safe, decent place to call "home" must be held as more sacred than one's right to own and to profit off property.

To own property in our neighborhoods ought to be seen as a privilege where exists a level of standards, not a source of exploitative and easy

profit.

We need a code-enforcement system that imposes real penalties, one that effectively discourages repeat offenses, and one that ultimately addresses the fruitful business model that is disinvestment rental-property ownership.

Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Kavanagh.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'll be brief again,
because we have -- we're running a little behind
schedule, and we have many witnesses, and, also,
because I've had the opportunity here, this is two
days in a row, I've heard -- had the opportunity to
hear your testimony.

But just, can you -- I mean, as -- as has been discussed, the purpose of this hearing is to review the system, from the moment there is a problem in the department, through adjudication and, you know, court determinations, and, hopefully, ultimately, through actually address -- you know, addressing the physical problem on the ground in the apartments.

Just -- but you talk -- you talked particularly about the court process and the eviction process.

Can you just -- are there -- from your experience in court, are there particular rem -- judicial -- legislative remedies that we could -- that you would suggest to strengthen the rights of tenants in the -- in the -- in those processes?

LAURA FELTS: Yeah, the tenants need to have the right to take action. We shouldn't always have to be on the defensive side of things.

The nature of the process now lends itself so that there's always a warrant of eviction on the table that is threatening a tenant who tries to assert their right to a decent place to live.

In Upstate New York, the only power that you have is to either hold back your rent and try to defend yourself in a courtroom where there's standing room only, where the judges are just having to hear the cases, honestly, as quickly as they can. You really can't blame them at a certain point.

But, if you're on the defensive side and the burden of proof is immensely on you to prove how your housing is falling down around you, you're just not going to have a good outcome.

All we have right now is the capacity to maybe file a small claim to sue for out-of-pocket loss if we have code violations, and that's not

meaningful.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And in terms -- so we would -- you -- you would suggest we create a sort of separate right of action that does not hinge on -- that is not a sort of defensive action in response to a landlord either trying to evict or to claim -- to claim non-paid rent?

LAURA FELTS: I think that the way that it exists now, the landlord has the right to enforce their side of the contract through the courts.

They can say, you failed to pay me, or you violated your contract, you're a nuisance, and I can sue you.

But if I'm a tenant and my side of the contract gets violated by the landlord, there's nothing that can I do about it. The court's not there for me.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

I just want -- from prior testimony,

I understand that you don't believe that this is a sufficient remedy, but do you believe that some of these phenomena that you're talking about today are -- would be a good basis for at least the beginning of moving forward with a just -- with a good-cause-eviction standard, which you know is a

legislative process -- a legislative proposal we
have before us?

LAURA FELTS: I think that, last night, Ellen from Legal Aid put it perfectly, that a rebuttal presumption is a -- it's a problem.

It takes a lot of the muscle out of our protections, and it causes us, again, to be so unbelievably defensive, that we just have an uphill battle before us with every single case.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Krueger.

SENATOR KRUEGER: No, I didn't have any questions.

I wanted to thank Laura for testifying again.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Biaggi.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

I think, actually, Senator Kavanagh touched on the bulk of my questions.

And I just want to say that I'm sorry for what you have had to live through.

This is a terrible scenario, and so many individuals are living through that too, which is why we're here today, and also why we take this incredibly seriously.

One thing I want to touch on, you mentioned,

and I don't remember the name of the specific technique, but you said that, when, oftentimes, you go to court and the judge will not issue certain orders in favor of tenants.

What were those orders again?

LAURA FELTS: Something that happened when they passed that Unified City Court Act, it gave the court the power to issue injunctive relief.

So a tenant could actually ask City Court to order that a repair be made.

So that's something that United Tenants has tried and tried to really make a regular part of the court process, where, again, tenants can enforce their rights under their same contract.

But we're just not seeing it happen no matter how much we ask.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Is it because they refused?

Is there discretion with this specific technique?

LAURA FELTS: I'm not an attorney, so I don't really understand why it's not happening.

I can just tell you that it's really not.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay, that's very helpful.

And just, lastly, has the warrant (sic) of habitability been used in court as a -- something

against the landlords as a breach of this specific tenet of the law?

LAURA FELTS: Yes, we talk about it every single day in court.

We've -- we've been working on a project to demystify the process of raising the warranty-of-habitability issues, but the problem is that, intrinsic to raising that, is that it's a defense.

So where your landlord has brought the case against you, and you've had to sign a contract that agreed to pay their attorney's fees, you are going to pay more in their legal fees than you're ever going to get in a rent abatement.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: So you're saying that it's a defense that the tenant can use against the landlord, in this specific instance, and so, therefore, the burden of proof, obviously, is on the tenant to prove that there's -- that there's a breach, which is what we've kind of gone through.

Okay, that's terrible.

Thank you very much.

LAURA FELTS: Yeah, thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thanks very much for your testimony.

Next up will be Gordon Wren, retired firefighter, and representing the Citizens United to Protect Our Neighborhoods, otherwise known as "CUPON," from Rockland County.

Thank you.

GORDON WREN: And thank you, Senators Skoufis and Kavanagh, for conducting these investigations and holding this hearing. They are desperately needed.

This area of government is deadly serious.

And, having been a firefighter in Rockland County for 53 years, and a former chief, and fire coordinator, and director of emergency services, I've responded to tens of thousands of calls, and I've seen the dead bodies.

It's -- so it's not impossible, you know, something that might take place, a remote scenario.

I've seen people die in legal buildings where everything met code.

And the conditions that we have people living in in Rockland County are deplorable in many cases.

So, as you started your comments by saying that county executives from around the state are asking you for a -- to be investigated, we reached out to the State of New York several times over many

years, and we weren't getting the cooperation we expected. So we reached out to some of our state representatives, particularly Assemblyman Zebrowski.

And I'm not sure if it's a good thing that
I'm following him, because I agree with every single
comment he made in his testimony, and the way he
answered the questions.

He has been responsive, as have our other representatives.

But, despite our efforts, the conditions still exist, they're expanding to other municipalities, and it's become a major issue in our county.

So, somewhere in the '90s I started to get approached by the Ramapo fire chiefs who were very dissatisfied with the fact that they felt they were being ignored.

And they're -- when you get -- when you have a major emergency, it's common to reach out to other agencies, you know, Hazmat, DEC, et cetera, and it's very routine to call for a building inspector or a fire inspector. Then you expect it to be taken care of.

And then we go back for additional calls and find the same condition exists in months or years

later.

At one point I suggested that they get together and they all write a letter.

So there are eight fire departments in the town of Ramapo, all eight chiefs signed the letter, sent it to the Town. Got zero response back.

Waited a while, sent a second letter.

Didn't get a response back.

They did it a third time.

Then we decided to discuss it on the radio, and they did get some responses back, but, still, they have not been responsive to the needs of the volunteer firefighters and the fire departments that supply fire protection to the town and its villages.

So we took a different approach.

We formed the Illegal Housing Task Force, and the premise was to investigate each town, not just Ramapo and its villages, every town and village in Rockland County.

So here's how we did it:

We reached out to the media, and we asked people, like, you know, terrorism, "see something, say something," if you see something in your neighborhood or you're aware of a building that may be occupied illegally or is being converted

illegally, call this number, we'll keep the information confidential.

And the results were rather telling.

In some communities, everything went well.

The inspectors were well trained. They were dedicated, they responded appropriately, and they took action.

When it went to court, the Village or Town attorney, the municipal attorney, functioning as a prosecutor, they were aggressive. They showed compassion when it was needed, when it was an innocent mistake.

But, for some landlords, they really hit them hard.

And for contractors that work illegally, using unlicensed contractors, and things of that nature, they'd come down really hard on them.

In the Haverstraw area we had a Village attorney who asked for a \$10,000 fine for a slum landlord.

The judge said, No. You've been here before, 20,000.

That's a deterrent.

In the town of Ramapo and five of its villages, that deterrent does not exist, and this

has been going on for years.

And I don't want to be redundant.

Assemblyman Zebrowski talked about 250- to 500-dollar civil compromises.

They don't work, they're not effective, especially with property that generates revenue.

We have court observers. They're volunteers, they're part of the Illegal Housing Task Force, that attend the court hearings.

And they've been going to Ramapos for 10 years now, and we have not seen any improvement. It's gotten worse.

Recently, we had a dormitory, your chief investigator was at the first hearing, the Monsey Fire Department responded to a call. They found four rooms occupied by six students in each room in overcrowded conditions. Numerous violations were issued by the inspector.

And, they were in court last week, and it was disposed of with a -- an adjournment in contemplation of dismissal; no fine, no penalty, an agreement that they'd let the inspectors come back in six months.

That's not a deterrent, and it encourages other people to do it.

Now, if the fire department hadn't gone there, there would be no knowledge that this building is being utilized in a hazardous fashion.

And, suppose we had a fire in there. The fire department would have no knowledge that you have 24 young men living in a cellar.

So -- and it didn't have all the safety things it required.

So, that's just an example. I'm using it because it's recent.

It's not unusual, it's unique. It's what's happening in the town, and happening right now.

And your senior investigator was in the court -- in the original court hearing.

So, when we found that the -- we watched how cases lingered and there were no major fines,

I didn't see any trials, we reached out to the

State of New York, several agencies. And those would include New York State Codes, New York State Ed, DOT, PESH, secretary of state.

Met with Deputy Secretary of State

Mark Patterson. Very little cooperation, or at least results.

Initially, State codes asked us for a list of buildings we felt that were not where the state fire

and building codes were not being enforced. 1 So we gave them a list. 2 They came down, they did field trips with us. 3 So the commissioner, the deputy commissioner, 4 an architect, an engineer, from State codes came 5 6 down, spent a lot time, met with the Town. 7 At one point they even laughed. You know, we gave them schools. 8 9 They said, You're just seeing the bad schools that the Illegal Housing Task Force gave you. We're 10 11 going to take you out to some of the good schools. 12 And they called me and said, they were full 13 of violations. These were the ones they were 14 bragging about. 15 And that's how bad it is. 16 So to make a long story short: 17 They sent threatening letters. They conducted investigations. 18 19 Eventually, they wrote reports. 20 Eventually, they did assign the monitors. 21 And, unfortunately, the monitors, the system 22 did not work. 23 There was no communication with us, or very 24 little.

They treated us like we were the enemy for

25

having the audacity to actually complain about the system being dysfunctional.

The monitor assigned to Spring Valley I've never met. Never spoke to him. I heard some good things about him.

The monitor for Ramapo, I've known her for many years. She's a knowledgeable architect, one of the most knowledgeable code officials, in the state.

I like her, known her for years.

I'm still puzzled by the response.

You know, so, it was a dismal failure.

Now, Assemblywoman Jaffee arranged for a meeting last October in Albany, where we went up and we met with the current commissioner of codes, and he listened to our concerns.

This -- we went up with CUPON and the Illegal Housing Task Force members, and we explained to them, in quite a bit of detail, how the system is still not working, the violations are, you know, serious and numerous and egregious.

And he said, Can you send us a list?

And I have done this three different times with, you know, code officials.

So when we got back, I said, Why don't we just send the same list we sent them five years ago,

because most of those buildings, despite actually taking the commissioner there with his deputy and his staff, the violations still continued.

News 4, the I-Team, did a series two weeks ago, and one of them showed a trailer with little kids in deplorable conditions.

I took the commissioner there, showed him that, and we filed complaint after complaint.

Five years later, it's still there, dangerous conditions.

So, the response we got back from the State codes department was, we met with them in late October and December, and they decided that Ramapo meets the minimum requirements, and they pulled the monitor from the town of Ramapo.

Makes no sense.

Things are not better.

There may be some progress, a little bit here and there.

We don't see it in the courts.

We don't see it out in the field where it really matters; that's where the rubber meets the road.

We have thousands of people living in substandard housing and extremely dangerous

conditions, and I'll give you a few of those examples.

And, also, around this time, we formed a group called Citizens United to Protect Our Neighborhoods.

We used legal action to sue the Town and the developers when they absolutely refused to follow proper guidelines, and they approved things that are detrimental to the general public and the community as a whole. And they've been very successful.

And, by the way, just -- here's an example of how things have been working with the State agencies.

One of our first challenges was a school that was going to -- for 750 students, that was going to be built on a residential -- former residential lot.

It was six stories in height, and there was -- because it's so tight for space, the playground was going to be on the roof of the six-story building. And it was on a busy state highway at a busy intersection.

So we hired a -- CUPON hired a consultant, who did a report, showed all kinds of improprieties.

So then I got funding from the local fire department to take legal action against the Town and

this developer.

While we were preparing, I reached out to DOT, and I asked the engineer for that area, Did you approve a road opening for this school on this busy state highway at this intersection?

He said, No, but I'm getting really tremendous pressure from my bosses in Poughkeepsie, who are getting pressure from their bosses in Albany.

So he said, I'm going to have to approve this. I've only been on the job a couple of years. You know, I'm worried about my (indicating).

So I said, Would a letter from the fire chief help?

He said yes.

However, then I was approached by the developer, who -- a friend of mine I've known for many years, and he said, You're going to sue us, you'll probably win. And even if you don't -- you'll probably win. But if you don't win, you'll tie us up for a couple of years or more, and we can't wait.

So this project is still a vacant field right now, three years, four years later.

So CUPON is very good -- is a great

organization, but why should local residents in a high-taxed area have to take -- generate revenue with fundraisers to sue, take legal action, against our own government?

It's just wrong. Something is just sinister about it. It's just wrong.

So, despite our requests from the State and from the local municipalities, and we've utilized the media, television, newspapers, radio, social media, and, generally, that works with public officials, elected officials, when you put the spotlight on through the media, they scurry to make things better.

Here, they doubled-down.

It's absolute hubris. They don't care.

They really -- I got -- I think they do not care, or they would respond.

Here's an example, and I'm sure some of the speakers that are going to follow me are going to say how great things are and how much improvement has been made.

In -- April 26, 2013, I personally received a complaint about a house that had been formerly occupied by -- a one-family house.

They torn it down and got approval to build

two-families, one on each side with a fire wall.

The original complaint, in 2013, was a two-family -- legal two-family house is now an apartment house. Numerous cars in the commercial parking lot.

So I filed the complaint with the Town through the Illegal Housing Task Force.

Two years later, no response. I heard nothing from the Town.

Got another complaint, April of 2015.

So I write to the Town.

Got a second complaint: All or part of the two buildings may be used as a rooming house.

We have no record of response from the Town of Ramapo.

No response.

July of that year, July 2015, got another complaint, which we also sent to the Rockland County Health Department through the housing division.

And then, coincidentally, the day after

I filed, I was in my emergency services vehicle, and

I heard the EMS and policeman dispatched for an

injury in this building, coincidentally.

So I went. I didn't go inside, but I asked the police and the paramedics to tell me what they

saw.

And they saw rooming-house conditions.

Locked doors. Every bedroom door had a separate lock on it. Said, all the things you would see.

Seven satellite dishes on the roof.

So I forwarded that information to the Town, and -- oh, by the way, I had 14 different requests -- I filed 14 different complaints or requests for updates during -- from 19 -- from 2013 till 2019.

And, eventually, one of the inspectors got back to me in 2016, September of 2016, saying, They haven't been able to get to it. It's on the list.

In December of 2016, I spoke to one of the inspectors who said they finally got in.

This is December of '16.

They issued a summons for local justice court, it is a rooming house. And the owner is supposedly evicting the tenants.

So that was three years after the original complaint.

My problem is, the -- it didn't work.

The building continued to be occupied illegally.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: If I may interrupt, I know

that there are a lot of questions that people have of you, and we're a little behind.

So if you can just wrap up your testimony, and then we can continue with questions.

GORDON WREN: To make a long story short,

I believe they were fined, as Assemblyman Zebrowski
described, 250 or 500 dollars.

I went in the building in 2019, with the fire department, partially. And, in one section we found five couples, with an assortment of children, all living in what used to be a one-family unit.

More people living in the basement.

On the other side there's an open door.

There was a young woman living there with a child, renting a small room for \$600 cash per month.

And the rest of the building, I believe, was occupied and dangerous.

And here it is, 2019, 6-plus years, and the building is still illegally occupied.

And there are numerous other cases, where a school opens up in a house.

The neighbors complain, that they had no idea it was a school.

School buses start pulling in the first day of school.

They file a complaint with the Town.

The Town, a month later, issues them a temporary permit for one year, to bring in, trailers, used trailers, for classrooms.

Here it is 2019.

That school is still in operation, and it has spread, from the one-family house and the trailers, they bought additional houses, and they're using it for a school. It's like a campus.

Down the road, the group buys three homes in a row, several years ago. Put gigantic tents in the backyard like you have for weddings, that they use.

Nothing. No enforcement by the Town.

They're so confident nothing is going to happen to them, because there's no deterrent, they buy two properties across the street and occupy them illegally, without a safe plan, without approvals, without building permits.

And I could go on and on.

I think that -- let me cut things short:

We have volunteers fighting with people in government.

They're getting paid to do their jobs.

They're not doing their jobs. The State has been woefully inadequate.

And one of the -- the outgoing commissioner from State codes said to me:

"You've been a pain in our asses, but,

I admire your tenacity. I admire what you're doing.

Keep doing it.

"Our department is charged with protecting the safety of the residents of New York State, and we're being prevented from doing it."

That is a powerful statement.

"We're being prevented from doing our jobs" which -- involving safety.

(Indiscernible) bureaucrat or political.

I say to the Governor and secretary of state:
Turn your employees loose.

Let your commissioners and their -- your departments do their jobs.

We need some new laws, but if you just enforce laws on the books, we wouldn't be having this hearing.

It's really irresponsible on the highest levels of state government, and right down to the poor little person, the little kids with their parents who are desperate and they're living in these rooming houses and cellars and basements and attics and sheds and garages.

And I had plenty more to cover, but I've made my points.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much.

GORDON WREN: And thank you for the hearing.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And I can tell -- thank you very much for your assistance and cooperation over these past many months, as well as your testimony here.

And I can tell you, one of the motivations of this investigation has been that, look, you know, you have men and women who put on a uniform every single day, they say goodbye to their family, and their families don't necessarily know that they're coming back home, by virtue of the dangers associated with their job.

And to the extent that we as government can provide as safe a work environment, or a volunteer environment for volunteer firefighters, is possible, we ought to be doing that.

And I know that, time after time, there have been examples of firefighters running into smoke-filled homes that, you know, are illegal homes, and they're bumping into walls that should not be there, and putting those firefighters' lives at risk.

And so I appreciate your service as a firefighter for over 50 years, as well as your continued advocacy.

You had -- at the end of your testimony you had quoted or paraphrased the former commissioner of codes, saying, that, We're prevented from doing our job.

What do you think he meant by that; prevented by, who?

GORDON WREN: Well, I asked that.

And the first time I heard it was in 2003 when Roy Scott, who was the commissioner before him, said that, We're being prevented by the Second Floor.

I didn't know what the "Second Floor" meant.

And I found out it was the Governor's Office, apparently.

That's how it's referred to in state government, "Second Floor."

And this commissioner wasn't the only one who told me that.

Other department heads have told me the same thing, that they are being prevented from doing their jobs.

I have had commissioners apologize to me, and

say, I -- I -- and we know you're right, but we're being prevented.

The attorneys for the secretary of state's

The attorneys for the secretary of state's office have told us, We can't go into this community. We can't do -- we can't take action.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Can you give me a synopsis, in your professional opinion, of the monitor's work?

What did you see the monitor doing?

Do you believe that she was well-intentioned, that her work was adequate?

It certainly sounds like you believe that she was removed prematurely, but can you speak beyond that?

GORDON WREN: She's a friend; however, the only time she really spoke to me this whole time that she was there as a monitor was on the local radio station.

I or someone else on the radio said, We believe she's drinking Ramapo's Kool-Aid.

And she was very angry about that statement that was made on the radio.

And I didn't tie it, and she had red lipstick, and I said, "It looks like you're drinking cherry today."

So, that was my, pretty much, only

interaction with her as a monitor.

And I find that strange, since we're the ones out in the field seeing this and filing the complaints.

And, by the way, I'm going to add, there was a group of women in the state education department, I call them "women of valor."

There was one women who was in charge, and they came out in the field, found deplorable conditions in our private schools, really bad conditions.

Took photographs, took them back, and they actually got in trouble for this.

Our district attorney at the time had to go to bat for this woman to make sure she didn't get fired.

And they have a codes expert, he's an architect. He agreed, but wouldn't come forward.

And we're still -- the State of New York is still subsidizing schools that have dangerous conditions in them.

It's deplorable.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: So as you're aware, you know, you don't have to look very far back to see this issue in the news in Rockland County.

In today's "Journal News," the story of two young girls nearly drowning, they had to be resuscitated, because they, I guess, fell into a pool, or somehow wound up in a pool, that did not have a locked gate.

And, subsequently, there were violations issued for that item, and for a couple of others.

Do you believe something like that could have been prevented; and if so, how?

GORDON WREN: When it comes to one-family homes, it's very -- you know, you have your right to privacy.

One -- the codes are very, and the Constitution is very, mindful of right to privacy.

So that's really tough.

I can't -- I'm not going to say I'm going to defend the Town, but it's very hard to get into a one-family house.

In this case, apparently, there is a history on this property. And maybe a reinspection probably would have been in order.

And I understand there may have been someone living, or had lived, in the cabana associated with the pool and the basement of the building.

So that area of the town and the village of

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Spring Valley, it's very close together, it's rampant.

When we have a fire in the building that's legal, we'll say, wow, look at this. We had a -- we had -- have an incident in a legal, code-conforming building, because the -- almost every -- in some neighborhoods, almost every building is illegal; illegally converted, illegally occupied.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: My final question is, you know, if there's one or two things that you believe after today that we should be doing, legislatively or otherwise, what, in your professional opinion, would those one or two items be?

GORDON WREN: Well, I think we do need some additional legislation.

But I think, what I said a few minutes ago, there is a -- I don't know if it's organized, but, the -- your departments are being -- and I can't tell you how many commissioners have told me this, over and over -- they're being told they can't do their jobs.

Turn them loose.

Let them use their good judgment and their training, and let them do what's right.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

Senator Carlucci. 1 2 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Thank you. Well, Mr. Wren, thank you for testifying here 3 today, and thank you for your commitment to our 4 5 community, and all the work that you've been doing 6 over the years. 7 I know it hasn't been easy, and thank you for your persistence. 8 9 So a few things. I know there's a lot we can talk about today, 10 11 but I'll try to keep it as brief as possible. 12 We talk about the -- to just enforce the 13 laws, but we also talk about this "minimum standard." 14 15 And it seems very concerning to me, this 16 bare-minimum standard, seems like a situation where 17 I wouldn't want my family to be living in these minimum standards. 18 19 Are there ways that you think we could 20 improve that standard? 21 GORDON WREN: Yes. 22 And I don't -- I think -- we're not meeting 23 the bare-minimum standard in many cases. 24 That's what -- we wouldn't be complaining as

much or as vehemently if we were meeting the minimum

25

standards. 1 SENATOR CARLUCCI: No, but, however, in the 2 monitor's report in -- the end of last year, they're 3 saying that they met the minimum standard. 4 Are you saying that is not true? 5 GORDON WREN: It is not true. 6 7 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. GORDON WREN: They're not meeting minimum 8 standard. 9 I mean, if that's a minimum standard, we need 10 11 to raise the bar significantly. 12 I mean, that's absolutely -- and --(indiscernible) more of the State codes division. 13 14 SENATOR CARLUCCI: So there's two things I'm 15 just trying figure out. 16 So, it's possible that they're meeting the 17 minimum standard, but we're saying that that minimum standard needs to be increased? 18 Or, are you saying, you think that they just 19 20 did not meet the standard? 21 GORDON WREN: I think they are meeting it in 22 certain areas. 23 A lot of buildings meet code, but their

enforcement is so poor because there's no deterrent.

You need to have a hammer.

24

25

You know, you need to show compassion when it's called for.

But, for slum landlords who put people in danger, and contractors who do illegal things, and then people who use political influence to get things done, that's the root of the problem.

You know, politics and safety -- public safety don't go together, and that's, like, my opinion what's happening here.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Now, there have been a few innovative programs that you've been involved in with the apartment registry we now have in Rockland County, and the Rockland Code Initiative.

GORDON WREN: That's the success (indiscernible cross-talking) --

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And if you could talk about that, yeah.

GORDON WREN: I think you're going to hear from the folks that run that program, and it's a success.

Our county executive expanded on the housing program that the health department does.

And, now, they don't -- some of the -- the sanitary code over -- you know, overlaps some of the State code requirements, but, they're dealing with

health-related issues.

So, the example I gave a little while ago about the -- over six years, the health department went in and they found they had smoke detectors and CO detectors and access, you know, for getting out.

So they could -- and they can't do anything about the building being occupied without a C of O.

So, I think it's a success, but we have so much more to do.

It's a success, but this is one successful part.

And then the slum landlords find a way to get around it. They form condominiums.

So instead of rental units, they're forming condominiums where the rental-registry law wouldn't apply. So they're calling everything "a condominium."

So it's like a chess game.

Check. Check.

We need to find -- get some checkmates.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: When we talk about the monitor, I know, when we first were -- we were able to get the monitor down, we were excited about it.

Now the monitor left. They made their notice that they were leaving before they issued the

report.

What would be some of the concrete things that you would ask for to get the monitor to return, and then what would be in place?

What are the concrete steps that you think need to be taken so that, most importantly, I think that we reverse the culture and that we feel safe in the community.

What are some of the recommendations that you have, from your experience?

GORDON WREN: Well, we keep coming back to deterrent.

If we had an adequate deterrent, it would give -- because this is all about money.

The word is out, in my opinion, that you can occupy a building without going to the Town and getting the proper approvals.

In fact, I had an individual brag to me -I was with the health department. They
thought it was with the health department too.

-- and they said, If we went through the proper process, hiring an engineer for site plan, and plans, it would cost us hundreds of thousands of dollars. We just moved in, formed a dormitory, brought in 10 trailers, started a school. Our

revenue, you know, is coming in. And then, when we get caught, if we get caught, you get fined a few hundred dollars.

It's a good business decision for them to do.

We need to change that culture, that, beg for forgiveness after the fact and get hit with not even a slap on the wrist.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: In terms of recommendations on the structure of how the monitor actually functions with the Illegal Task Force, with the community, with elected officials, do you have recommendations for that?

GORDON WREN: Well, we should be allies, not enemies, and we should not be treated like we are the opposition.

We should be part of the solution.

And there has been no -- very little communication between stakeholders, let alone the monitors.

The monitors are told, we're not -- they're not allowed to even talk to us, really. They're not supposed to interact with us.

So they're supposed to be there to monitor.

But the example that Assemblyman Zebrowski gave about that fire hydrant, that was a sham.

They used -- they ran some firehose across
the road into a plastic, makeshift, fake hydrant.

When we turned the water on to it, it blew out of ground.

And that was just part of the problem there.

That was absolutely disgraceful.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Chairman.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Krueger.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.

So I'm from New York City, and people think maybe I won't understand things that go on outside of the city.

And so, just for the record, my husband's worked with the FDNY for 35 years, and so we talk a lot about fire and fire safety.

And he points out to me that, even in the city of New York, when you look at the cause of fires in one-, two-, and three-family homes, which is much more the reality in this part of the state, faulty wiring over makeshift, overutilization of old wiring; space heaters when inadequate heating systems for the houses; and these translate in my city to huge fires.

I'm assuming, for all the things you

presented today, you'll verify for me now that these actually are causing fires that put, as

Senator Skoufis pointed out, not only the firefighters and emergency responders at risk, these cause death and destruction for people who end up living in these homes.

Am I wrong about this reality?

GORDON WREN: No, you're right on target.

In fact, your husband has probably seen it all.

One of the reasons why we formed the Illegal Housing Task Force is, the fire called "Black Sunday," where firefighters had to jump out of the five-story building because the building had been illegally converted, and they couldn't get to the fire escape or -- to be rescued.

So we take it very seriously.

And then one of the points I was going to make in my presentation, that when these buildings are converted illegally, they hire contractors who are not licensed contractors, frequently. There's no sides on their trucks. They don't put an announcement sign on the front of the building.

And then they'll pick up people on a state road by the McDonald's to work for them, for 20 or

25 dollars an hour, cash.

And they didn't go through an apprenticeship.

They're doing electrical work, which is covered by sheetrock.

It's not inspected, we don't know if it meets code.

And in most municipalities, when that work is discovered, which doesn't happen in Ramapo very much, they'd say: Take everything out. Everything you did without a permit, tear it all out. All that electrical, plumbing, gas lines, insulation, take it all out, throw it into a dumpster. And, either put it back to its original condition or get a permit.

That's what should be done.

That's what the Town of Clarkstown does.

We even had a seminar to show how Clarkstown does it.

Because that's a penalty that doesn't show on the record.

They'll fine them tens of thousands of dollars.

All that work that they did with the illegal contractor, and then to have to take it out, plus legal fees, it can be a very expensive mistake when you get caught in the town of Clarkstown.

That's the message that Ramapo and five of 1 its villages should be sending, but they're not. 2 3 So, very good question, and that's how it's being done. 4 We talked to some of these workers, and they 5 don't even know where their yard is -- where the 6 7 construction yard is for the contractor. They just get picked up, and the materials 8 are on the job, and that's how it works. 9 So, we've got some work to do with our office 10 11 12

of consumer protection to go after them too.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Biaggi.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you very much for your candid testimony.

I think that you took a light and you shined it in a very dark area, and I think that that is incredibly appreciated by all of us here.

I want to go back again to the comment that you made about -- from the former commissioner, which is that, quote, We are prevented from doing our jobs.

Can you just again repeat how they were prevented from doing their jobs, or by whom were

they prevented from doing their jobs? 1 2 GORDON WREN: The same statement pretty much apply. They're all different. 3 But, with State codes, state ed, PESH. 4 The example I gave, the DOT, with that 5 engineer, he said he knew it was inappropriate. 6 This is a busy -- a bad intersection. 7 The traffic would back up during rush hour 8 every morning and every afternoon. 9 And he felt it was improper to issue -- have 10 11 a road opening on that state highway for buses and 12 parents and, you know, faculty. 13 So he didn't want to approve it. 14 So his bosses in Poughkeepsie -- his bosses 15 locally, and in Poughkeepsie, and in Albany, were 16 pressuring him to approve this project. Why would they do that? 17 18 Why would you go against an engineer, a PA? 19 Why would he do something -- why should he be 20 forced to do something? 21 And he said, "Oh, I've only been on the job 22 two years, " sort of like, he's worried about keeping 23 his job.

And I had a commissioner almost -- I couldn't

tell, I was on the phone, she sounded like she was

24

25

crying. 1 She said, "I am involved in the fire service, 2 and I know this is wrong, but I need this job." 3 SENATOR BIAGGI: So -- so -- okay. 4 5 So just drawing the link. 6 So the -- you mentioned several State 7 agencies, right, who were overseeing the process. And so they, presumably, were the ones 8 preventing the commissioner from being able to 9 enforce that commissioner's power, right, to the 10 full extent of the law. 11 Who do you think is responsible for that 12 13 commissioner's power being granted? 14 GORDON WREN: Secretary of state and State 15 codes and PESH and the governor of the state of 16 New York. SENATOR BIAGGI: Uh-huh. 17 18 So --GORDON WREN: The woman I described -- the 19 20 women I described from state ed, they uncovered some 21 really, really bad stuff. 22 SENATOR BIAGGI: Uh-huh. 23 What -- what -- can you define "bad stuff"?

GORDON WREN: Bathrooms that had been put

into a one-family house in the town of Ramapo, with,

24

25

I mean, urinals, toilets, without permits, and they were leaking. And they -- the products of the toilets and the urinals were leaking, and -- into a classroom. And they tied plastic bags around the leak, which was full of liquid, and it was spilling onto children's decks.

She took photographs of that, of those conditions, along with many, many, many other violations, hundreds of violations. Gave them to her bosses. And she was almost fired.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Well, presumably, that would not be a fireable offense, but -- and I'm kind of shocked by that.

But, fired for what, do you think?

GORDON WREN: For doing -- it was more complicated.

They were looking at the nutrition program, where they were getting, you know, 6 or 7 dollars per day, per child, for nutrition, for lunch, for food.

And I was happened to be -- I was there -- I was there with them when the food was delivered.

And the food consisted of a 6-ounce bottle of water and spiral noodles, with, each kid got a ladle of diced carrots and peas in that salty brine.

And that's they're lunch.

That wasn't -- the six or seven, whatever amount was they were getting, that's not the kind of lunch you're -- they're paying for.

Where's that money going?

SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. So --

GORDON WREN: Those are the type of things they were looking at.

And they were told, basically, back off.

And this -- it's just wrong.

They were very brave to come forward and give a blunt report.

And it was a lot more complicated, a lot more violations.

SENATOR BIAGGI: So just -- so just going back to the, I think, original undertone, and then I will just close this out:

So, it's very clear, right, that a lack of code enforcement can lead to death, and deaths, and that people have died as a result of the failure to enforce the building codes.

And that the State agencies are the ones who are overseeing the process in the municipalities?

GORDON WREN: If the cities, towns, and villages are unable or unwilling to do it, the State

should have enough oversight in all these different areas to come in and force them to do their jobs.

SENATOR BIAGGI: And is it -- is it your opinion, just from your experience, that the State has been negligent in the oversight, or has refused to have oversight?

GORDON WREN: Yes. Or partial.

They'll do -- I think State codes initially did a good job. They wrote great reports, but then nothing happened.

And then Senator Zebrowski wrote a -- after a fire we had New Year's Day, I don't know what year it was, 2016, in one of the buildings we had complained about to the State, we had a, you know, dramatic fire. It was close-quarters, the building was occupied.

He wrote a really blasting letter to the State codes commissioner. And then they -- I think, they took more action, but, it's still not enough.

If the end result is the condition --SENATOR BIAGGI: Right.

So I think I'm just -- I'm just trying to draw a line here.

So the State is given -- the State agencies have the power, of course, from the executive.

1 And so the executive, perhaps, would you 2 suggest that they look at their oversight of the agencies, and perhaps give them more power to 3 oversee or fulfill their duties so that deaths are 4 5 prevented? 6 GORDON WREN: Yes, I think they could use 7 more power, in some instances. But just let them use the power they do have now. 8 9 SENATOR BIAGGI: Right. So do you think that the lack of the ability 10 11 for these agencies to use their power is the cause 12 of deaths? 13 GORDON WREN: I'm trying -- that's a --14 that's a -- if I answer that question yes, I'd 15 better come up with some examples. I'd have to 16 think about it. 17 SENATOR BIAGGI: Could you draw an inference, 18 perhaps? GORDON WREN: Yes. 19 20 If not --21 SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you. 22 GORDON WREN: If not, it will. 23 SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you. 24 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you, Mr. Wren.

GORDON WREN: Thank you.

25

1 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Next we'll hear from the Orange County Landlord Association. 2 I believe we have Michael Acevedo; right? 3 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: That's me. 4 SENATOR SKOUFIS: And, Rafael Rivera; is that 5 6 right? 7 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Correct. 8 RAFAEL RIVERA: Correct. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 9 10 If you can both please raise your right hand. 11 Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the 12 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, 13 so help you God? MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I do. 14 15 RAFAEL RIVERA: I do. 16 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 17 Please proceed. MICHAEL ACEVEDO: 18 Okay. 19 My name is Michael Acevedo. 20 I'm a landlord. I've been a landlord for 21 43-plus years. 22 And I have some issues that I -- I think is 23 total opposite of what you want to hear, to be 24 honest with you, but at the end I will explain some 25 things.

I've seen fire-code department driving around in their big fire trucks to go to McDonald's to pick up lunch.

I don't think that's necessary.

Okay?

I have seen the fire -- fire code has given landlords violations to have an electrical survey because there was a loose outlet or a blank plate missing on a panel, not a fire hazard.

I think that's unnecessary, because it cost the landlord over \$1200 to do that.

I want to know, when inspectors go to inspect a property, why are they violating a landlord when it's tenant issues?

They should be violating tenants.

There was a new law put into place, that tenants are supposed to be held accountable.

Why hasn't this law been used?

I've asked the local government to set up an appointment with myself and code compliance so we can open channels for communication.

It hasn't been done.

I had to take it into my own hands and go straight to the fire department and talk to the chief myself.

126 Why didn't they do it the right way, the 1 right channels, the correct channels? 2 Smoke detectors, carbon monoxide detectors, 3 and fire extinguishers are installed by the 4 landlord. 5 All inspections are made. 6 7 Tenants sign an affidavit stating they are there. 8 9 Okay? I think that code compliance is using 10 11 selective enforcement on landlords, certain 12 landlords. 13 They think you're making too much money so 14 they go after you. 15 Not necessary. I think it's uncalled for. 16 I'd also like to mention that I think what 17 you're here -- what you're saying is correct: If you have a bad landlord and he's not doing things 18 properly, you should go after him. He should pay 19 20 for what he's doing if it's wrong. 21 But I don't think it's all issues tenant. How many people here have rented an apartment 22

Could you raise your hands? (looking at

in their lifetime?

audience.)

23

24

25

Did you go in and not see the apartment before you rented it?

Or did you just lay down money and rent it and walk in, after you paid for it, go into it?

I don't believe so.

That's all I have to say.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Would you like to add anything?

RAFAEL RIVERA: I just want to add my personal experiences dealing with the various codes of New York City -- I mean, of city of Newburgh.

So, once again, my name is Rafael Rivera, a property owner within the city of Newburgh.

Thank you, Senator Skoufis, for this opportunity.

I really, really appreciate that we can talk and you can hear our experiences and grievances, and so forth.

My intent today in the hearing is to bring attention to the actual experiences and challenges that I have personally gone through in dealing with various ambiguous interpretation of the building codes and the personal enforcement interpretation of those codes; however, not all interaction is directly negative in nature.

Some of the men and women who serve the building department in this great city have performed in the best interests of the building department, city council, and the citizens of

reflection of the building department.

Newburgh; therefore, this is not an entire

On May 1st of 2017 I was cited with two building violations.

The first, was not having the building labeled with a property number.

Within 48 hours I cured that issue.

The second building -- the second building violation from the code-compliance officer stated that I required a bond, a vacancy bond, for my building.

However, I was under construction with two permits existing on this property.

I informed the code inspector of this, and requested that, please go to your computer network to verify that that is the case, and I'm, literally, in compliance of the law.

His response, in turn, he continued on informing me that I still will require a vacancy bond regardless that there are existing permits.

However, he stated, that all that was

required for this particular situation was a \$2,000 bond, not a \$10,000 bond.

I asked, what would be required as far as the verbiage related to this \$2,000 bond?

He directed me to go to the office and pull out a generic form, and that generic form has no specifics as far as what would be required to be labeled and acceptable by the City of Newburgh.

I then went to my insurance broker, and she requested, yeah, I'm going to need that information, for sure.

I went back to the inspector and informed him of the situation, and I said, I need your guidance and direction as far as how will this bond be labeled, other than, obviously, "additionally insured"?

He began to become belligerent and vocal.

I let him say what he said, I hung up the phone.

The following day I brought a \$2,000 bond, labeling the City of Newburgh as "additionally insured."

He immediately stated to me, "Why did you do that when the bond is supposed to be 10,000?"

I said, "We spoke yesterday. You told me a

2,000 bond is only required because of the existing permits."

He then stated, "You obviously got it completely incorrect."

Shortly thereafter I said, "I will return with a \$10,000 certificate of a bond."

As I walked out the building, and I got to my car, he approached me and stated, "Oh, that bond must be in a check form."

Immediately I was getting heated, because it was obvious that there was three different interpretations, three different directions, of what was required.

We returned back into the office, and there was a secretary there, or I believe she was a secretary, who came in and started getting involved in the conversation.

She immediately stated to me that, yes, a check of a bond is required, not the certificate, and that's what is -- and that's what you have to do.

I have to say that a heated discussion took place shortly thereafter.

Then, right after that, Assistant

Chief Horton came out and requested everyone to

lower their voices, and also stated, "You need to 1 come back with a bond." 2 He claimed that I had no existing permits 3 4 whatsoever. I said, "I will." 5 I then brought that issue to the attention of 6 7 the city manager. Unfortunately, he wasn't in his office, so 8 I spoke to his assistant. I told her what 9 transpired. 10 11 I said, I really see what this is going to --12 how this is, unfortunately, going to play out. 13 And -- and, sure enough, I was -- I received 14 the -- I received orders to report to court, because 15 I'm going -- I was being charged for not complying 16 with the bond, when I was trying to figure out, what is the bond? what is the verbiage? what is the 17 18 amount? 19 Everything is contradicting to one to 20 another, and I need clarity. 21 Give me orders. 22 I followed my orders.

I never got them.

RAFAEL RIVERA: Sure.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: (Inaudible.)

23

24

25

I'll make it brief. 1 Shortly thereafter it was dismissed. 2 I was directed by the ADA to submit a bond. 3 Shortly thereafter I submitted a bond. 4 But as I brought the bond in, the building 5 6 inspector said, "Why do you have a bond when you have an open permit existing already?" 7 And I said -- I took a minute and a half to 8 calm down, and I explained the situation to the 9 10 inspector. 11 And the inspector says, "I understand, but, 12 unfortunately, that's not the way it should have been handled." 13 14 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 15 Thanks, for your testimony. 16 And, hopefully, you've come to understand, by 17 virtue of, you know, this invitation, that we are trying to be objective here in this committee. 18 You know, I understand that Mr. Acevedo said, 19 20 you know, that the testimony would not be what we 21 want to hear, but make no mistake, we're not 22 predisposed to wanting or not wanting to hear any information. 23 24 And I appreciate your testimony. 25 Would you both agree that it's -- the City of

Newburgh's, or any municipality's, obligation to 1 make sure that the housing in that municipality is 2 3 safe? MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes. 4 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 5 6 And the primary enforcement mechanism is code enforcement to do that. 7 Would you agree with that? 8 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I do. 9 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 10 11 And, so, how many -- now, how many buildings 12 do each of you own in the city of Newburgh? 13 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: One too many. 14 RAFAEL RIVERA: I only own one, and I won't 15 go any further. 16 SENATOR SKOUFIS: I'm not looking for you to 17 go any further than that. Mr. Acevedo, does 10 properties sound right? 18 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: There's more. 19 20 SENATOR SKOUFIS: There's more. 21 Okay. 22 LLCs own the properties? 23 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: No. My children own properties as well. They're in their names. 24 25 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, but, do you have any

LLCs, either of you, owning properties? 1 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: No, I don't. 2 RAFAEL RIVERA: (Shakes head.) 3 SENATOR SKOUFIS: 4 No. 5 Okay. MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Not here. 6 7 SENATOR SKOUFIS: How many -- can you give me a sense of how many violations, ballpark, you've 8 accumulated on the properties? 9 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: The only violation that 10 11 I had in the past was for the rental agreement. 12 I refused to do it because, we took the City 13 to court, the Orange County Landlords Association, 14 and the inspections were supposed to be every 15 two years, as agreed upon in court. 16 And as soon as we went to do it, they changed 17 the statements and said they were every year. 18 So I refused to do it, to rebel against it. 19 And when I went to court, I explained to the 20 judge. 21 And he asked me to do the inspections, which 22 I did, and I have all the inspections on all my 23 properties. 24 But I'm still unclear if they're every year, 25 every two years, because I keep getting different

1 stories. SENATOR SKOUFIS: So that was one violation? 2 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: That was the one volition, 3 other than the fact that I had grass that was a 4 little high. That was it, grass. 5 SENATOR SKOUFIS: So you've had two 6 7 violations on your properties over the past number of years; is that right? 8 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: You know, it's hard to say. 9 10 I mean, I don't recall having many violations, going to court for violations. 11 12 I think I spoke with Jeremy once or twice 13 through -- in the past three or four years, for 14 housing violations. 15 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 16 Mr. Rivera? 17 You said you have one property in the city of 18 Newburgh. 19 Can you give us a sense of how many 20 violations that property has had in the last number 21 of years? 22 RAFAEL RIVERA: I would say every two years,

I've gotten where people have sprayed

So you cut the grass.

maybe minor stuff. Like, I've gotten about grass.

23

24

25

1 graffiti on the exterior wall, and removed that. So (indiscernible). 2 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 3 So between the two of you, a few violations, 4 is your understanding? Yeah? 5 6 Okay. That's not the information that we have. 7 And I know one of my colleagues is going to 8 9 discuss that aspect of all this further. 10 So how many times have you appeared in 11 housing court in the last, let's say, five years? 12 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Couldn't tell you. 13 SENATOR SKOUFIS: You couldn't tell me, why? 14 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: No, because I have "CRS." 15 I can't remember [expletive bleeped out]. 16 Okay? 17 I'm sorry, but that's the way it is. I am in court all the time for evictions for 18 19 non-payment. 20 I never gave out a 30-day notice in over 21 40 years, to anybody, to evict them for any other 22 reason than non-payment of rent. 23 Okay? 24 I have, all my apartments are full, for one 25 reason, because I give nice housing to people.

1 And I work with people. SENATOR SKOUFIS: And, Mr. Acevedo, housing 2 3 court? RAFAEL RIVERA: I went recently for an 4 eviction with a tenant. 5 And the last time for -- I went to court for 6 7 violations, I think was this one, 2017, related to 8 it. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 9 Have you ever received complaints from any of 10 11 your tenants about conditions; and, if so, what's 12 generally your response when you do? 13 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: "Take care of it right 14 away." 15 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Same? 16 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: That's why I'm not in 17 court. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 18 19 Thanks for your answers. 20 Senator Myrie. 21 SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you for your testimony, 22 and coming in today. I want to talk about the violations for a 23 24 second, and I would remind both of you that you did 25 take an oath before you testified.

The information that we have suggests that, 1 2 Mr. Acevedo, that, over the course of 13 years, between 2005 and 2018, that there were 247 code 3 violations. 4 5 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: That I appeared in court 6 for? 7 SENATOR MYRIE: Irrespective --SENATOR SKOUFIS: You don't have to appear in 8 9 court. SENATOR MYRIE: -- yeah, irrespective of 10 11 whether or not you appeared in court, there were 12 247 code violations on the properties that you own. MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Not that I know of, I'm 13 14 sorry. 15 SENATOR MYRIE: Okay. 16 According to the information that I have, 17 there were also 264 complaints lodged against the properties that you own. 18 19 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Really? 20 Surprise to me. 21 SENATOR MYRIE: Okay. 22 So you dispute this information? 23 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes, I do. 24 SENATOR MYRIE: So that is not correct? 25 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I don't believe it is, no.

1 SENATOR MYRIE: Is -- are these larger than 2 the two complaints that you said you received, (indiscernible cross-talking) two violations? 3 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Are those numbers much 4 larger than the two that I have stated? 5 6 Yes, that is quite a large -- that's a lot of 7 complaints. SENATOR MYRIE: Okay. 8 So I'm going to accept the information that 9 we have. 10 11 And if we took the average, over the 13 years, it would be nearly 20 complaints a year 12 13 and 20 violations a year. 14 Now, I went to law school because I'm not 15 good at math, so those numbers may be a little off. 16 But if you own a property in which people are 17 complaining at that rate, and you are receiving 18 violations at that rate, you would admit that that 19 is a --20 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Absolutely --21 SENATOR MYRIE: -- problem? 22 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: -- I would admit to it, 23 yes, that is a problem. 24 SENATOR MYRIE: That would be problematic? 25 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes.

SENATOR MYRIE: Now, you mentioned in your 1 testimony that the code enforcement is selective 2 because there are certain property owners that are 3 making too much money, and that the enforcement is a 4 mechanism by which to take away money. 5 So can you tell us --6 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: (Indiscernible 7 cross-talking) --8 9 SENATOR MYRIE: -- how much --Hold on, hold on, hold on. 10 11 I want you to respond when I ask. MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes. 12 13 SENATOR MYRIE: -- how much money have you 14 paid in fines? 15 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Maybe \$200? \$300? --16 SENATOR MYRIE: 200 --17 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: -- in fines --SENATOR MYRIE: -- in fines? 18 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: -- when I -- if I went to 19 20 court. 21 And that was because of the fines that I had 22 for the -- in the past year, with not doing any 23 inspections. There's a \$25 per house. 24 SENATOR MYRIE: So you have paid a total of \$200 in fines? 25

1 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: That's about it. 2 SENATOR MYRIE: Okay. 3 So --MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Because I haven't been to 4 5 court, is what I'm telling you. SENATOR MYRIE: Okay. 6 7 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: That's why I haven't had the fines. 8 9 SENATOR MYRIE: Okay. So you would understand why I would be 10 dubious of that number --11 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Absolutely. 12 13 SENATOR MYRIE: -- given our discrepancy --MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes. 14 15 SENATOR MYRIE: -- in the violations and 16 complaints. 17 But let's accept that number, that you have only paid \$200 in fines. 18 How, then, is code enforcement used as a 19 20 mechanism to take money away from property owners? 21 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I didn't say it was against 22 me. 23 I'm speaking about a council member stepping up and complaining about a landlord that they said 24 25 was making much -- too much money, "and we got to

stop this." 1 That's what I'm talking about. 2 I watch the council meetings. 3 SENATOR MYRIE: And what I'm trying to 4 5 understand is, how imposing a fine would take away 6 the money, or a landlord's ability to make money, 7 when you, having violated the law 247 times, have only paid \$200 in fines. 8 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I haven't violated the law 9 237 times, or whatever numbers you said. 10 11 I haven't gotten any violations like that. 12 SENATOR MYRIE: Okay. 13 Thank you. 14 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Krueger. 15 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. 16 Mr. Acevedo, in your opening statement you 17 said, "Has anyone been a renter?" And I was one of the people who raised their 18 hands. 19 20 And then you responded, Well, you know, you 21 take a look at the apartment, and you decide whether 22 or not to rent it. 23 But isn't it true that, I'm not an

electrician, I'm not a firefighter, I'm not a

24

25

plumber.

1 So --

2 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I have inspections.

SENATOR KRUEGER: So I rent an apartment, and then it starts to flood, and then I start to have mold in my walls.

And I might not know that it was faulty electrical wiring, until I got there, tried to plug some things in and discover that a fire starts.

So I'm confused that you think the definition of a "landlord-tenant relationship" is, I looked at the apartment and I signed a lease, so everything afterwards is my fault?

MICHAEL ACEVEDO: It's not only that, ma'am. We have inspections.

In order to rent to a social-service tenant, we have to have an inspection prior to them moving in, which is for a CO.

And now we have the new inspections, which they do every year, or every two years, to inspect it, to make sure that everything is in order for the tenants to move in.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Hence your confusion over having so many violations against you, based on the numbers that were just provided by my colleague, since you assume, because there was some kind of

social-service inspections, that you had met all 1 2 your obligations --MICHAEL ACEVEDO: 3 No. SENATOR KRUEGER: -- as a landlord? 4 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: 5 No. SENATOR KRUEGER: 6 No. MICHAEL ACEVEDO: 7 No. SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay. 8 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Because I don't have any 9 10 floods. 11 I mean, maybe somebody blocked up a toilet 12 and it overflowed. 13 We would go there right away and take care of 14 the issue. 15 SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay. 16 That's not a question, but you had made a 17 statement that, as far as you can tell, your 18 firefighters just ride around on their truck and go to McDonald's. 19 20 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I've seen that. 21 SENATOR KRUEGER: Well, actually, that's 22 perfectly allowed --23 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Okay. I didn't know that. 24 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- because firefighters 25 need to go out and get something to eat sometimes.

MICHAEL ACEVEDO: In their fire truck? 1 SENATOR KRUEGER: And they must be in their 2 fire trucks because, if they have a radio call to 3 get to a job --4 5 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Well, thank you for explaining that to me. 6 7 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- being in the fire truck ensures that they won't have any delay --8 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Okay. 9 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- in continuing their 10 11 work. 12 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Okay. 13 SENATOR KRUEGER: If they were all in private 14 cars, and had to go back to the firehouse, then get 15 in the truck, then go out, that would be the 16 problem. Not that they're using their firetruck --17 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Thank you. 18 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- to do things they need 19 to do while on duty. 20 How did you end up the president of the 21 Orange County Landlord Association? 22 Is that an association that votes? 23 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: How did I end up? 24 SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes. MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes, that we re-elected. 25

1	SENATOR KRUEGER: You get re-elected.
2	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: There's close to
3	170 members.
4	I was the vice president for probably
5	30 years.
6	And when it came time for this president to
7	step down, everybody was asking, who they wanted as
8	the president, and they said me.
9	SENATOR KRUEGER: And are there bylaws of
10	this association
11	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes, there are.
12	SENATOR KRUEGER: and job description?
13	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes, there are.
14	SENATOR KRUEGER: So the committee could ask
15	to get copies of those?
16	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Sure.
17	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you very much.
18	SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Biaggi.
19	SENATOR BIAGGI: (Shakes head.)
20	SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Kavanagh.
21	SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yeah, I don't want to
22	prolong this because we do have many speakers.
23	But, just, I'm trying to I'm perplexed
24	here.
25	So you began by saying that you don't think

we want to hear what you have to say, which, of course, we wouldn't be here and asking you to testify if we didn't want to hear what you have to say.

But, you know, just, clearly, a code-enforcement system that has selective enforcement, and where representatives of the agency is supposed to enforce don't know the rules and can't state them clearly, are problems.

And they're probably problems of training, perhaps they're problems of other -- you know, that result from other aspects of the system, other deficiencies.

But just -- I -- you're the president of
the -- a county landlord association, and you are
not willing to tell this committee how many
properties you have an ownership interest in?

MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I don't feel that there's a reason for that.

I don't feel that you need to know how many properties I have.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: You stipulate you own some amount of property, but -- like, if we -- if we had a code-enforcement agency up here and we said, "How many inspectors do you have?" do you think it would

1 be appropriate for them to say, We're not -- We don't see your need to know that? 2 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: They are paid by taxpayers. 3 Right? 4 Nobody pays me for my information. 5 6 I'm sorry, I just don't agree with it. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: So you're not -- in -what we're trying to understand is, how -- how to 8 9 take your testimony here today, and what your 10 experience is with being a landlord and being with code enforcement. 11 12 And, an inability to share the most basic 13 information about what -- about your experience as a landlord makes it hard for us to take the rest of --14 15 like, you know, the rest of your (indiscernible) 16 sincerely. 17 Do you own one property? 18 Do you own any property? 19 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I said before 20 (indiscernible cross-talking) --21 SENATOR KAVANAGH: You own some amount of 22 property? 23 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: -- I have more than 24 10 properties. 25 SENATOR KAVANAGH: More than ten.

1 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes. SENATOR KAVANAGH: How -- and -- but 2 3 you're not willing -- you're not willing to discuss how many properties you and your family have 4 ownership interest in? 5 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: 6 No. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Thank you. 8 9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And the same for, Mr. Rivera, I know you're the spokesperson of this 10 11 organization, and you own one, and exactly one, 12 property; is that correct? 13 RAFAEL RIVERA: Yes. 14 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And you have no ownership 15 interest in other -- in other residential real 16 estate in the state of New York? 17 RAFAEL RIVERA: No. 18 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 19 And, again, you -- you know, we've discussed 20 this at some length with Mr. Acevedo, but -- well, 21 let me stick with Mr. Acevedo (indiscernible). 22 You have never -- have you ever received a 23 vacate order on any property that you own? 24 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes, I have. 25 SENATOR KAVANAGH: You have?

1 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Just this past Friday. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, and what --2 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: A car hit my building. 3 The inspectors went there, I went there. 4 Ιt was 2:30 in the morning, 3:00 in the morning. 5 They put a "condemned" and a "vacate" sign on 6 7 the building. Okay? 8 9 Fine. He was doing things that I thought were 10 11 unnecessary. 12 When I was standing outside, and so were the 13 tenants, he was breaking down doors to their 14 bedrooms, which I thought was unnecessary when 15 there's somebody standing outside with a key. 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: What were the conditions 17 that caused that vacate -- that are the basis for 18 that vacate order? MICHAEL ACEVEDO: A car hit the building in 19 20 two locations, and crashed into a car parked in 21 front of it. 22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And what was the address of that location? 23 24 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Excuse me, I'm sorry, 25 I didn't get that?

1	SENATOR KAVANAGH: The address of that
2	location?
3	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: 73 Carpenter Avenue.
4	SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.
5	Have you ever received a vacate order on any
6	property in which you have an ownership interest?
7	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: In the past?
8	SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes.
9	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Sure.
L 0	SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, can you give us
L1	another example of an instance where you have
L 2	received a vacate order?
L 3	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: 86 Johnson Street.
L 4	SENATOR KAVANAGH: And what was the basis for
L 5	a vacate order at 86 Johnson Street?
L 6	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Tenants that lived there
L 7	were animals.
L 8	Okay?
L 9	SENATOR KAVANAGH: Excuse me, are you
20	characterizing
21	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Sorry to say
22	SENATOR KAVANAGH: human beings as
23	"animals" (indiscernible cross-talking)?
24	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I say that only because,
25	when code compliance went in to make an inspection,

1 they violated the tenant, and that was four or 2 five years ago. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Can you discuss the condition -- the physical conditions of the 4 5 property --6 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: It was just trashed. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- that caused (indiscernible cross-talking) --8 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: The whole house was 9 trashed. 10 11 They broke windows. 12 There were holes in the walls. 13 This there was garbage everywhere. 14 It was just trash. 15 So they ordered -- they gave an order to 16 vacate. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Can you give -- can you give an additional example of an -- instances or 18 19 property, that you are the owner -- that you have an 20 ownership interest in, has received a vacate order? MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I can't remember if I've 21 had any others, I'm sorry. 22 23 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, you don't recall if 24 you've had more than two vacate orders in your 25 career as a landlord?

MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I'm sure that I have. 1 2 It's a long career, it's 43 years. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. And you don't recall the circumstances of any 4 other vacate order that you've received? 5 6 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I don't remember, I'm 7 sorry. SENATOR KAVANAGH: I mean, would you 8 acknowledge that a vacate order is a pretty 9 significant thing to occur on a piece of residential 10 11 property, and that it requires people who are living 12 in the property to leave the premises promptly 13 and -- and -- and, you know --14 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Of course. 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- find other shelter? 16 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Of course. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. So it's just -again, it's for -- I -- there's a -- you know, a 18 clever line about "CRS syndrome." 19 20 But, you know, we are here to ascertain the 21 facts, and what's going on, and we are seeking the 22 perspective of landlords, as we do in all of our deliberations. 23 24 You know, it's very difficult to do that when

the association of landlords for an entire county of

25

1 our state declines to give us, you know, forthright 2 testimony, or, you know, sends us representatives 3 who assert that they can't remember the most basic facts about their own experience as landlords. 4 5 But thank you for, you know, being here 6 today. 7 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Biaggi. SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you. 8 I just have a few questions, and then I think 9 we are on our end point of our inquiry. 10 11 I believe that housing is a human right, it's 12 a basic human right, and that the ability to do 13 business in any capacity is really a privilege. 14 So, I just have a few questions about the way 15 in which you operate your properties. 16 So, do you have to file any paperwork or 17 obtain any licenses to operate your properties with the municipalities? 18 19 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: The registry. 20 SENATOR BIAGGI: The registry, can you 21 explain that a little bit? MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Well, it's -- to me it's an 22 23 additional tax, but, it's so they have a list of who 24 owns what properties.

SENATOR BIAGGI: That -- who is "they"?

25

```
MICHAEL ACEVEDO: The code compliance, the
1
        city hall, whoever you want to call it.
 2
               I don't know who has them.
 3
               Okay, we have to fill out a paper.
 4
               We have to pay their fees.
5
6
               They come and make an inspection.
7
               They give you the right to rent the
        apartment.
8
9
               It gives you a clear inspection.
10
               SENATOR BIAGGI: So the municipality gives
11
        you the right --
12
               MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes, ma'am.
               SENATOR BIAGGI: -- to rent?
13
14
               Okay.
15
               So do you operate any affordable-housing
16
        units?
17
               MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Affordable-housing units?
18
               I think all our apartments are affordable,
19
        yes.
20
               SENATOR BIAGGI:
                                 Hmm.
21
               Okay.
22
               Do you receive any benefit from the
23
        municipality or from the State as a result?
24
               MICHAEL ACEVEDO: No, I don't.
25
               SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay.
```

But you do agree that you obtain a license, so to speak, from the municipality to operate your rental?

MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I believe in Newburgh.

I don't have any -- I have properties outside of Newburgh, but I don't -- there's no registry yet.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay.

So I believe that it's a privilege to do business with a city or the State, or government, generally, and, that, with that privilege comes responsibility to the people that are renting those units.

And that, as a result of being able to have the privilege to do business with the municipality or with the State, that transparency, and the ability for individuals in the community, and otherwise, to understand the number of properties that you are owning for rental units is a pretty significant fact.

So I will ask you for the last time, and hope that you will answer the question: How many units do you own, or how many properties do you own, that you are currently renting?

MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Where?

SENATOR BIAGGI: In Newburgh.

1	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: In the city of Newburgh?
2	SENATOR BIAGGI: Uh-huh.
3	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: 10, 13, 12, around there.
4	SENATOR BIAGGI: In surrounding areas?
5	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I have more.
6	SENATOR BIAGGI: About 10? 20? 30?
7	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Around there.
8	SENATOR BIAGGI: 30?
9	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yeah.
10	SENATOR BIAGGI: So about 40, total, so far?
11	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Okay.
12	SENATOR BIAGGI: Would you say that's the
13	totality of how many properties you own?
14	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes.
15	SENATOR BIAGGI: 40?
16	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Okay.
17	SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay, about 40.
18	Thank you.
19	MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Thank you.
20	SENATOR SKOUFIS: I just want to make one
21	last remark, and, look, I wish I didn't have to say
22	this to a constituent, but, I am still floored, and
23	I'm deeply offended, that you would characterize any
24	human being that you deal with as "an animal."
25	[Applause.]

1 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Hold on.

2 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes. Go ahead.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I don't care what any person did to your apartment, or any apartment.

They could be the worst tenant in the world.

They're not animals, sir.

And I think that speaks volume to the relationship, or lack thereof, that, perhaps, you, and some other landlords -- not -- there are many, many good landlords -- have with their tenants, and the need for government to step in as a municipality and do proper code enforcement, and as a state government to make sure that there are protections in place.

Because, if a landlord views their tenant as "an animal," clearly, that landlord is not going to go out of their way to do the right thing by that person.

And so, nevertheless, I want to thank both of you for your testimony, and I appreciate your presence here.

SENATOR KRUEGER: I have one more question.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Sorry?

SENATOR KRUEGER: I have one more question.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Sorry.

```
Senator Krueger has one more question.
 1
               SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.
 2
 3
               Thank you.
               Mr. Acevedo, might you have a relationship to
 4
        a Michael Acevedo, Sr., who was a marshal --
 5
               MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes, that's me, ma'am.
 6
 7
               SENATOR KRUEGER: -- in Newburgh at the same
        time?
 8
               MICHAEL ACEVEDO: Yes, that's right.
 9
               SENATOR KRUEGER: And you were fired for
10
11
        illegally evicting tenants; is that correct?
12
               MICHAEL ACEVEDO: No, that's not true.
13
               SENATOR KRUEGER: But you were fired as a
14
        marshal?
15
               MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I was never fired for
16
        illegal evictions of tenants, no, I did not do that.
17
               SENATOR KRUEGER: What were you fired for?
               MICHAEL ACEVEDO: I was asked to resign
18
        because a new judge came in and he wanted to place
19
20
        his own marshal in there.
21
               That's why I was asked to resign.
22
               SENATOR KRUEGER: Do you see any conflict
23
        between being a marshal --
24
               MICHAEL ACEVEDO: At the time --
25
               SENATOR KRUEGER: -- and evicting tenants?
```

1 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: -- I didn't own the 2 properties, ma'am. 3 My son owned properties. SENATOR KRUEGER: 4 Oh. MICHAEL ACEVEDO: 5 Okay? 6 SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay. MICHAEL ACEVEDO: 7 Anything else? SENATOR KRUEGER: No --8 MICHAEL ACEVEDO: 9 Thank you. 10 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- I'm very interested. 11 Thank you. 12 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 13 All right, we're going to switch the next 14 two, and they've both been notified, and agreed, as 15 far as I know. 16 So, next, given the testimony that we just 17 heard, I'd like to bring up the City of Newburgh. 18 Joe Donat, city manager. 19 And congratulations on your permanent 20 appointment as city manager just this week. 21 Do we have Jeremy Kaufman here, as well? Michelle Kelson, Bill Horton, Allie Church. 22 23 And I don't know if he's still here, but I do 24 want to acknowledge that the mayor, Torrance Harvey, 25 was at least here, in attendance.

1 Okay.

Before we hear from you, if you could please just raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

(All witnesses say "Yes.")

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

Go ahead.

JOSEPH DONAT: Thank you, Senator, members of the committee.

As you referenced, today is my first day as being the permanent city manager here in Newburgh.

For the last six months I served in an interim capacity, and I can tell you, some of the most disturbing and alarming things I've seen over the last several months have been related to the issues that we're discussing here today.

It's my intention to talk about solutions rather than problems, but before I do that, I will just say, you may have seen the gentleman to my right jump up about an hour ago, it was right around lunchtime. I'm sure he was hungry.

He wasn't going to get lunch.

He was going to a three-alarm fire less than

a mile away.

Thankfully, that fire has been knocked down, and everyone's okay.

But that speaks to the amount of different issues, significant problems, that the city faces on a daily basis.

For the last 15 years I've worked in the legislative capacity, so I appreciate the work that you are all doing here today, of put together hearings of this nature, and I know firsthand the amount of work that goes into it.

So, I commend you, your staff, and others.

For the last six years, prior to serving as interim manager here in the city, I worked above the codes office for a member of Congress.

I saw the hard work that Chief Horton and his team does on a daily basis.

He leads by example, and it's an uphill battle, but he shows up on a daily basis and he makes a difference.

I'm here with a cross-functional team from the City because code enforcement is an effective and important tool for our municipality.

We've spent countless hours working on this matter, often addressing very severe problems.

But as I discussed, our number-one priority, the point of what I'll be providing to you today, is going to be based on safe, affordable, and quality housing, and now I'm going to talk about some solutions.

The cities of Buffalo and Syracuse have implemented a number of different initiatives that I believe could, legislatively, be enacted for the city of Newburgh and our fellow cities across the state of New York that will help address some of the issues that we're here discussing.

We could allow the City to collect any unpaid housing-, building-, and fire-code violation penalties through placement, by the City, onto its annual tax levy.

This was done in Syracuse.

It was codified in the Real Property Tax Law, Section 901.

Buffalo's law is, more or less, exactly the same.

I would encourage for the City of Newburgh to be allowed to do so as well too.

As a result of this, default offenders would either have to pay fines or risk losing their property to tax foreclosure.

Passage would also encourage people to appear in court and address their violations.

Another item that's been successfully carried out in Syracuse and Buffalo, would be to allow for the City to create a municipal code violation bureau.

It would allow for cities, like Newburgh, and its code-enforcement officers to treat relatively minor housing-code violations, that have a significant impact on the community, in a similar manner to parking tickets.

Violations of this nature could be issued for garbage and debris, basic sanitation, graffiti, and failure to maintain one's sidewalks outside of their residence.

These tickets would be issued, and, obviously, adjudicated in a municipal bureau, similar to a parking-violations bureau that the City has.

In addition to that, we could revive multiple-dwelling law, including exploring the expansion of receiverships in context of housing, and amend law to cover smaller cities like Newburgh.

Currently, regulations of this matter only apply to cities with populations of 325,000 or more.

I would encourage, and gladly work with anyone here today, to allow for this, to apply for cities of all nature -- of all different population sizes.

This process would result with receiver managing property, to recoup costs, to rent or take title of the property, and, obviously, ensure that the conditions would be improved as a result.

In addition to this, we could require property owners who receive government dollars or vouchers or subsidies for housing to certify and submit that they have a valid rental license on file with the municipality.

This is something that the City has worked hard at doing, and any additional assistance in that regard will be appreciated.

Last, but not least, we can amend the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law to require more information to any landlord-tenant proceeding.

If we were to do this, it would certify that they have an active, valid rental license on file, and, obviously, allow for increased coordination between all parties.

As I mentioned, I'm gathered here with a number of different valuable, critical members of my

team: Chief Horton, Alexandra Church,

Jeremy Kaufman, Michelle Kelson.

And I would gladly yield the rest of my time for any further comments that they would like to provide before the question-and-answer session.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much for your testimony.

And I also want to thank each of you for cooperating, and really providing assistance to our efforts over the past number of months.

And thank you, Chief Horton.

I was made aware of what you just went and left do earlier today, and it does speak to the important work that happens here in the city of Newburgh.

So thank you.

I think it's only natural to ask, in light of what we just heard in -- from the previous witnesses, what do you make of that, that was said?

I mean, you know, the -- first, I guess, the discrepancy, where, you know, we have information straight from the -- this -- the code-enforcement software, BuildingBlocks, 247 code violations on Mr. Acevedo's properties in Newburgh.

And I -- and I guess he has -- his sons who

own additional properties, which we weren't aware 1 2 of, and that's not even including violations against 3 those properties. He said he had a couple of violations, 4 I think, in recent years? 5 I mean, do you want to just confirm that the 6 7 numbers that we have sound accurate? And, if you have any other response to, you 8 know, the various things that he has said. 9 ALEXANDRA CHURCH: I do want to take a minute 10 11 and thank the Attorney General's Office. 12 That BuildingBlocks does come from the 13 Attorney General's Office. 14 It was not long ago that we weren't able to 15 do compiling like that. 16 So I just wanted to take a minute to say all 17 that. JOSEPH DONAT: Yes, the numbers you have are 18 19 accurate, and I think they speak for themselves. 20 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 21 Thank you. 22 He talked to me about LLCs. 23 Do you run into -- you know, we heard from 24 the City of Albany, especially with vacant

properties, they've -- sounds like an enormous

25

1 difficulty trying to find out who owns these LLCs and who to contact. 2 Same issue here? 3 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: Both (inaudible) 4 5 very similar. 6 SENATOR SKOUFIS: For mostly vacant 7 properties? But also -- or also for tenant -- or, for occupied? 8 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: Rentals as well. 9 10 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Both? 11 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: Yes. 12 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 13 Do you have any kind of landlord registry? 14 It sounded like you did, from the previous 15 witness. 16 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: We have a rental 17 registry in which people who rent buildings to families or individuals in the communities are 18 19

supposed to register with the City, and can have an inspection completed by a code officer.

I would just initially start by saying that code enforcement in the city is very difficult.

20

21

22

23

24

25

The executive team assembled at this table right now, there's more people at this table than who do code enforcement in the city of Newburgh.

There's 10,500 housing units in the city of 1 Newburgh in less than 3 1/2 square miles. 2 That's over 3300 housing units per square 3 mile. 4 There's four code officers. 5 6 We struggle every day to conduct efficient, 7 effective, and equitable code enforcement, but we can't do it alone. 8 It's a struggle. 9 We are in a reactive posture every day; we 10 11 react to problems every day. 12 We are not proactive. 13 And that is a problem, for code enforcement, 14 and for the people who live in the city of Newburgh. 15 SENATOR SKOUFIS: You have four code 16 enforcement officers. 17 In your professional opinion, how many do you feel you would need to fully and effectively do the 18 job that needs to be done? 19 20 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: When I was moved into the position, the previous city manager asked, 21 22 What do you need? 23 I said, I need 10 more code officers in

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, so you need to,

24

25

5 years.

basically, almost triple --1 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: Yes. 2 SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- the number that you have 3 right now? 4 5 Okay. 6 If I could ask my staff to put up Exhibit A, 7 66 Campbell Street, which I know the City is familiar with. 8 9 Recently condemned, and I want to applaud the City for that. 10 11 Clearly, it is a building that should be 12 condemned. 13 Can you just walk us through the process of, 14 you know: 15 The violations that were levied against this 16 property? 17 And, you know, sort of what response you got from the landlord, or lack of response? 18 19 And, what led you to condemn this property? 20 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: This property had 21 been, I believe, condemned in 2015 because it was 22 being used as a single-room occupancy, where 23 bedrooms were being rented out to individuals rather 24 than the single family that was -- that had a

certificate of occupancy for it.

25

This is an interesting case because, the

City, unfortunately, took ownership of 68 Campbell,

The building was acquired by the City. It was in extreme disrepair. I think there was multiple collapse. And we had to initiate demolition of the building.

the building that was adjacent and connected to it.

When the building was demolished, what we found was that, 66 Campbell was highly dependent on 68 for structural -- or, the structural, the fourth wall, the west wall.

We "re-condemned" the building, which is kind of a terrible term, but, we re-condemned the building and discontinued the utilities to the building because, number one, it was no longer safe because of the removal of 68 Campbell.

But the second reason, because it was being used as a single-room occupancy.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you think the land -before you condemned it, what was your -- what was
the City's interaction with the owner of that
property?

ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: I didn't have a lot of interaction with him before.

This was one of my earliest buildings I dealt

with when I was moved into the position.

I wasn't in the office at that time.

So I think, for the most part, the building, why it was condemned in 2015 for the SROs,

But the landlord is not -- does not live in the city.

It was being used as an SRO. I think it was still being used as STAR exemption.

So there were some problems with that building.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

I know the City, fairly recently, took the step of issuing a warrant to get a landlord to appear in court. This is maybe a month or two ago.

Which I applaud, and I wish every municipality would utilize more.

But can you talk to me about, is that a new tool that the City has begun to explore?

Is that something that has happened with some frequency in recent years?

Is that something that should happen more?

You know, my understanding, from what my team has found, is that, in all these municipalities we've looked at, landlords refusing to appear in court is a very frequent problem.

So, perhaps, can you just -- or, someone talk about that process; what made you use it in this case, and how frequently should it be used more, et cetera?

MICHELLE KELSON: I'm not personally aware of this specific case that you are speaking about; however, as you've heard from prior testimony, building code violations are prosecuted in the municipal courts as a quasi-criminal/quasi-civil action; therefore, some of the availabilities for criminal practice are available in code-enforcement proceedings.

So there is the ability for failure to appear if you are an individual landlord, for a judge to issue either an arrest warrant for failure to appear on arraignment, or a bench warrant for failure to appear on a rescheduled or an adjourned date.

We are able, where we have the requisite information, to utilize our City of Newburgh police force to execute arrests and bench warrants as they would for any other criminal process.

So their jurisdiction is limited by state law to Orange County and adjacent counties. We wouldn't be able to go upstate, we wouldn't be able to dispatch them to Long Island or into the five

boroughs.

We have used it sporadically over the last 18 years that I've been in the corporation counsel's office.

Again, it's a matter of resources and information.

Our police department is also very overtaxed with various levels of crime, and needs to address that in priorities.

So, where we have all of the information that we need to actually execute a warrant, and we have the available manpower, we're willing to use every and any tool that's available to us.

And, the more tools that we have in the toolbox, the more -- the better able that we are to address those who would not respond to the normal civil process.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And here's my last question, and thank you for that:

Building off of that, can you just speak to the scope of the problem I mentioned before, which is landlords not showing up in housing court, how often does that happen in Newburgh?

JEREMY KAUFMAN: I don't have the statistics, but it happens on a fairly regular basis.

I don't think that as many individuals recognize that not coming to court is a problem.

If you're summoned to appear in court, you need to lay all business aside and appear in court.

And our City Court judges take their dockets very seriously, and they will issue -- they will go above and beyond to send additional letters and communications to those property owners, letting them know that they missed a court date, they're expected to appear at the next court date.

If they fail to appear at that court date, then a warrant or some other process may be utilized to effectuate their appearance in court.

So I think there's a failure to understand that -- that this is a significant and serious matter; it should be taken seriously.

Where you don't appear on a traffic offense, your license can be suspended.

So there are some severe penalties in other legal parameters that make appearing in court significant to those who have to be there.

We just don't have those similar consequences for building- and property-code violations.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

Senator Kavanagh.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

Let me just begin, rather than a question, just with a point of information, which is, the bill you described, of permitting municipalities to treat unpaid fines for building- and fire-code violations, is a bill that's pending before the Legislature.

And, in fact, the Senate passed it on

May 15th of this year. And has, actually, this is a
bill that's passed the Senate a couple times

previously.

Senator Gaughran of Long Island carries it in the Senate.

And Assemblyman Magnarelli in the Assembly, and has made some effort to pass it in the -- in previous years.

I'm not sure what the holdup has been in the Assembly. There may be some technical concerns about it.

But I would urge you to contact your Assembly Members, some of whom have been here today, to discuss that with them.

Just to get a -- thank you -- first of all, thank you for bringing, you know, the full team here today, and for your willingness to share your -- you know, your experiences with us.

Just, can you -- just to give us a sense, can you discuss, like, your code -- just -- let me just (indiscernible) some brief, sort of, (indiscernible).

How many code-enforcement inspectors do you have?

ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: We have four code officers who are assigned to both code enforcement and the building-inspection process, which is, might be new construction, rehabilitation of a building.

So they might be moving from a code-enforcement issue of garbage in the yard or problems with a condemned building, to inspecting a framing condition for our rehab.

We are very lucky in Newburgh that we're experiencing a true rebirth in the city. And we have a lot of people who have moved to the city, and are looking to do -- raise their families and conduct their businesses here.

And they are renovating buildings at a rate that we have never seen before.

So at the same time as we have stepped up code enforcement in the city, we've also seen an increase in the amount of work associated with framing inspections, electrical inspections,

plumbing inspections. 1 So those four individuals are doing both. 2 SENATOR KAVANAGH: How many in -- how many 3 buildings under your jurisdiction? 4 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: There are 6800, or 5 6 6500, buildings in the city. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: So, roughly, one inspector for every 1600 buildings. That sounds like quite a 8 workload. 9 And how many -- just to get a scale, how many 10 11 sends -- how many violations are issued in a year? 12 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: I believe in the 13 last year and a half we've issued nearly 14 3600 violations for buildings in the city. 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And can you give us a 16 sense of the disposition of those? 17 Like, how many of them have resulted in fines, how many of them were dismissed; that sort of 18 19 thing? 20 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: We've issued 21 3556 violations. 22 Sorry, I left my glasses in the car when 23 I came back. 24 1900 have been corrected, and nearly 25 1,000 are still open or pending.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And how much does an inspector make?

ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: I believe -- you know, I wanted to the look at that this morning, but I believe an inspector makes around \$38,000 a year, to \$39,000.

There's incremental steps, as they gain seniority, in their collective bargaining agreement.

I would also add that, of the four code inspectors, three of them have less than three years experience.

So we're dealing with new employees who are working really hard to get up to speed with code enforcement.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, that was actually -I was going to ask, how is -- how are inspectors
recruited, and how are they trained?

ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: Inspectors are recruited through the civil-service process.

We put a posting out to -- that we're looking to hire code-enforcement officers.

We look to hire people who already have the class -- the six classes that give you the certifications of a code-enforcement officer.

We were struggling with that.

We had people who applied to be a code-enforcement officer, and that were offered positions in Westchester for twice the salary.

So that makes it very difficult for us to attract strong candidates.

We are -- one time before we offered the classes in the city, with the hopes of recruiting some residents.

And one of our successful candidates was Tammy Hollings, our (indiscernible) property specialist, who went through the program, and eventually we were able to hire her.

We're also working with the school district to, possibly, much like electricians or plumbers, is to actually have a code-enforcement program in the high school, so that, when they graduate, they might be able to get a job with the City.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: That sounds like a smart (indiscernible cross-talking).

ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: But the funding is difficult.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: How -- in -- just -- we heard from Albany that -- I think we were going to get details on this, but, roughly speaking, they're taking in \$1.8 million in fines, and spending about

1 \$1.2 million on the enforcement effort, which 2 suggests a -- you know, a generous return on their enforcement efforts. 3 Do you have -- the funding for the -- for 4 5 code enforcement and the revenue that comes in from 6 fines? 7 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: I really can't speak to the revenue too much with the fines. I don't 8 9 typically follow that. Once it goes into the court proceedings, 10 11 I don't manage that number really effectively. 12 Our code-enforcement budget is, typically, 13 approaches three-quarters of a million dollars. 14 15 officers out, plus the account clerks and the

That's what it costs us to put the four plumbing inspector, and issues like that.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So three -- it's nearly \$750,000 it costs us right now.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And, presumably, you know, I didn't mean to suggest that the only way that would be funded would be through fines.

There's, presumably, other revenue associated with reviewing plans, and --

ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: (Indiscernible cross-talking) fees, street openings, plumbing permits, electrical permits, all contribute to the cost of doing business.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Great.

JEREMY KAUFMAN: If I may answer that, if I may add on to that too?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Please.

JEREMY KAUFMAN: That the -- is that the amount of -- is that the -- the fine amounts that are collected aren't necessarily indicative of the overall progress, with respect to what's made in the housing stock, generally.

Oftentimes, when a violation is reported up to court, it's generally the policy of this office, and just kind of, in an overall practice, to not offer -- to not make plea offers or settlement offers, unless and until the underlying violations are remediated.

It's really important that compliance be done. That's kind of the first -- really, our first job here, at least in terms of prosecuting the -- in terms of prosecuting a lot of these cases.

People who have substandard housing, we want to make sure that they're brought up to code, that they are safe, that they are code-compliant.

And so the fines, while they are very helpful

as far as the, kind of, City's financial health and 1 bottom line in a lot of ways, isn't necessarily the 2 3 entire picture, and that we also try to focus on and make sure that we get underlying compliance to bring 4 the properties up to code as well. 5 6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I appreciate that. 7 And I mentioned up front that we want to hear exactly that kind of, you know, perspective today. 8 9 The -- how do you become aware of conditions that residents believe might be violations of the 10 11 code? 12 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: They typically 13 contact the code officer either by phone, or stop in 14 many times. They do stop right into the office. 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Is there like a widely --16 is there a hotline or some widely circulated number? 17 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: Just the eight -the general number to the code-enforcement 18 officer --19 20 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Got you. 21 ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: -- office, excuse 22 me. 23 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And what -- and how many

complaints do you get in a year?

ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: We -- do have you

24

25

that?

JEREMY KAUFMAN: Well -- so in a particular year, what you're really talking about, and this -- and the City also has a general policy of -- in its best effort, to try to investigate each and every phone call.

So while some may or may not actually have merit to them, ultimately, it's still the City's policy and the City's position that every single phone call that comes in should be treated as though it does have merit.

So what often happens is, a phone call -typically, a phone call will come in to the building
department. Those numbers, typically, are -- you're
looking at, anywhere from, I think, about six to
seven thousand, just phone calls, dealing with
possible issues.

Those issues are then investigated further; some may have some merit, some may not.

Some may then grow and turn out to reveal that there are housing-code violations or housing-code issues that come about from that.

If there are violations, the code-enforcement officers are told and instructed, basically, if you see it, it's a -- if you see it, then you have to

write it, similar to a parking ticket in New York City.

If you're beyond a -- if you're beyond a deadline in the -- you know, for the -- for your parking ticket, they're just told to write it. And then dealing with it afterwards kind of escalates -- escalates up, accordingly.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So I want to wrap up.

But we've heard some testimony today, and in the Housing Committee in recent hearings has heard a lot of testimony, on the notion that tenants have a lot of disincentive to report conditions in their buildings because of concern about retaliation or, you know, other negative consequences that come from reporting conditions, even when they're quite problematic.

Do you have a perspective on that, whether that is a significant factor?

MICHELLE KELSON: We are -- we are advised by our elected officials that retaliatory conduct is reported to them on a fairly frequent basis.

We take complaints, we try to investigate them all.

Our policy is to comply with all legal requirements.

We are able, within the confines of the Freedom of Information law, to withhold the names of the complainants.

So we do try, to the best of our abilities, to protect their identities, to make sure that we are investigating the problem.

We're unable to really track retaliatory conduct, but, we hear the same information, that conduct generally gets reported to our elected officials, and then our elected officials then report it back to us.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And -- and one of the most common retaliatory actions that we hear about are -- are efforts to evict.

Do you -- you know, and we've had legislation before us to strengthen people's protections against evictions for no reason, you know, that -- for reason -- for eviction without a good cause.

Do you have a perspective on whether there might be some merit in making it -- making it clear that landlords can't evict tenants for -- without any good cause?

MICHELLE KELSON: Our city council has taken an official position to support the state

Legislature in their actions to pass state

legislation that would provide for those
protections, and, from our perspective, we support
our legislators.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

ALEXANDRA CHURCH: And with that, this needs

to be part of a larger conversation as well.

The City had 42 eviction -- condemnations last year.

Those are hundreds of people that the City, on our own action, by finding these non-compliant structures, put out.

And we need to have a comprehensive policy to have safe and secure places in New York State where these people can live.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And does that involve having additional resources, to make sure that -- to give you an alternative to condemning the building and removing the residents?

We had testimony earlier about emergency repair programs, which are fairly active in New York City.

But --

ALEXANDRA CHURCH: Absolutely, both emergency repair and emergency housing in -- within the city of Newburgh.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Great.

Okay. Well --

MICHELLE KELSON: We do try to be sensitive to the fact that, if a building has to be condemned or vacated, that it's, ultimately, the people who are living in those buildings that have to scramble, and that they're -- they face the most difficult challenges.

The City has endeavored, in multiple iterations, to work with our county partners, to work with any -- we have multiple not-for-profit agencies that operate in the city of Newburgh.

We've done our level best, without legal requirement, to, again, leverage those resources to prevent displacement where we can prevent displacement.

 $\label{eq:wedo} \mbox{We do} \mbox{ $--$ we do support a wide range of} \\ \mbox{housing opportunities.}$

We know that there's no one-size-fits-all, and we try to do our jobs to the benefit of all the interested parties.

And there's many stakeholders in this process.

ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: I would also add that (inaudible) abatements are -- can be difficult.

Code-enforcement condemnations happen at the worst time. They happen at 6:00 on a Friday as -- as offices are closed. Staff is gone -- from the different agencies, have gone to their own homes.

And it's very difficult to place somebody at 6:00 on a Friday night.

Our emergency housing is in the city of Middletown for Orange County. That means the families have to be -- gain transportation out to the city of Middletown, 20 miles away.

And their question is:

Well, how do I get my kids to school the next day?

How do I get to work the next day?
What are we going to do?

Emergency housing is a significant issue, and sometimes alternatives to condemnation don't always exist.

When the building is in a state of disrepair that requires condemnation, there's not a lot of give-and-take about that. It has to be condemned.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And from my -- from my -- the difference between condemnation and -- is that what we would -- might also refer as a "vacate order," or is that something different?

ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: It's essentially the same thing.

The building's condemned. That means it's uninhabitable, for whatever reason. It could be because there's no water. It could be because there's no heat. It could be because the roof caved in.

Any number of reasons causes a building to be condemned.

Typically, an order to vacate is also issued that same -- for that same building.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I see.

Okay.

Well, I will -- I will conclude there.

And if you would pass along to your inspectors our thanks for the work they're doing under what sounds like very difficult and underresourced circumstances.

But -- you know, and thank you, all of you, for the work you're doing, and the testimony today.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Carlucci.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Thank you.

And I want to thank all of you for being here today and testifying and sharing with us your experiences.

And I have to say, after the previous

testimony from the Orange County Landlords

Association, I'm very concerned and, frankly

disturbed by some of the responses that we got;

particularly, that we have the president of the

association, with over 247 code violations, and then

we learn that there might be more because we don't

know about the properties owned, and the fact that

the landlord association would send us someone

unwilling to tell us exact numbers, is very

concerning.

And even more so, and this is the question for you, is that, he was asked -- one of the landlords was asked, with the 247 violations, How much have you paid in fines?

And this is a theme that we have seen reoccurring, and one of the problems we particularly have in the community that I represent, is that even when these violations are taken to court, that it's almost not even a slap on the wrist to the landlords.

And this has become the culture or the cost of doing business.

How is it possible, and if it is even correct, that one of the landlords, with

1 247 violations that was confirmed by the City of
2 Newburgh, could then only pay about \$200 in fines?

Is that accurate, and how does that's happen?

JEREMY KAUFMAN: Well, I don't know whether or not that particular -- that particular statistic is -- is actually accurate.

I mean, the way the -- the other thing to keep in mind is that, the way that violations are generally generated, not every violation automatically escalates all the way up to court.

There's a handful of time -- there's a number of, kind of, circuit breakers in the process that allow a -- that allow a property owner to comply.

And the other thing to keep in mind is that, you're trying to create a scheme or a system that is applicable to each and every property owner, not just the worst of the worst.

So, that's balancing what Chief Horton said before about the scarce resources that the City has.

What we try to do is build in opportunities for property owners to comply upon the initial receipt of a violation.

They have opportunities to cure.

They have opportunities to come back and get a reinspection.

They then have opportunities for further inspection.

They have opportunities to cure in court.

So there's an entire, kind of, system in place for how people can deal with them.

Of the 200 and some-odd violations in particular, I don't know, off the top of my head, how many went -- ultimately went all the way to court and were resolved in court with a fine.

But that's certainly some information that we can provide at a, kind of, off -- offline there.

The other -- the other thing to -- that might be helpful, though, in dealing with some of these issues, is further enforcement, in the manner in which the -- the previous landlord stated, he mentioned that he was -- that he spends time in court, evicting, or trying to evict, you know, tenants who aren't -- or, who he has issues with.

Our city manager mentioned a minute ago, one proposal, to, basically, build into any real estate eviction petition a requirement that they verify — that any landlord who wants to evict a tenant verifies whether or not they actually have a rental license on file and in effect with the City.

You could add in other things, too, about --

about numbers of violations.

And make that critical jurisdictional information before entertaining a petition, akin to your name and address, where you don't even get through the door to have your -- to have your petition to evict entertained unless you can, up front, tell the Court that you're in compliance with everything you need to be in.

So, that's just one other suggestion for how to address problems similar to what the previous landlord had spoken to.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And just so I understand,
I know you don't have the documents in front of you,
but it is possible, though, that a landlord could be
hit with 247 violations and pay no fine whatsoever?

MICHELLE KELSON: It is within the realm of possibility.

So a fine is only assessed after a violation is then elevated for enforcement in our municipal court system, and either has been processed through to a verdict after a trial, or has been resolved through what is known in a criminal process as a "plea bargain," in which the fine would then be assessed by the judge.

So while the Legislature sets the maximum

amount that a fine can be, and there is jurisdictional ways, as the City of Albany indicated, that there intended to be a fine for each day that the violation exists, all of those things need to be properly pled and properly followed in your criminal procedure in order for a judge to be able to assess a fine that would accomplish that order of magnitude.

So what I want to reiterate is -- what I also wanted to point out is that, everybody is talking about \$250 a day.

So the Executive Law does provide fines for uniform building code violations of -- maximum of up to \$1,000 a day.

For some reason, that doesn't seem to be translating back down to some of the municipal judges and other people who prosecute these code violations on a regular basis.

Our own city code provides for a maximum fine, in certain instances, of \$250 a day.

But, where we're required to enforce the state uniform building code, those fines could be as great as \$1,000 a day.

So that's something else that needs, I think, to be publicized, and I think everybody needs to be

aware -- made aware that the potential exposure is much higher than it is.

And what we have done in our City Court violations, is to try to improve our papers, and improve our presentation, so that the property owners who do come to court, who are called before the judges, can understand that it's not just the one violation.

It's one -- that violation times X number of days that you have failed to do anything about it, leading to a potential exposure of tens of thousands of dollars.

And that usually gets somebody's attention to, again, at least go down the road of compliance.

Now, you can assess 150,000, 200,000 dollars in fines, but that's not going to protect the party who is now being forced to live under those horrible conditions if compliance has not been achieved.

So we have a -- kind of a balancing effort to make sure that compliance is one of our significant goals.

We know that fines can be a deterrent if they are significant enough and they can be levied in a way that will cause a deterrent effect.

And that goes back to one of the bills that

we hope the Assembly will take up, that would allow these fines, where they remain unpaid, to be re-levied into the real property tax, and collected in the form of a delinquent tax, if necessary, where the ultimate pain, the ultimate remedy, would be the loss of title to the property, which, if you're a landlord and that's your investment, that's a significant loss. SENATOR CARLUCCI: Well, thank you.

And --

ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: And I would just add --

SENATOR CARLUCCI: -- yeah.

ASST CHIEF BILL HORTON: -- I struggle with the idea of compliance (indiscernible).

I'm not fine-driven, I'm not fine-motivated;
I'm compliance-driven about these properties.

But one of the things that I struggle with is, if somebody has -- a property has a violation, we issued a violation, and we -- you have 7 days to comply, you have 14 days to comply, or whatever it is, equate that to a speeding ticket.

If you get a speeding ticket, you're given a ticket, and you move on.

You don't gain relief from that ticket

because you don't speed for the next seven days.

You don't gain relief from that ticket because you're a good person for the next two weeks.

If you -- if your building has a violation, there should be a -- there should be a complaint -- a violation issued, and it shouldn't matter that you cleaned it up in 29 days when 30 days was the time that you're supposed to get it cleaned up on.

No matter what, yes, you should clean it up, but there also should be some type of penalty or fee associated because the violation occurred in the first place.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Right.

And that's what it sounds like, that the cost of doing business, the landlords have associated in that, well, catch me if you can, and then, if so, I can rectify it.

So there's no real concern for the welfare of the tenants, no -- no real leverage that the government/code enforcement can put on the landlords because, okay, if they catch me, I'll see how long I can go without the four code inspectors -- code-enforcement officers in the city of Newburgh to find me.

So I think you're right on on that.

And I appreciate you paying atten -- or -- or -- or, profiling the case of the legislation to add the code violations to the tax levy.

And that's a legislation that I've carried, and we've passed in the Senate in the past, and, hopefully, we can get it through both Houses.

But now the concern that I have, even with that legislation, and putting that legislation forward, is that you will have situations where the judges still just will plea down these fines.

Right now, if we were able to pass that legislation, how would it impact the City of Newburgh?

Because, as we know, it has to be violations that are over a year, and then it would added to the tax Levy.

Could you tell us, approximately, like, how many outstanding violations do we have over a one-year period in terms of fines?

MICHELLE KELSON: Well, I don't know if we have any exact statistics, but what it would -- it would give us -- it would give us a tool that would not require an additional use of resources to try and collect those fines from those who are required to pay.

So, a re-levy process is something that we already have in place for unpaid water bills, unpaid sewer bills, unpaid sanitation bills.

If we are able to achieve a fine -- a fine is assessed in court, and, for whatever reason, that fine remains unpaid, we can file the -- we can get that fine converted to a judgment. The judgment can be recorded in the county court records.

There's a small fee for that, which we gladly pay.

That fine can -- that judgment can languish.

The mechanism for us to enforce that lien would to be execute on the judgment.

There may be superior liens on the property which would make that process ineffectual, and it's an additional resource that we have to engage in in our legal department.

Jeremy Kaufman (indicating) and
Michelle Kelson (indicating), we're the only two
lawyers for the City of Newburgh. We do all the
legal work.

This is one component of the legal work that's required, and it takes a substantial period of time.

Sometimes when the property then gets

transferred and these judgments come up in a title search, then, all of a sudden, we get a telephone call, Hey, how can we pay this off because there's a lien on the property?

And so then it becomes the cost of doing business because, I want to get the property sold, you know, it will come out of the purchase price.

That's fine.

But in a re-levy situation, it's automatic.

We already do it. It doesn't require any additional legal resources. It's all done automatically, and it's a process that we already have in place.

And when people get their tax-foreclosure notifications, you can bet that the people pay a lot more attention to a notice that says, If you don't pay this, you will lose all right, title, and interest to your property by a certain date.

So it's a fairly Draconian remedy, it's intended to be a Draconian remedy, and it doesn't require any additional use of resources on the City's part, which is what makes it a little bit better of a tool for us.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thanks very much.

I think that's all of our questions. 1 2 And I really want to express my gratitude to all of you, who I work with on a whole bunch of 3 different things, but, really, for your 4 participation here, and like I said, for the past 5 6 number of months, your cooperation. 7 Thanks very much. Okay, next up will be Rockland County 8 9 Initiative. And if I may, to all the witnesses, and also 10 11 my colleagues, just be mindful of the time. 12 We do have another hearing this afternoon 13 that we need to get to, and there will be witnesses 14 there. 15 So, with that, welcome. 16 Catherine Johnson Southern; right? 17 CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Correct. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Yep. 18 Thank you for being here. 19 20 If you may, just please raise your right 21 hand. 22 Do you solemnly swear that you'll tell the 23 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: I do.

so help you God?

24

25

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Good afternoon, and thank you, Senator Skoufis and other Senators, members of the committee, for inviting me here today.

I am thrilled to be here, and to represent Rockland County, particularly the department of health.

I am currently the deputy commissioner of health.

I am in charge of all public health programs, and the program I'm here to speak about today is "RCI," otherwise known as the "Rockland Codes Initiative."

We have now a center in Rockland called

The Center for Rockland Codes Investigations, as of

February of this year.

So a little bit of history.

Myself, I've been with the Rockland County Department of Health for 32 years.

I started out myself as a housing inspector.

Became a supervisor in housing, then left and did

other programs, tobacco, body art.

And in 2013 I was put back in housing as the program manager in housing.

And, at that time, the housing program was getting smaller and smaller because it wasn't, and still is not, a State-mandated program for enforcement.

We enforce New York State Public Health Law.

We also enforce Rockland County sanitary

codes.

So, in 2014, after a year of being in charge of the program, our county executive was elected, Mr. Ed Day, and he ran with a platform and an agenda to improve the housing stock in Rockland County.

That was half the mission.

And the other half of that mission was to protect our first responders in Rockland County.

And, again, timing is everything.

We all are aware that, in 2007, 2008, we experienced a mortgage crisis throughout New York.

And so what we had going on in

Rockland County, in addition to the housing stock,
you know, inspections not being made, but we then
had single-family homes that were going into
foreclosure, and that were being bought for cash,
and then used as, you know, six apartments.

They would be on the tax rolls as a

single-family house, but when you make
six apartments illegally, convert them -- convert
the garage, convert the attic, convert the
basement -- it poses very serious and dangerous
conditions, not only for the residents, the tenants,
but also for our first responders.

And so the Rockland Codes Initiative, 4 years young, as I sit here, was -- began, and it commenced enforcing Article 13, Housing, Hygiene, and Occupancy, one of our sanitary codes, under the auspices of Article 1, the commissioner of health's awesome powers, to allow enforcement to take place.

And you all have a, you know, folder in front of you, which sets forth our work and what we've done over the past four years.

So, at the health department, we do administrative enforcement.

And so, with the Codes Initiative, what we sought to do was to enforce Article 13, and to seek the highest possible fines, which are up to \$2,000 per day per violation.

And, again, enforcement is what we do, but we do seek compliance, and we also educate.

We then developed a website where residents, any member of the public, can register a complaint.

We also have on our website "The Worst Landlord List," which shows, displays, every couple of months we change it out, the five worst landlords; people who do not correct the violations when given the opportunity to do so.

That was initiated four years ago.

About two years ago we said, Hey, let's be a little kinder and gentler.

So we also have a "Most-Improved Landlord" on the website now.

And we also developed a multiple-dwelling rental registry, and this went into effect in 2017.

This requires that any landlord who owns, rents, three or more units has to pay a fee -- a one-time fee of \$25 per unit, and register with the Rockland County Health Department.

When they register, they must give us the name of the owner, and a responsible party with an address in Rockland County.

And I've spoken to Senator Skoufis before, and I explained that, when we have the LLCs, very difficult, because our program is completely complaint-based.

And so the first thing we do when we get a complaint, is to find out, who is the responsible

party? who is the owner?

And oftentimes we find LLCs, and we see the LLC is -- you know, can be sold, you know, to somebody else. It could be ABC, LLC, sold to 123, LLC, with the same principal partners.

But oftentimes, when we go online to look at the New York Department of State, we don't have a responsible party.

So it takes a lot of time and energy trying to find out who we're going to go after when we get these complaints.

So that's just one suggestion, where, if we could, develop a way where the department of state required an individual's name and an address in the locality where they're being -- where they're found under violation.

So, again, complaint-based.

We take complaints from the public.

We take them by telephone, people walk in. People meet us out in the field.

My -- the team that works with me, we have two supervisors, a program manager, six inspectors, three support staff.

And we have, also, a Healthy Neighborhoods component; so again, education, very important. And

we have two individuals in that program. 1 This paradigm of enforcement has worked for 2 3 us over the past four years. As I said, the fines are significant. 4 5 \$2,000 per day per violation is the maximum. 6 Where, in the past, prior to the innovative 7 approach, we would bring in, maybe, you know, people, fine them, \$200, \$500. 8 When we started this program, it really woke 9 10 people up. 11 We were now fining, \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000. And, again, these are the assessed fines. 12 Collections are not as high as the assessed 13 14 fines are. 15 But one thing that we found in the past year 16 is that we are gaining compliance, and we do now 17 offer stipulations. So as long as all the violations are 18 19 corrected, we then accept a stipulated fine amount. 20 But, again, the fines are high, and they're 21 not the purpose of our enforcement.

We really want compliance. We want safe housing, sanitary conditions.

22

23

24

25

But we are collecting fines, more now than we were in the past, with the stipulations.

In addition to enforcing Article 13, Housing, Hygiene, and Occupancy, we have expanded our enforcement under Article 1, and so we are also doing enforcement in some of the private schools where we're finding egregious unsanitary conditions.

We're doing enforcement under Article 3, Offensive Material.

Again, these are sanitary codes.

Article 4, Sewage.

And what we've done is, and to begin with, an intra-department enforcement.

So we're working with all the different departments within the health department, so, our environmental division; our community health; our children programs for early intervention and pre-K, the homes where those children are living.

We really work with all of our departments within health, as well as, throughout the county, all the other departments. So we work with the department of social services, adult protective services, the office of fire and emergency services. We work with consumer protection.

Most recently we formed a liaison with our department of human rights, for fair housing and discrimination.

So, from my perspective, and I think that our county executive has done a tremendous job, is, if you take a program and you make it a State mandate, if all counties throughout New York State had to, you know, we're mandated, to have a housing program in their health department, in public health, and work within the community.

We work diligently every single day with the municipalities, with the building and fire departments, throughout Rockland County.

We are in constant contact, letting them know of violations that we found that would also be violations of their code.

Our program manager, who's, unfortunately, not here any longer with us here today, but he is a member of NYSBOC.

So he is familiar, he knows; he's been with the department of health for 38 years, and he knows the building and fire code inside out and backwards.

We do not do zoning, we don't have jurisdiction for that, but we certainly work with the building department on zoning issues.

Rooming houses, they were mentioned earlier today. They are a big problem in Rockland County.

And there is information in the packet that

I provided.

Rooming houses, where there's three or more unrelated individuals living, you know, in the same place, and they are renting units.

We will permit, at the Rockland County Department of Health, a rooming house.

We do not care if the building department has said, We don't allow them in our jurisdiction.

We will bring it to their attention that they do have a rooming house within their jurisdiction.

It is then up to them to say, We're not going to allow it; to go out and inspect and disband it.

If they do not, the health department will go in and we will permit that rooming house.

We will make sure that it is safe and sanitary; that every person living there has a smoke detector, a carbon monoxide detector, water, toilet facilities, and everything is in place.

So, again, we get a lot of calls from the building department. I think we make more calls to them.

But I think it is, and as, you know,
Assemblyman Zebrowski said first thing this morning,
everybody needs to work together.

And if the State provides oversight and a

means for everybody to work together, I think that would be very helpful.

State, county, and municipal level, we all need to work together, and I think it's very possible for us to do that.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thanks very much for your testimony.

And when our team and I met with you and some other county officials, it was really quite an illuminating meeting.

I just have a couple of questions.

First, to your knowledge, is this the only -- is Rockland County the only county in New York that has an initiative like this?

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Yes, to my knowledge it is.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, that was my understanding as well, and I agree with you.

I think that, you know, there -- this ought to be looked at in other counties, and, you know, we're going to recommend that they do that.

I do want to just explore a little bit about this -- you know, the packet that you handed out.

So here, clearly, I mean, this is, total number of complaints received, RCI complaints, and

complaints to the Town.

And it's a pretty startling graph, in that,
Ramapo has more than triple the next nearest town in
terms of number of complaints to the Initiative over
the past number of years.

Can you give your sort of synopsis as to (a) why that is?

And, also, if you can speak to your relationship with the five towns' building departments, and how your relationship is with Ramapo specifically?

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Sure.

I believe that we have an excellent relationship with most of the municipalities.

There are five towns, there are also hamlets and villages within all the towns, and we do work well.

When the Codes Initiative started, I met with all of the building departments and tried to put out there that we wanted to work together.

I would say that, Clarkstown, Orangetown,
Stony Point, Haverstraw, we have worked diligently,
and I think we have a very successful relationship.

Ramapo is a struggle, but we do work with them. We do reach out to them and let them know of

the problems that we find.

Yes, there are, obviously, the statistics bear out, more complaints come in from Ramapo.

And it's, again, we go out and investigate the complaints that are brought to us.

So, it speaks for itself.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Would you -- would you -- do you believe that Ramapo and the building department there cooperates well with the Initiative?

Would you describe it that way, or would you describe it perhaps a different way?

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: I would say that the health department reaches out to Ramapo just as much as we reach out to any other municipality.

And I would say that there are struggles, and I believe there are issues going on within the town of Ramapo and the various municipalities within Ramapo, that, perhaps, make it, you know, difficult for them to, I guess, have a working relationship with us.

A lot of, you know, people --

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I know you're being very careful --

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Yes, I am being

very careful. 1 SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- with your words right 2 3 now. But if you can -- if you can, perhaps, 4 illuminate on what exactly you're getting at here. 5 So, local problems that make it difficult for 6 7 the Town to work with you, what exactly do you mean by that? 8 CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Yes, there --9 I'm familiar with, just being a resident of 10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Rockland County my entire life, in Ramapo there is not, by the building departments, it doesn't seem, the same kind of enforcement that goes on in the other towns in Rockland County.

So other members have already spoken today. Gordon Wren, about the enforcement that is done, the code enforcement, in Ramapo.

But I really am not an expert on Town code enforcement, but, again, the fines and the different ways that, you know, problems come about.

I will say that it is very difficult to work in the town of Ramapo.

There seems to be building that goes on that kind of behooves what should be being done.

I think I explained in the past to you,

Senator Skoufis, that we have permits for a -- maybe four buildings, a four-family structure, that's going to be built.

We turn around and we see, now we don't enforce zoning, but, eight units are built on that property.

The health department gets involved and they will ask us for an irrigation-well permit.

So we will issue the irrigation-well permit prior to the buildings being built.

And, supposedly, perhaps there's going to be a plat of land that's 10 feet-by-12 feet that's going to need an irrigation well.

We approve the irrigation well, the building goes up, and, lo and behold, there is no plat of land of grass, of trees, that requires an irrigation well.

However, our program manager will get a call from Suez Water, saying, Hey, we have eight units at such-and-such location where there is no water usage, and yet we have eight accounts.

When we go out, we find that the irrigation well has been connected, through piping during the building process, to eight of the units.

And inside each unit there will be a switch

where they can switch from Suez Water to the irrigation well.

The irrigation-well water has no chlorine residual, so they're not allowed to use that water.

And we do find resistance with builders, with building inspectors, and even with the landlords of these properties, in trying to gain compliance.

A very tricky situation.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Just one final question, if I may.

You mentioned that you reach out to the -the Initiative reaches out to all five of the
building departments when complaints are brought to
your attention.

Do all five reach out to you when complaints are brought to their attention?

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Yes.

Not every single complaint, and not all that we would like, but, certainly, we reach out more to the building departments than they reach out to us.

And that's something that we would appreciate, if the State could step in and say, Building Departments, you have to cooperate with your health department.

That would be wonderful.

1	SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.
2	Senator Carlucci.
3	SENATOR CARLUCCI: Thank you.
4	Thank you for being here, and for the
5	innovative work that you guys have done in the
6	county.
7	And so, with the Rockland Code Initiative,
8	have you had conversations with the monitor that was
9	in the town of Ramapo?
10	CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: No, I have not.
11	SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. Do you know if the
12	Rockland Code Initiative worked with them at all?
13	CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: No, we have not
14	worked with them.
15	SENATOR CARLUCCI: You have not. Okay.
16	And is that the same with the monitor that's
17	currently the building monitor currently in the
18	village of Spring Valley?
19	CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Yes, we have not
20	worked with them.
21	SENATOR CARLUCCI: There's no working with
22	them.
23	CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: No.
24	SENATOR CARLUCCI: The health department has
25	not worked

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: No, the health department has not.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay.

Do you think that would be a valuable process, to have a relationship with the monitor from the department of state, with the health department?

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Absolutely.

If there can be a liaison in any way, shape, or form, I think we should all work together.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And so we know, we heard from Gordon Wren, talking about, that the Rockland Code Initiative has made some progress.

And we see from the chart here, it seems like some of the -- the -- it seems like it's working, that the -- many of the complaints and violations have gone down.

However, what are some of the major stumbling blocks in terms of what could help do your job even more?

Now you say, to require the department of state to ask the building inspectors to cooperate with the department of health.

How -- could you be more specific about that; what -- what exactly could the department of state

do on that level?

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: I think the department of state could, whether it's through legislation, or, however it would happen, to mandate that the building department works with the health department, provides information, has certificate of occupancies for all the properties, because, with multiple-dwelling rental registry, which has been a huge success for us, we require that the property owner submits a certificate of occupancy.

And we're finding a stumbling block there, that oftentimes they don't have one.

So they want to comply with us, they don't want to be in violation, but they can't get their certificate of occupancy.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Well -- and now we see the fines assessed.

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Yes.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: It looks like a total of, what, about \$1.8 million since the RCI was formed?

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Yes.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And do you know how much of the fines have actually been collected?

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: I can't give you a precise figure, but I would say that,

approximately, one-third of the fines are actually collected, with the exception of the past year.

We're collecting probably two-thirds of the fine now, because we're off -- fines now, because we're offering stipulations, and people are more apt

6 to pay \$10,000 than \$40,000.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And just to be clear, these fines on this graph, where we talk about the 1.8 million -- or, actually, 1.7 million, are those fines going to the department of health or to the respective towns?

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: No, those fines are going to the department of health, yes --

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay.

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: -- yes.

And we do have collections also.

So we work with our department of law, with an attorney there, who does collections through Rockland County Court. And, also, our sheriff's department is very involved.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Biaggi.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

My question is simply operational, because

I think that what you're doing should be replicated

across the entire state, in every single county, actually.

Can you just, if you know, off of the top of your head, the cost of the operation to do something like this, let's say, and replicate this in other places?

And how many people are on staff?

And how long it took to get it up and running?

CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: Okay.

So it got up and running pretty quickly.

Right now we have, as I said before, one program manager, we have two supervisors, we have six inspectors.

And this is civil service, so, of course, the -- somebody starts as an inspector, a Public Health Technician I, and the base salary for that is \$49,002.

And then they would be a supervisor, as a Public Health Tech II.

And they would be program manager, as a Public Health Sanitarian.

But it's all promotional, and I think that's key also, to give people the incentive.

We also have support staff, so we have a

223 1 program specialist, an environmental health assistant, clerical. 2 And then we have a Healthy Neighborhoods 3 program, which has two individuals who work in that 4 5 program. So a total of 14. 6 7 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. 8 CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: We need more, that's for sure. 9 10 SENATOR BIAGGI: Sure. 11 How long did it take to get it up and 12 running? A year? 13 CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: We were up and running, I would say, within -- the kickoff was 14 15 April 30th of 2015, and we were up and running 16 April 30th of 2015. 17 SENATOR BIAGGI: Wow. CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: We had a housing 18 19 program. As I said, it had been a large housing 20 program 32 years ago, when I started, with 21 8 inspectors. But it had been diminished by 2013 to 22 only two inspectors. 23

And so now we've, you know, tripled that.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Great.

24

25

Would you be willing to go to, or have you

traveled to, other counties to talk about what you 1 2 do? CATHERINE JOHNSON SOUTHERN: I'd be willing 3 to travel to other counties, for sure. 4 I have not yet traveled to other counties, 5 but I've had a few counties call me and ask me what 6 7 we do. And I've spoken with them at length, and 8 they're exhausted, and they say, It sounds great, 9 but how do you do it? 10 11 I say, You just do it. SENATOR BIAGGI: Right. 12 13 Well, I invite you to Westchester County, 14 where I represent a small portion in the Lower 15 Hudson Valley. 16 Thank you very much for being here. 17 LAURA FELTS: Thank you. 18 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much for 19 your testimony. 20 Next we'll have the Town of Ramapo, 21 Supervisor Michael Specht and Town Attorney 22 Dennis Lynch. 23 Thank you, and welcome. 24 If you may, raise your right hands. 25 Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the

truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, 1 2 so help you God? MICHAEL SPECHT: I do. 3 DENNIS LYNCH: I do. 4 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 5 6 Please proceed. 7 MICHAEL SPECHT: Thank you, Chairman Skoufis, 8 Senators. 9 My name is Michael Specht. I am the supervisor of the town of Ramapo, 10 11 and have been since January 2018. 12 Thank you for affording me the opportunity to 13 speak at this hearing. 14 The town of Ramapo is going through a 15 transformation. 16 We have seen our population increase as we 17 become one of the fastest-growing towns in the 18 state, if not the nation. 19 We are proud of the growth of our community 20 and of its great ethnic, racial, and religious 21 diversity. 22 With this growth and transformation comes 23 challenges. 24 As we watch our neighborhoods grow and prosper, the safety and security of all of our

25

residents, visitors, and first responders remains our top priority. This includes making sure that we have an efficient, effective, and proactive building department.

When I was elected supervisor by the residents of the town of Ramapo, I vowed to work with our dedicated Town employees to make the needed changes.

That is what we have done, and that is what New York State has confirmed that we have done.

This has not always been the case.

In 2016, prior to my administration, the department of state, after an investigation, determined that the Town's enforcement and administration of the State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code did not substantially comply with the minimum standards required by the State.

As a result, an oversight monitor was assigned to work with and supervise the Town's progress in this area.

After two years, in December 2018, at the close of my first year in office, the State determined that our code enforcement and administration had materially improved, and that we now substantially comply with the standards.

As a result, oversight was discontinued.

A report was issued, detailing the progress the Town had made in various aspects, including inspections, issuing permits and certificates of occupancy, recordkeeping, training, and enforcement.

While I am certainly proud that the State has determined that our practices are now acceptable,

I am not content to rest with being just good enough or meeting minimal standards.

We seek to always enhance and improve our work in this area so as to minimize any safety threat to our residents and first responders.

We are meeting this challenge by implementing new procedures and hiring additional personnel, and investing in state-of-the-art equipment and software.

It is the Town's policy that complaints are responded to promptly.

If the complaint alleges a potential fire safety violation, it is responded to immediately.

If a violation is found, we take action.

A notice of violation, specifying the details of the violation, is issued to the occupant or owner, with the demand that the conditions be remedied.

In all serious cases, an appearance ticket is also issued, compelling the violator to appear in the Town's Justice Court.

The Town attorney's office then works with the code-enforcement personnel to draft and file the accusatory instruments in court.

If the fire inspector or building inspector determines that the violation presents an imminent danger to life or safety, he will recommend to me that the Town board authorize the Town attorney's office to bring an action for an injunction in Supreme Court.

The Town board will then vote to authorize the injunction, and in every instance in which an injunction was requested, it was authorized.

In all cases we seek compliance with the law.

In cases which were prosecuted in court, any disposition takes into account whether the offender has a prior history of violations, and how cooperative they were in remedying the unlawful conditions.

One new policy that we have implemented this year is that, whenever a case is resolved in court, the Town attorney's office will require, as a condition, that the property owner consent to

additional inspections for a period of time after the case is closed to confirm that the property remains in compliance.

All Town departments work together in reporting potentially unsafe or illegal conditions to the building department, including our police department and our assessor's office.

We have restructured the building department so that zoning and planning matters are handled by a professional planner, and so that the building inspector can focus on permits, inspections, and enforcement.

We have hired additional building inspectors, fire inspectors, and plan reviewers. And just last night, voted to hire an additional part-time fire safety inspector.

All of our fire safety personnel are, in addition, dedicated volunteer firefighters in their spare time.

Do we make mistakes?

Are there oversights and errors in judgment?

Is there room for constructive criticism?

Yes.

Are we able and willing to learn from our mistakes and strive towards best practices?

1 Yes.

We learned from the period of State oversight how to improve our practices and procedures.

We look forward to any recommendations and insight this committee will offer as well.

As one example, we have been less than satisfied with the software system we use for record management.

Mr. Mazzariello, when he visited the town during the course of his investigation, made some recommendations for alternative platforms that we are now exploring.

We have also hired an information technology director to fill a post that had been vacant for several years, and we have tasked him with improving and upgrading our systems.

Within two weeks of taking office in

January of 2018, I reached out to the various
individuals and organizations critical of Town
policies, including the Rockland County Illegal
Housing Task Force, and I attended a meeting of the
task force.

I emphasized that my door would always be open to anyone who wished to discuss any issue of concern within the town.

I also announced that I wished to revive the Town bureau of fire prevention, which had been inactive for many years, and have the various fire departments within the town nominate members to serve on it, for the purpose of meeting regularly with building department officials, in order to advise and aid in working towards greater fire safety.

In February of 2018 I sent a letter to all of the fire chiefs within the unincorporated town, asking for nominations to the bureau.

I wrote, "That it is my sincere wish that the existence and operation of the bureau of fire prevention will foster greater communication and cooperation between the town government and the fire services, leading to enhanced safety for our firefighters, responders, and our residents."

Receiving no response to my letter, I sent a follow-up in March, again with no response.

Likewise, at that time, I invited all of the fire departments to suggest members to be appointed to the Town's planning board and zoning board of appeals. This offer too met with no response.

However, my door continues to be open to all, including all emergency services personnel.

As this committee considers ways to improve code enforcement, I would respectfully recommend that you consider legislation that will allow code violations in the town to be prosecuted at an administrative hearing, to allow for an expedited and streamlined process in a way that advances public safety and compliance with the law without sacrificing due process.

Once again, I thank you for your time, and I welcome any questions that you may have.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much for your testimony.

And I appreciate you and your Town's cooperation over these past number of months with the committee.

As I'm sure you know, and it's been mentioned a number of times, the importance of code enforcement and what we're talking about here is evident, as recently as this week, in the town of Ramapo, with what happened with very -- two very young girls who nearly drowned.

As has been also noted, it is very difficult to enforce, you know, single-family homes due to privacy reasons, et cetera.

But, it does reinforce just how essential

this issue is.

I want to jump right into it here.

So if my staff can put up Exhibit C, which is a non-public, a private school, on Route 306 in the town of Ramapo.

I know it's been the subject of -- of some of tension over the years.

Nine violations were issued on February 26, 2018, ranging from, problems with the water system; ceiling clearance; problems with the fire alarm system; issues with insulation and maintenance of electrical equipment; means of egress, getting in and out safely of the school.

These were violations that were issued.

Then, however, the certificate of occupancy expired for this school, actually, previous to those violations, on September 30, 2017.

And Rockland County Supreme Court

Justice Paul Mark held that, "The Town of Ramapo has an obligation to ensure and enforce compliance with its laws, and are entitled to judgment, in join" -- "judgment, in joining defense, from all use and occupancy of the premises, except in conformity with a valid certificate."

So, basically, the Court granted you the

opportunity to shut this school down.

My understanding is that you have not in the number of years since that authority was granted to the Town.

Many believe that the students are attending that school in unsafe conditions.

Can you explain why the Town has not taken up the Court on your new authority?

MICHAEL SPECHT: Yes.

First of all, the Court issued that order in the fall of 2018, so it hasn't been years, it's been months.

But, either way, we brought the original injunction action in early 2018 because our fire inspector and building inspector determined that there were unsafe conditions at the site.

There were also zoning violations because their CO had lapsed, and they had not gone through the complete process to get an approval.

The fire safety violations were at some point cured.

That was our first concern.

Our concern was the safety of the students, the safety of anybody who might have to respond to that site.

1 SENATOR SKOUFIS: At what point? 2 Sorry to interrupt. 3 MICHAEL SPECHT: At what point was it cured? SENATOR SKOUFIS: Yes. 4 5 MICHAEL SPECHT: It was -- I'm going by 6 memory here, I'm sorry, but I believe it was cured 7 sometime in the spring or summer. There was a reinspection in the summer, found 8 additional violations. 9 Those were cured fairly quickly. They 10 11 weren't as major as the previous ones. 12 SENATOR SKOUFIS: So the CO expired in the 13 fall of the previous year, and they were cured in 14 the spring or summer of the following year, which 15 begs the question, how could the school operate for 16 that long? 17 I mean, that's, basically, a full school year, right, without curing, and the Town not taking 18 19 any action. 20 MICHAEL SPECHT: Well, we have to distinguish 21 between a zoning violation and a safety violation or 22 a code violation. 23 This school came to being legally. It applied for a CO under a law that we had at the 24

time, that was since repealed, which allowed the

25

building inspector to issue a temporary permit for modular units on a school that would last for up to two years.

After the school received its permits, at some point in time, the Town board repealed that law, found that it was not a -- working the way it should have been working.

Repealed it, and the school CO lapsed, and they were not able to get a renewal.

They needed to go to the planning board to get a site plan approved.

And in order to do that, because of the shape and the layout and the size of the lot, they needed to get area variances from the zoning board.

They went to the zoning board at one point last year, and were denied the variances.

Again, our concern was to make sure that it was compliant with State code, there was compliance with safety issues, and, that was accomplished.

The zoning violation continued on.

They -- in the fall they went back to the zoning board, under revised application, seeking lesser variances, and the zoning board approved them.

They then applied to the planning board.

2 2

At that point, since they have every -- we have every reason to believe they will (indiscernible) -- at some point be approved and become legalized, and that the only thing holding them up is their need to go through the entire process, we made the decision not to evict the students, who were mostly young girls, from the site.

The main concern that I had was, knowing from past experience, that if these -- if this school was closed down while it was finally now safe and on the road to compliance, they would probably be located in other sites that we weren't aware of, that were not safe, or were potentially not safe, and were not legal as well.

So, it was a balancing of the -- what would be the appropriate response, and that was to keep the school -- allow the school to remain open, as long as they were safe, as long as they permitted regular inspections by our staff, and as long as they were working toward getting their final CO, which they have been.

So --

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I appreciate your response.

So I'll just -- from my perspective, at

least, you know, the prospect of students, you know, not, sort of, coming down on the school that is unsafe, because the prospect those students might be attending -- or, sent to other schools that are also unsafe, is not really a valid reason, in my mind, to not move forward with proper enforcement.

And, quite frankly --

DENNIS LYNCH: (Inaudible.)

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Well, let me -- if I could just finish.

-- you know, the Town should be aware of those others schools that may be unsafe as well.

Yes, go ahead, very briefly.

DENNIS LYNCH: My point is, and, again, I -- I -- I wasn't -- didn't have a chance to give my opening statement, but, responding to your particular point, what's happened frequently is zoning issues are confused with State building code issues.

The Town was satisfied that there was no issue of safety under the State building code.

The fact that there was zoning code violations is totally separate from what I understand this committee is looking at.

I have specific suggestions with regard to

how the committee can improve it.

For example, Town Law, Section 268, allows for taxpayers to bring claims or bring lawsuits for zoning violations, but not for code violations.

You could change that.

The Uniform Justice Court allows, under Section 209, for Provisional Remedies, with regard to recovering chattel, a replevin action. But not to go into a place where you can have an order to show cause and act quickly in the Justice Court.

So, I mean, some of those issues, if they're safety issues, there's mechanisms, which I submit to this committee, are two specific examples: Town Law, Section 268. Uniform Justice Act, Section 209.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, thank you.

I want to let my colleagues get to their questions, but I -- if I may just offer a battery here, and just, sort of, precise answers, succinct answers.

How often does your housing court meet?

MICHAEL SPECHT: We meet, approximately, once every three weeks.

We don't have a dedicated housing court. We have a Town Justice Court.

The Town judge/justices hear code-violation

1 cases once every three weeks. 2 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. That seems to be --DENNIS LYNCH: If we go to the Supreme Court, 3 we don't have to wait for the Justice Court calendar 4 to be reached. 5 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 6 7 -- once every three weeks does seem to far less frequent than a lot of the other 8 9 municipalities --DENNIS LYNCH: Maybe the State --10 11 SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- (indiscernible) every 12 other (indiscernible cross-talking). 13 DENNIS LYNCH: Maybe the State can get us 14 more funding so we can meet more frequently. 15 SENATOR SKOUFIS: City of Newburgh, 16 I believe, meets once a week, if I'm not mistaken --17 MICHAEL SPECHT: I would agree with you --SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- (indiscernible 18 19 cross-talking) --20 MICHAEL SPECHT: -- and that's an improvement 21 we would like to see happen, with the Court's 22 cooperation. 23 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 24 Town of Ramapo, let's see, department of 25 state requires that every city, village, town, and

county charged with administration and enforcement 1 of the uniform code submit an annual report of its 2 3 activities to the secretary of state to check for compliance. 4 Has the Town of Ramapo sent that annual 5 6

report, 2014, '15, '16, '17, and '18?

MICHAEL SPECHT: To my knowledge we have.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Under Town Code 376-140, enforcement officials are required to make any reports required by the Town board.

Has the Town board required any reports of code-enforcement officials during your administration?

MICHAEL SPECHT: We have asked the Town -the building inspector and the fire inspector to report if there is a condition that we think would need injunctive relief, or some other remedy outside of the normal code enforcement process.

DENNIS LYNCH: And, also, the State committee -- the State investigation that did the report, made recommendations for regular meetings with the building inspector and staff.

That's being done.

And if there's anything that happens, we just

had an example, about, I'd say four weeks ago, where there was a need to go to Supreme Court quickly.

The building inspector immediately made the recommendation to the Town board, and the Town board voted to go to Supreme Court.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: So how many times has the board requested reports for specific cases, because that's what you're talking about here?

MICHAEL SPECHT: Right.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And how many times have you requested a general report, a quarterly report, an annual report, about what's going on with code enforcement?

MICHAEL SPECHT: Since I've been supervisor,
I would say -- specific sites, I would say about a
half a dozen times.

And, annual or quarterly reports, I don't believe the board has requested that.

I will meet -- I meet with the building department officials on a regular basis, I get that information.

But, no, the board has not requested it.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

Has the Town ever not enforced the expiration of a building-permit application after 180 days if

the permit is not issued or an extension granted in 1 2 writing? 3 MICHAEL SPECHT: Not to my knowledge. I can't speak to every building permit. 4 5 If there were oversights or mistakes, I can't answer that. 6 7 But that would not be the policy. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 8 9 Has the Town ever not enforced the expiration of a building permit after 180 days when work has 10 11 not commenced or 90-day extensions have been granted 12 in writing? MICHAEL SPECHT: I'm not aware. 13 14 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 15 Has a Town building official ever suspended 16 or revoked a permit issued in error based on 17 incorrect, inaccurate, or incomplete information by 18 the applicant? 19 DENNIS LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, if we knew these 20 questions ahead of time, we could give you the 21 answers on the spot. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Well, if you don't know 22 23 them now, then we can follow up with --24 MICHAEL SPECHT: We'd be happy to send 25 (indiscernible cross-talking) --

1 DENNIS LYNCH: Oh, certainly, we'd be happy 2 to follow up on them. 3 MICHAEL SPECHT: Absolutely. SENATOR SKOUFIS: But you're not aware of 4 5 any --6 MICHAEL SPECHT: I'm not aware. 7 I know the building department has, just recently, the building inspector revoked a 8 9 certificate of occupancy. Revoking a permit, I'd have to find that out. 10 11 DENNIS LYNCH: And we'll follow up with a 12 written response to your questions, Chairman. 13 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Has the Town ever issued 14 partial permits for site plans? 15 MICHAEL SPECHT: We have done that. 16 We've been advised that, while there is no 17 prohibition in the State code, we would need a local law to do so. 18 19 So we have actually scheduled a hearing for 20 June, for -- a public hearing, for a proposed local 21 law, amending our code to allow that. 22 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 23 Especially given that you're -- you deal with 24 these housing issues in court once every three

weeks, which is quite a lengthy period of time

25

compared to other places we've looked, I think --1 I do need to ask about, sort of, the duration of 2 these violations, how long they languish in court in 3 4 Ramapo. 5 Can you -- do you know what the longest

violations have been in housing court?

MICHAEL SPECHT: I don't --

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And can you speak to these motions to adjourn, right?

So we heard from the City of Newburgh, they've recently issued a warrant for a non-appearance from a landlord.

Have you ever issued warrants?

MICHAEL SPECHT: Yes, we have.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: How recently?

MICHAEL SPECHT: I would say --

SENATOR SKOUFIS: How often?

MICHAEL SPECHT: -- well, I would say, probably, within the last month warrants have been issued, bench warrants or arrest warrants.

One of the problems that we've had in the past, that we believe we found a partial solution toward, without a birthdate for the defendant, the Court would not issue a warrant because it would be unenforceable, for fear of arresting the wrong

person.

What we do now, the building inspector requires, anytime somebody applies for a building permit, that a photocopy of their driver's license be provided as well, so, that way, at least we have somebody accountable, and, if need be, we have the pedigree information to issue a warrant.

It doesn't help in situations, obviously, where somebody commits a violation without first seeking a permit, but it helps in situations where something starts out lawfully and then goes beyond that.

DENNIS LYNCH: And we thank your chief investigator who gave the recommendation about dates of birth.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

MICHAEL SPECHT: Uh-huh.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: We heard from Mr. Wren before, that, in his conversations, he believes that there was undue political influence placed on state agencies, other actors here, vis-a-vis the Town of Ramapo.

Have you or anyone in town hall, since you've been on the Town board, made phone calls like that, had conversations like that, with either other

1 elected the officials, state agencies, stakeholders, the monitor? 2 3 Have you been engaged in anything like that? MICHAEL SPECHT: Absolutely not. 4 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 5 6 Are you aware of others --7 MICHAEL SPECHT: Not to my knowledge --SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- on your Town board 8 9 (indiscernible cross-talking). MICHAEL SPECHT: -- no one that I'm aware of, 10 11 nor would I -- would I accept that from anybody on 12 the board. 13 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 14 And my last question for now: 15 We've heard a lot of LLCs. 16 There -- we've experienced a proliferation of 17 LLCs in the town of Ramapo in the few months that we've been looking. 18 19 And, you know, we've heard some strategies 20 from other municipalities. 21 For example, you know, registries. The County now has a registry where they're 22 23 slowly being able to sort of identify owners of 24 these LLCs. 25 What steps have you taken as a town, given

the enormous, I would call, problem with LLCs and their anonymity, to identify who is actually behind these LLCs, and so when there are issues with a property, you are able to take action?

DENNIS LYNCH: Can I respond to that?

One of the suggestions your chief investigator said was, that your committee may make a recommendation that New York State law be changed to have requirements for disclosures of LLC members, and even if its transferred.

We would welcome that.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And so, yes, that's my bill, and I obviously support my own bill.

But, the Town of Monroe, for example, here in Orange County, they actually don't offer local approvals for any applicants that come to them as an LLC, until they get the ownership information of that LLC.

So things -- steps can be taken before state legislation is enacted.

Have you done anything?

MICHAEL SPECHT: Well, one thing we have done, as I mentioned a little earlier, is we now require anyone applying for a building permit, even if it's on behalf of an LLC, to have somebody accept

responsibility and give a driver's license.

I had a very irate builder come to my office and complain how unfair, because it was an LLC and an LLC can't have a driver's license.

And my explanation was, whoever is going to accept responsibility and wants the permit -- to receive that permit will have to give the building inspector a license.

That's one thing that we've done.

Another thing we've done is that, our prosecutor in court will ask for default judgments, under the law.

And LLC or a corporation must appear in court by an attorney on a criminal matter.

If the LLC does not appear, or, does not appear by an attorney, within a reasonable amount of time, she will file motions for a default judgment.

I believe she has seven or eight motions pending right now.

And once the default judgment is issued, we then ask the Court to convert it into a civil judgment, so we can file it with the county clerk's office, it remains a lien on the property, so that when that property, if a builder is building a prop -- you know, a building, developing a parcel,

with the intention to sell it or transfer it, we 1 will have a lien that will, presumably, be paid at 2 some point in time when they're ready to sell it. 3 So it's not the most ideal solution, but it's 4 the one we've been able to come up with so far. 5 6 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 7 Thank you. Senator Carlucci. 8 9 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor and Town Attorney, for 10 11 being here today. 12 And, you know, we've -- obviously, we've had 13 a lot of concerns, particularly in Ramapo. 14 And, unfortunately, the perception is, and 15 I -- and you had mentioned that you had inherited a 16 situation, but it seems to still be the perception 17 that there's this culture of, build first, ask for permission later. 18 19 And it seems like that's gone on again and 20 again. 21 And what could you -- what do you say about 22 that, and is that continuing? 23 DENNIS LYNCH: May I respond?

If you had come to a Town board -- to a

planning board meeting, I haven't seen you there in

24

25

1 quite a while, you would know that's not what's 2 happened. 3 That may be the perception, but it's in the reality. 4 MICHAEL SPECHT: Well, I would also just add, 5 I think we have been increasing our enforcement 6 7 efforts lately. Just to give some numbers: 8 In 2017 and 2018, we had a combined total of 9 about 350 cases in court. 10 11 2019, year to date, and we're a little less 12 than halfway done with the year, we're at 149. 13 So if that continues, we'll have over 14 300 cases just for this year alone, instead of 15 350 for 2 years. 16 So I think we have stepped up the level of 17 enforcement. 18 We have a new prosecutor who started a few

We have a new prosecutor who started a few months ago.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And we also have a new judge in the Justice Court.

And I think the two of them make a good team.

Obviously, there's a separation of powers, but they make a good team in terms of moving the calendar, not having cases linger as long as they

have.

Chairman Skoufis, you asked earlier, I didn't respond at that time, but there were cases that lingered for one to two years or more.

Sometimes that is the result of the fact that we're waiting for someone to go through the process, get variances, and get a site-plan approval.

That can be a two- or three-year process.

So, to some degree, if we're going to wait till the case is fully disposed of in the administrative part before we can dispose of it judicially, there will be a delay.

But, other cases, there have been repeated adjournments by the defendant.

And our attorneys have been objecting to those requests when they've been unreasonable.

And the Court, I believe, now, lately, has been scheduling trials quicker, and forcing cases to come into a disposition much more promptly.

DENNIS LYNCH: If I could supplement that,
Senator Carlucci, again, zoning code versus building
code.

Zoning codes are democratically enacted by local legislatures, as you know, of the towns, and the towns democratically determine what they do.

We had a complaint from Mr. Wren that the 1 2 buildings were too close together. 3 Well, it was pursuant to the code -- State building code, but also our zoning code allows it. 4 5 So, I mean, again, zoning is unique to a 6 town, the Town can do what they want. 7 But, obviously, your building codes, statewide, must be complied with. 8 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Now, this exhibit right 9 here is -- now you're saying that this is compliant 10 11 with State code? DENNIS LYNCH: No, I'm answering your 12 13 question about the perception of build, build, 14 build. 15 What I'm telling you, in this particular 16 case, is that particular matter was in court. But if you're talking about overbuilding, 17 that's a zoning issue, not a code issue. 18 19 MICHAEL SPECHT: I just have to ask when that 20 photograph was taken? 21 SENATOR CARLUCCI: I'm not sure it is -- when 22 this photograph was taken? 23 SENATOR SKOUFIS: You can -- you can -- just, when was it taken, the photo; do you know? 24 25 MICHAEL MAZZARIELLO: When?

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Yes, when.

MICHAEL MAZZARIELLO: Not even a month and a half, two months ago.

 $\label{eq:senator} {\tt SENATOR} \ {\tt SKOUFIS:} \ \ {\tt Month} \ {\tt and} \ {\tt a} \ {\tt half},$ two months ago.

DENNIS LYNCH: Probably with a ride-along, when we cooperated with your investigator, and took him to every place in Ramapo that he wanted to go.

MICHAEL SPECHT: It appears that, from what I see in the photograph, there's a lot of debris on the property.

I can't speak as to its condition right now.

It's certainly something that we would inspect if we saw that.

And we have a -- two new initiatives:

One, with our prosecutor, to hold property owners accountable for property maintenance, and littering conditions, through enhanced prosecution.

We've had some zombie properties that were in foreclosure, that we've had the banks clean up successfully.

We also have created a new unit within the town for cleanup, which cleans up within a right-of-way, but in issues of violations and summonses on private property.

And that just started last month, and that's had some success.

So, certainly, if this is a current condition, we would have it looked at.

I can't speak as to anything beyond that. SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay.

And we've heard from municipalities where, if that is the case, where they build first, ask later, that, not only will they be hit with a fine, but they'll have to rescind the work or take the work out.

Have you had examples of that in Ramapo, where there have been cases where people have built before getting proper permits, and you've required them to take what work has been done, out?

MICHAEL SPECHT: That has happened.

Generally, what the building department will do, if they build something that could be up to code, could be approved, could get a building permit or CO, depending on what it is, they will give them an opportunity to do so.

However, if it's something that is clearly not permitted, either under a zoning law, a rooming house, for example, with individual locked bedrooms, single-room occupancy doors, or something not

permitted under code, then they would have to remove 1 it, and that's been done too. 2 SENATOR CARLUCCI: It has been done --3 MICHAEL SPECHT: It has been done. 4 5 SENATOR CARLUCCI: -- and you could provide 6 some examples (indiscernible cross-talking) --7 MICHAEL SPECHT: Interior partition walls have been removed. 8 9 We have forced entrances to -- if an illegal apartment is created in the basement, we've removed 10 11 any barriers that separate the basement apartment 12 from the rest of the house and made it one dwelling 13 unit. 14 We have asked that kitchens that have been 15 installed illegally be removed, things like that. 16 So it does happen. 17 DENNIS LYNCH: The Town is very much aware, Senator, under the case of Parkview Associates 18 19 versus the City of New York, which took down about 20 20 stories of building, that they had the right to 21 take down property and order that if there's a 22 violation. 23 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Right, and I'm just asking for examples of that in the town of Ramapo. 24

MICHAEL SPECHT: Generally, a lot of our

25

violations will occur, where you have a family that will add a basement or apartment, or convert a garage, to have a little space to allow family members to move in.

We're talking about families that have large -- you know, large members, and they will do that.

And, in that case, if they can legally convert it to habitable space, it may be a question of making it an extra bedroom, that's legal, but not necessarily a separate apartment.

Or, it may be a question of, if it's in the right zone for it, to make it from a one- to a two- or three-family house, but they have to go through the process.

And if they can go through the process, and if they meet the State code, they meet the Town laws, then there's no reason why they can't be permitted to do that.

Still leaves open the prosecution in Justice Court for committing the violation.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay, and we just heard from the Rockland County Department of Health, with the Rockland Codes Initiative.

And they were responding to the Chairman's

question about compliance and working with the municipalities.

And it was stated, from the deputy county health commissioner, that the working relationship with the Town of Ramapo has been difficult and not forthcoming.

Can you respond to that?

MICHAEL SPECHT: Well, I'm disappointed to hear that.

I'm certainly open to improving our relations with any agency or any part of the county government or any other municipalities.

I would be more than happy to meet either with the health department, or with the county executive or anyone from his office, to work out a better line of communication and ensure better communication between our building department staff and the county health department, absolutely.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay.

And now, with the State monitor that was in the town of Ramapo for a year, under Supervisor Specht's tenure --

MICHAEL SPECHT: Right.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: -- you know, we were concerned, when the Town -- when the monitor left,

saying they left -- they were going to leave before they issued a report publically.

And we talk about, and you've admitted, that there's still work to be done.

Would you welcome the town -- a State monitor back in the Ramapo building department?

MICHAEL SPECHT: I don't believe it's needed.

I believe that they've determined that we are able to fly on our own for now.

But, at the same time, we have nothing to hide, and we never are looking to turn away from help from any level.

So, while I don't believe it's needed, if that's the decision of the State, then we would welcome it, and we would cooperate and work with the monitor.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay, thank you.

And we talked a little bit, you heard about, the recommendations from the staff of the investigations committee, about the software, and, I guess, the recordkeeping practice for the building department in the town of Ramapo.

What are the mechanisms that you plan to implement to turn that around, to change it, to make the records more accessible?

MICHAEL SPECHT: Right now we use the Municity software system, and I know the building department staff has issues with it.

They feel it's not very user-friendly.

And it -- we have a problem, for example, pulling up an original certificate of occupancy from a property. We have to go to the file to get the hard copy.

We can pull up the information that was on the certificate of occupancy, but we can't pull up a digital one and print it.

So we're looking at doing two things.

One is, looking at alternative software that was recommended, and we appreciate that advice.

And we have our IT director looking into that. And if he finds something he thinks meets our needs, the Town board will authorize entering into a license to use it, and training our employees to use it properly.

The other thing that we're in the midst of doing, and it's a long-term project, but it's being done, we are scanning and digitizing all of the building department files, so that, eventually, we will have everything online in digital format, and we'll be able to pull up original building permits,

original COs, make them accessible.

Our long-term goal -- our immediate-term goal would be for the building department to use that.

Longer-term goal with that -- for that, to be part of -- accessible through a portal for any member of the public as well as.

DENNIS LYNCH: One of the issues is transporting the old data from that old system to the new system.

We would welcome State funding to help on that.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: And when we talk about funding, now, how many code-enforcement officers are there in the town of Ramapo right now?

MICHAEL SPECHT: We currently have nine people that do enforcement work, including building inspectors, assistant building inspectors, fire inspectors, code-enforcement officers, and plan reviewers.

Last night we -- as a Town board, we voted to hire a new part-time fire safety inspector, a young man who's a member of a local fire department. So, he has fire experience.

He does not have fire inspection experience, but he'll go through the training, and we hope to

get him certified and add to our resources. 1 2 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. 3 So is it fair to say you have nine full-time fire inspector, code-enforcement officer, building 4 inspector, throughout the whole town? 5 6 MICHAEL SPECHT: That's correct. 7 SENATOR CARLUCCI: And now you're going to --MICHAEL SPECHT: We'll have ten. 8 9 SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- with another -- well, ten, or a half? 10 11 MICHAEL SPECHT: Well, part-time. Nine and a 12 half. 13 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. And are all 14 those -- those nine, are they full-time? 15 MICHAEL SPECHT: They are full-time, and 16 they're all certified and up to date on training. 17 SENATOR CARLUCCI: And just so we know, because we heard from the City of Newburgh, which 18 said they had about 6600 -- about 6500 units, and 19 20 they have four full-time inspectors, and they claim 21 that's far too little. 22 How many units does the town of Ramapo have 23 (indiscernible)? 24 MICHAEL SPECHT: In the unincorporated 25 town -- and as you know, the town of Ramapo has

12 villages within the town.

So we only have jurisdiction for code enforcement and building matters over the unincorporated town.

We have 8,000 buildings.

We have about 9500 parcels, but the ones that have buildings on them are 8,000.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. And would -- do you think that you're adequately equipped to handle the building that's going on in Ramapo with the current amount of code-enforcement workers you have?

MICHAEL SPECHT: I think with the current amount, and that includes, you know, we've added to our -- over the last two years, we've added to our staff, and with the new hire, we will be adequately equipped.

Could we use more?

I think we would, and we would still be open to recruit other inspectors.

As you know, one of the advantages of hiring this young person part-time, was that we were able to avoid having to go through the county civil-service process, which, while it has its benefits, it also limits and prolongs how we can hire.

So, part-time, there's less restrictions on 1 2 it, but we're certainly would still be looking to 3 increase. 4 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. 5 And the comment was made a couple times about 6 funding, and asking the State possibly for funding, 7 to help increase the improvements in terms of code enforcement. 8 9 What would be your ask, that you're here on the record with the panel? 10 11 What is the type of need that you need? 12 Is it for the software importing out of an 13 old program? Is it for code enforcement? 14 15 DENNIS LYNCH: We'd be happy --16 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Is it for --17 DENNIS LYNCH: We'd be happy to give you a 18 laundry list in the next 10 days with specific 19 amounts. 20 MICHAEL SPECHT: But I think, certainly, at 21 the top of the list would be for software, and for, 22 as we said, transitioning the -- from one platform 23 to another. 24 Okay. SENATOR CARLUCCI:

Thank you.

25

MICHAEL SPECHT: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Just one -- first, I want to introduce, we've been joined by a couple of senators, Senator Salazar and Senator Breslin.

Thank you for joining us.

Just one final question, as we close with your testimony, and I don't mean to ask this facetiously, but, over the, you know, last number of months we've seen very clearly that there are many residents and advocates and firefighters, stakeholders, who have very hard feelings about this in the town of Ramapo.

I understand you believe you've made improvements.

Do you owe an apology to those individuals, the stakeholders or residents, for what was done or not done in recent years?

MICHAEL SPECHT: I really wouldn't know how to answer that.

Do you mean a personal apology?

Does the Town owe an apology?

SENATOR SKOUFIS: From the Town -- on behalf of the Town.

MICHAEL SPECHT: I think that the Town has made mistakes over the years, and that's very

evident.

I think that we are doing our best to move beyond those and to institute best practices across the town.

And I don't think it's a question of apologizing.

I think it's a question of doing the right thing.

And I would ask everybody to work with us, give us a little bit of good faith, and allow us to show what we can do as we keep improving.

I think that is more valuable than whether we would need to apologize or not apologize to anybody.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

Thanks very much for your testimony.

MICHAEL SPECHT: Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

And we're running up into the second hearing here, so everyone please be mindful of time.

Next we have Mount Vernon, the City of

Mount Vernon: Mayor Thomas; Kim Knotts,

Omondi Odera, housing inspectors; Theodore Beale,

fire commissioner.

Please have a seat.

Before we get started, if you could raise

your right hands.

Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

(All witnesses say "Yes.")

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

Please proceed.

MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: Thank you, Senator/Chairman Skoufis.

On behalf of the City of Mount Vernon,

I would like to say thank you for the opportunity to
appear, to talk with you and your committee about
the importance of enhancing code enforcement.

I want to thank our senator,

Senator Allesandra Biaggi, for making sure that

Mount Vernon is not only on the map, but a part of
the conversation.

It's very important that we recognize that code enforcement is life or death.

And in Mount Vernon we have a shocking statistic, where 44 percent of our properties were involved in a fire incident.

That's a huge number.

And we want to make sure you know that the City is very grateful for your leadership on this

1 matter.

We desire to continue this conversation.

And before we dive into a few of the things that we'd like to bring to your attention, I just want to introduce who is with me.

To my right is Chantelle Okarter. She is the commissioner of planning, as well as the executive director of the Urban Renewal Agency.

To my left is the commissioner of fire, this is Teddy Beale. He's been with the fire department for --

How many years?

THEODORE W. BEALE: 46.

MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: -- 46 years.

So we have a wealth of experience with us at the table.

As well as, to my far right is Omondi Odera. He is the one, and only, inspector for the city of Mount Vernon, about 80,000 people, 4 square miles.

It's ridiculous, I know.

So in the correspondence that we have, we point out the common and uncommon challenges we face.

Also to my far left is Kim Knotts.

Kim is recently been promoted into the role

of housing inspector in the building department.

She's getting trained up, fully certified, but still getting caught up to speed.

But, nonetheless, I just want to begin with David Dinkins.

Mayor Dinkins said, "You can tell whether or not a community cares, or a City cares, about its community if the block is clean, if the homes are well-kept, if the sidewalks are straight. But if it's filthy, full of just burnt-out, abandoned buildings, it's clear that the government doesn't care."

So, like you, like him, the City of

Mount Vernon believes that our neighborhoods should
be clean and zombie-free.

These zombies, they suck the life out of property values, and they invite all sorts of negative activity that harm quality of life.

And we have an exaggeration per se of what the situation is like, with a picture of Count Dracula with a werewolf, greeting the neighbor, because that's exactly what neighbors experience when they see these zombie homes overrun with mosquitoes and rats and rodents, et cetera.

So we do our best to communicate with the

neighborhoods about what we're doing, and how we're working with you, and, specific, on trying to make sure that we keep the neighborhoods clean.

And one of the things that we've done with the leadership of Commissioner Okarter, our zombie task force, which is a cross-cutting task force of police, fire, buildings, law, public works, water, we go and visit these various locations in town, and we apply everything that you're asking us, from the BuildingBlock software that was given to us, access to, through the New York State Attorney General's Office, which we're very thankful for, but, also, the laws that you passed, holding banks and derelict property owners accountable.

On January 15th we levied penalties and fines, using state and local laws, on 44 bank-owned properties.

As of March 15th, the fines and penalties reached over 4 million.

Today those fines, approximately, are \$8 1/2 million.

Our goal is to do what you intended, punish the banks to do something with the properties.

And our objective is to reclaim those parcels and auction them off to middle-class, hard-working

families.

That's something that we believe we can do, we're going continue to push it.

We ask you to monitor this progress.

And we've been keeping Senator Biaggi's office updated as to what we've been doing to remain vigilant on this.

As I mentioned, we have some common and uncommon challenges.

Common, yes; resources, priorities.

We're very limited on resources.

But, the priorities, uncommon.

For some reason, the funding for our operations by our city council does not include monies to hire inspectors, even though these roles, pay as you go, that's an internal, you know, baseball thing.

But we do believe that we're going to win that game for the people of Mount Vernon, and, hopefully, our colleagues will fund the operations much more adequately.

Moving on, I just want to point out two things, and turn it over to Commissioner Okarter.

We know, as I already described, that, zombie homes, they suck the life out of neighborhoods.

They prevent our beautiful gardens from blooming.

And we believe we have to take every measure to prune and rid our neighborhoods of these zombies.

And there are two points I just want to suggest.

One is, perhaps New York State Senate can think about giving communities, cities like

Mount Vernon, an additional tool to deal these zombie properties.

Perhaps we can explore measures or laws that would require insurance companies to pick up the tab, to require the homeowner, be it a burnt-out parcel, they get their insurance check, they disappear.

Or, perhaps there could be a more stringent requirement to say: You have to deal with this, you have to maintain it. You just can't take your money and run.

Another one could be, thinking about investing in the database to complement Tolemi, Tolemi software, BuildingBlocks.

They have an internal aggregate system that helps municipalities like ours deal with all the data and synthesize it.

Maybe there's another software platform that

can help create a user -- end-user interface on the constituent end, that can kind of blend the systems per se, and help us even better communicate, than having to use some real simple measures of pen and paper.

But with that, I just want to say thank you again.

We understand this is the beginning of a conversation; we want to continue the conversation.

And with that, I'll just talk -- yield to Commissioner Okarter, and then Commissioner Beale, if they want to add anything in addition.

CHANTELLE OKARTER: Absolutely.

Thank you very much for allowing to us speak today.

So, some of the numbers that we are dealing with:

We have about 201 abandoned, vacant properties right now, and one of the large issues, is about 163 of those are owned by LLCs.

So we have been having a hard time finding out who is behind the LLCs so we can actually deal with the problem.

So as the mayor said, instead of, you know, kind of running into roadblocks, we have decided to

go ahead and focus on the bank-owned properties that we have, because at least we have been able to identify the bank-owned properties.

So we are also actively trying to work on our City-owned properties as well.

We only have about 14 that are zombies, so -which is a good thing, that, you know, in our
4.2 square miles, we only have about 14 properties
that the City needs to remedy.

But, in regards to the fact that we also have been working with very, very limited resources with our code-enforcement officer, one of the things that we've tried to do, is that we received on the list, a zombie grant. And we're trying to make sure we can use some of the those fundings to have -- to hire another code-enforcement officer to help us with direct code enforcement.

One of the numbers that I really want to highlight is the 44 percent that the mayor had mentioned, and we have had a lot of, you know, fire instances in the city of Mount Vernon.

And I think it's very important that you hear from the commissioner of fire because, these vacant and abandoned homes, they do cause more fire incidences that we have in the city of Mount Vernon.

1 So at this point I'd like the turn the mic 2 over. 3 THEODORE W. BEALE: Thanks, Commissioner. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Just be succinct, please. 4 5 Yeah, thank you. THEODORE W. BEALE: We have -- we had 6 11,533 structure fire -- incidents in 2018. Out of 7 that, 58 were structure fires. 8 9 MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: Repeat the number. THEODORE W. BEALE: 11,553 fire incidents in 10 11 2018. 12 Out of that, 58 were working structure fires, 13 meaning, we had hose, flames, smoke, putting ladders 14 on the building. 15 In 2017, in December, at 328 Union Avenue, we 16 had a zombie home with smoke coming out of it at 17 10:00 at night. 18 We were there for the next 7 1/2 hours, and 19 we lost a 70-year-old man who was inside the home, 20 trying to stay warm by using Sternos. 21 That's one example of what we could do. 22 That's one life too many. 23 All right, at 151 Union Avenue, we have a 24 similar situation we've been battling for the last 25 three years.

The courts, the building department, the law department, the police department, we're all on board, working together as one unit under the mayor's leadership.

But this is, we need a little bit more help, and that's what it comes down to.

MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: And in closing, I want to say, you know, very thankful for the opportunity to appear before you, bring this to your attention.

It definitely hurts the economy.

And just wanted to leave you with one story.

A family that lives next door to a zombie, they have a daughter that decides to go to college.

The parents, hard-working parents, try to go get equity out of their home.

They can't.

10 percent vanished because the vampire next door sucked it out.

That means one of the parents or relatives has to work a double or triple job to come up with the money to buy books at college.

That hurts.

So we take it serious, we understand the impact.

And we hope that you continue to bring the

1 fight to where it belongs: the people that are doing this are nameless and faceless, and we ask you to 2 3 keep go getting them. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much for 4 5 your testimony, each of you. 6 And I also want to thank Senator Biaggi for 7 really taking the lead on this component of our effort here. 8 9 And I thank you for viewing this as an 10 opportunity to share and to learn. 11 And, hopefully, the entire state will be able 12 to get some best practices and further support from 13 the State at the end of this. I will be very brief. 14 15 If my staff could just put up one property. 16 We have 19 Terrace Avenue. 17 This building caught fire in May of 2016. 18 I suspect, at least you, sir, are aware and 19 remember. 20 But it was -- we found it odd that, you know, 21 you could obviously see the condition of that 22 building there, that there are no violations listed

Can you explain how -- how you reconcile that?

in the software for that property.

23

24

25

THEODORE W. BEALE: The fire department
doesn't do those violations. It's all in the
building department.

And we're using the Muni software.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Sorry, I didn't mean

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Sorry, I didn't mean you directly, but I meant, "you," the panel.

THEODORE W. BEALE: No, I can't explain it more than, we were there, we've been on top of it. We go there on a weekly basis to make sure that we're trying to get something done through the planning department and the banks and the zombie task force.

But, it's -- I think Deutsche Bank owns that. Right?

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And perhaps code enforcement can respond?

CHANTELLE OKARTER: So I know that, with the zombie task force, we have been actually been focusing on properties like this.

We understand that, because we've had limited resources, the amount of violations that should happen, often don't happen because we have one inspector.

So when we actually have a zombie (indiscernible), this is one of the properties that

we actually went out and violated.

I'm not sure if it fed into BuildingBlocks, but there are violations that have been placed recently on this property.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

Before I just turn it over to Senator Biaggi,
who I know wants to make some remarks and ask a
question or two, I just would like to say that
I'm -- I totally get the constraints on resources,
and we've heard it from Newburgh and elsewhere.

But I'm sort of astounded that, for a city of 80,000 people, I think you said, there's only one code-enforcement inspector.

That's a lot of people for one person, and so I don't envy your work.

But I would encourage the City to perhaps better prioritize code enforcement, moving forward.

Thank you.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you, Senator Skoufis.

Thank you to all of you for being here today.

I appreciate you making the journey up here, and
also prioritizing this very important issue.

As you know, you can draw a direct line from the lack of code enforcement to the loss of life, and so we do take this seriously.

And, of course, this is a matter of life and death.

And so our aim is to make sure that we understand the needs of the cities and the municipalities that are here today, as well as understand the system better.

I think that what we have seen today is a pattern of lack of resources, a pattern of enforcement and accountability.

And so I think that what I would love to start with is the comment, Mayor Thomas, that you made about the funding.

So can you talk a little bit about the way in which the code-enforcement aspect of the city's operation would be funded?

Because you made a reference to the city council, so I want to just be clear as to how that works, and to understand your involvement in the budget.

At a state level, I'm sure you're very aware that our budget process is very different.

It's incredibly imbalanced by the Executive over the Legislature.

So I'm just trying to understand, from your perspective, so we can understand how you allocate

your resources.

MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: So the system performs as designed.

And for those that are just learning about

Mount Vernon, that -- or watching this online,

Mount Vernon is structured like a three-legged

stool.

You have the mayor's office, you have the city council which is independently elected, and a comptroller who is also independently elected, and the three have, you know, various responsibilities.

As mayor, I set the vision.

I try to present -- I present a budget that I believe meets the needs of the people.

And then the city council makes the determination, whether or not to allocate resources according to that vision.

For the past few years, they have chosen a different approach, an approach that does not put the dollars toward protecting the people, or dollars toward funding inspectors and code enforcement.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Is there -- is there a housing agency in -- or, excuse me, not a housing agency -- a housing committee in the city council?

MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: There is buildings and

codes.

It is chaired by Councilwoman Lisa Copeland, and she's been very adamant about getting the proper funds allocated.

And she attended with us a seminar at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government just yesterday. There was a great discussion on code enforcement as well.

That's included in your packet, our presentation.

And it takes, you know, as you know, votes.

And we've been unsuccessful in getting cooperation from our colleagues.

Commissioner Okarter can speak more at length about that.

But the bottom line is, we presented a pay-as-you-go budget each year, and will continue to do so.

The inspections pay for themselves, and that's, essentially, what we hope our colleagues can embrace.

SENATOR BIAGGI: That makes sense.

Do you -- so, I mean, looking at the numbers here, I think that the fire commissioner speaking about the fact that, in 2018, there were

1 11,553 fires that --2 I'm sorry? THEODORE W. BEALE: Fire incidents. 3 SENATOR BIAGGI: Fire...? 4 THEODORE W. BEALE: Fire incidents. 5 6 SENATOR BIAGGI: Fire incidents. THEODORE W. BEALE: That's natural structure 7 fires. 8 SENATOR BIAGGI: Fire incidents. 9 And you said 58 percent of those were...? 10 11 THEODORE W. BEALE: 58 of them were structure 12 fires. 13 SENATOR BIAGGI: 58 of them were structure 14 fires. 15 I mean, there is a direct correlation between 16 zombie properties and fires, and zombie properties 17 and abandoned properties and code enforcement that is necessary in these areas. 18 And so what would it take for the City of 19 20 Mount Vernon to be able to, from your office, say, 21 this is actually an emergency, so we need to 22 actually allocate funds to assess this? 23 Because, I mean, the portion of Mount Vernon 24 that I represent is Fleetwood, and so there's not

much -- it's not a huge portion of Mount Vernon.

25

But I have seen, over the years, having grown up in the adjacent town, an increase in abandoned homes, more so than I've ever seen in my entire almost 30 years living there.

So would I argue that this is an emergency, and that this is something that needs to be taken care of and assessed and prioritized quickly, mainly because it is, again, a matter of life and death in many instances.

And we don't want people to lose their lives, and we don't want firefighters to go into areas where they don't know what the layout of the building is or what possible harms could be in their way.

THEODORE W. BEALE: That's right.

CHANTELLE OKARTER: So I think that the mayor has definitely prioritized this exact point.

That's why he's led the zombie task force, and just -- we've also been working on, you know, trying to get the grants, like the Cities Rise (indiscernible).

We have done our part to try to get the funding.

We have also explored using CDBG funding to also fund a code-enforcement practice.

Those are the things that are within our power and our purview.

Unfortunately, we're still struggling to get the other parties on board, but --

SENATOR BIAGGI: Do the other parties include the State?

CHANTELLE OKARTER: So I know that we have definitely communicated with your office, and wanted to keep you updated, and that's why we're here today --

SENATOR BIAGGI: Sure.

CHANTELLE OKARTER: -- because I think we do need to start to partner more with the State, because we just need the State's input to help us get it together.

SENATOR BIAGGI: What would the amount that you need, you think, for the operation to run effectively, or at least to address some of these issues, and make sure that some of these properties are taken care of?

CHANTELLE OKARTER: I would say at least, about, 200,000.

So, you know, we have actually tried to fund one or two code-enforcement officer roles, and those are at least sixty to eighty thousand to get someone

that's actually certified.

One of the issues that we have, is that a lot of people are not really certified. They say they can go in and look at the properties.

But we definitely want them to be State-certified and trained, because we know that our properties have a lot of issues that we need --

SENATOR BIAGGI: Sure, sure.

Okay, that's -- that's --

MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: I just want to add one more point to that.

Before we arrived here this morning, a street collapsed adjacent to a construction site in Fleetwood.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Oh, great.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Broad Street.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Not great.

MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: Not great.

But -- but, it happened.

And I share that because there's a lot of construction going on. And no matter how many different management approaches we put in, we still need warm bodies to kind of go into and do the quality control.

Where I'm going with this is, yes, we dodged

a bullet, but, one of the workers that were inside 1 2 came out, and he said, he's a plumber, he's very concerned about the inspections and the delays that 3 are involved. 4 And the only thing we could do is invoke 5 6 State law and City law to outsource some of this 7 work. SENATOR BIAGGI: So when you say -- so 8 I don't want to get us off track, because I do have 9 questions, and I want to make sure that we answer, 10 11 and I know we're very tight on time here. 12 But when you say "the resources," so is that 13 because it's a state road? Or --14 MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: No, no, no, no. 15 SENATOR BIAGGI: Or, I'm sorry. 16 Not the resources. 17 My apologies. 18 For the permits. 19 Isn't that something that is -- that is --20 MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: It's locally 21 administered. 22 SENATOR BIAGGI: Right. 23 MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: It's just, the system

performs as designed.

24

25

If we only have one inspector, and we have --

1 you know, if you go to McDonald's, or you go to a fast-food establishment, if you're waiting on line 2 3 long, you're going to walk out, you're going somewhere else. 4 5 So that's basically the experience people 6 have. 7 SENATOR BIAGGI: What is the average time that --8 MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: So we've been --9 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- it would take for a 10 11 property --12 MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: -- we've been able to 13 reduce the intake, in terms of processing permits, 14 down, from 80 days, to 3 days. 15 That's an electronic approach that we've 16 implemented, but it still requires people to go and 17 inspect. 18 And what I'm pointing to is, we have created 19 a vendor list to conduct inspections, but that's, 20 again, pay as you go. 21 There are hazards with it. 22 We're doing our best to maintain quality 23 control. 24 SENATOR BIAGGI: I understand. 25 MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: But when you have --

SENATOR BIAGGI: I got you. 1 2 MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: -- a deliberate, quote/unquote, unfunding of the government --3 SENATOR BIAGGI: Sure, sure. 4 MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: -- that's what we're 5 dealing with, and we're doing the best to keep up. 6 7 And Omondi who's here can speak, if you want, you know, he can speak to the time it takes, 8 9 because, if he has to go to court and provide testimony (indiscernible cross-talking) --10 11 SENATOR BIAGGI: No, I get that, I understand 12 that. 13 And I want to just, like --14 MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: -- yeah, sure. 15 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- if we could do shorter 16 answers, then we can get to our other witnesses --17 MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: Done. 18 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- because we do have a rent 19 hearing after this as well. 20 Is the building department fully automated, 21 or is it based on paper too? Is there an 22 integration? 23 Because I know you mentioned the system that 24 you're using, which a lot of the municipalities are 25 using.

CHANTELLE OKARTER: So the integration is pretty much complete.

We had a building commissioner that came in at the end of last year, and he is focused solely on integrating the intake process.

So I would say that, from speaking to him, it's about 80 to 90 percent done. But there is still some paper that still needs to be integrated.

SENATOR BIAGGI: That's great.

In terms of the relationship between the code-enforcement office, even though you're one person, you're an entity, and also the fire department, how are you communicating with each other?

And how -- how do you -- how would you be made aware, as the fire commissioner, of any new properties that are eminently, you know, providing a risk or could possibly provide a risk?

And then how are you communicating with code enforcement about things that your firefighters are seeing so that they understand what they need to do, and vice versa?

THEODORE W. BEALE: Basically, we do it all by e-mail,; e-mail back and forth between myself, my captain in charge of fire prevention, and the

building commissioner, and we have a pretty steady flow going on.

Plus, we're also in BuildingBlocks.

So, BuildingBlocks, we put it into our system, it goes into there, and they put it in.

And, at the end of the day, when the BuildingBlocks data mines the information, it comes up in the report.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. Do all of the firefighters see what's in BuildingBlocks?

THEODORE W. BEALE: No.

SENATOR BIAGGI: So how would the rest of the firefighters get the information to make sure that they're safe?

THEODORE W. BEALE: All right, we use a system called Red Alert, and Red Alert is part of our system, and that's where our fire inspections are in.

So if there is an incident at one of these buildings, there's a flashing scene, while the dispatcher puts the call out, to be aware that there is an incident or a hazard or a violation outstanding on that property line, so we know, when we go in, to be aware of it.

SENATOR BIAGGI: So there is any process by

which any of the abandoned properties, or a list of 1 properties, that would provide risk to the 2 firefighters, has been implemented to say, let's 3 say, a weekly briefing, or a monthly briefing, where 4 the firefighters are getting this information in a 5 6 way that is -- that makes sense for the turf that 7 they cover? THEODORE W. BEALE: So, you know, we do it. 8 9 What we do is, we put on it paper at every watch staff, 'cause also on the computer. So 10

when -- there's screens in every firehouse, they'll put the calls out.

So if you're going to a call at 123 Main Street, for example --

SENATOR BIAGGI: Sure.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THEODORE W. BEALE: -- and there's a hazard --

SENATOR BIAGGI: I understand that part.

THEODORE W. BEALE: -- it starts flashing, so it immediately kicks in.

SENATOR BIAGGI: I get that, I get that part.

I think the thing I'm just -- I'm getting at, that I'm suggesting that you do, if it's not already there, is to implement a system or a process whereby the firefighters have this information, and it's in

a place where they can access it, regardless of, if 1 2 this flash comes up on the screen, because you could 3 imagine that, systems fail, and this is a way to prevent loss of life. 4 5 I have so many questions, but I'm just going 6 to end on this one. 7 We heard from Newburgh earlier about the way in which their code-enforcement officers are put 8 into their jobs. 9 It's a civil service job. Right? 10 11 So that's a job that, as we -- we know what 12 the definition of "civil service" is. 13 Would you recommend that -- I mean, I should 14 actually back up for a second. 15 The code-enforcement positions, are they 16 appointed? 17 Are they --MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: (Indiscernible.) 18 19 SENATOR BIAGGI: They're -- just -- just the 20 civil service. 21 So it's a civil-service process as well. 22 Okay, that's great. 23 My time is up. I have so many more questions for you, and, 24

luckily, I represent Mount Vernon, so I can ask you

25

anytime. 1 2 3 4 5 Yeah, thank you. 6 7 topic is rent. 8 9 10 11 12 13 City will pay the rent.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you very much for being here.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much for your testimony, appreciate your presence here.

MAYOR RICHARD THOMAS: I heard your next

I just want to point this out, something I think may be important for you to think about.

New York City Mayor de Blasio implemented a new policy, about having people rent outside of New York City for at least one year, where New York

After that, what happens?

It's a concern.

We understand that we want to create new housing, but we also don't want to artificially increase the cost of rent in our local community, because renters may not be able to compete with New York City.

Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

Thanks very much.

Next we'll hear from the department of state, John Addario, director, division of building

standards and codes.

MATTHEW FERNANDEZ KONIGSBERG: My name is

Matthew Fernandez Konigsberg. I'm special counsel

for ethics, risk, and compliance of the department

of state.

I'm going to be counseling Mr. Addario in his official capacity as the director.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

Thanks very much to both of you being here.

If you may, as we've done with the other testimony -- the other witnesses, if you could raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear that you'll tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.

JOHN ADDARIO: I do.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much.

Please proceed.

JOHN ADDARIO: Chairman Skoufis,

Chairman Kavanagh, and other distinguished members,

thank you for this opportunity to address the Joint

Committee.

My name is John Addario.

I am the director of buildings -- of the division of building standards and codes at the

department of state.

As you know, the division of building standards and codes provides a variety of services related to the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention Building Code and State Energy Code, including, but not limited to:

Serving as a secretary to the New York State
Building Code Counsel, which is the governing body
for modifications and updates to the uniform code;

Assisting the code council with development and adoption of periodic updates and amendments to the uniform code and energy code;

Providing technical assistance to local governments and to regulated parties;

Administering applications for variances to the uniform code and energy code;

Delivering training for the basic training, certification, and education to code-enforcement officials;

Overseeing the code-enforcement practices of local governments;

Approving modular-home construction plans;

Among many other statutory requirements under Article 18 of the Executive Law.

Under Article 18, a local government, which

is a city, town, or village, is responsible for administration and enforcement of the uniform code and energy code with respect to buildings and structures located in the municipality.

The department of state has no code-enforcement authority at any local government; however, the department of state does oversee code-enforcement activities in all local governments throughout the state.

The local governments are required to enforce the uniform code and energy code in accordance with the minimum standards established by the department of state's regulations.

A local government can opt out of enforcement of the uniform code, but in no case can the local government opt out of applicability of the uniform code.

When a local government opts out, the responsibility for administration and enforcement of the uniform code in that local government transfers to the county.

Executive law provides that the secretary of state shall promulgate rules and regulations prescribing the minimum standards for administration and enforcement of the uniform code in local

governments.

The regulations, including Part 1203 and 1208 of Title 19 of the Rules and Regulations of the State of New York, establish the minimum standards to be used for administrating and enforcing the uniform code.

The minimum standards provide that each local government and each county that is responsible for administration and enforcement of the uniform code must adopt one or more local laws, ordinance, or other appropriate regulations that establish a code-enforcement program.

The minimum standards further provide that each such code-enforcement program must include the features described in Part 1203.

Those features include, but are not limited to, provisions relating to building permits, construction inspections, stop-work orders, certificates of occupancy or compliance, temporary certificates of occupancy, establishing procedures for identifying and addressing unsafe structures and equipment, operating permits, fire safety and property maintenance inspections, establishing procedures for addressing bona fide complaints, and periodic condition assessments of parking garages,

and recordkeeping.

When the department of state is reviewing aspects of the local government's program for administration and enforcement of the uniform code, these are the features that are used as a basis to judge whether they are meeting the minimum standards.

The division of building standards codes has the authority to review aspects of a local government's program for administration and enforcement of the uniform code and energy code.

The uniform code is a regulation that provides requirements on how to build a building or structure, whereas a local zoning or ordinance regulate where to build a building or structure.

Buildings must comply with both the uniform code and any local zoning requirements.

The department of state does not have the authority to review local zoning or land-use laws or regulations, including actions taken by local planning boards.

Issues related to local zoning or land-use laws, ordinances, or regulations are administered and enforced by the local government.

The uniform code on one hand, and local

zoning and land-use laws on the other, are separate and distinct laws.

The division has the authority to grant variances to the uniform code and energy code, but does so under the assumption that all other laws, regulations, are complied with.

If a variance is required under any other law or regulation, those requirements would need to be addressed by the governing body of those regulations.

A variance to the one does not preclude regulated parties from requirements of the other.

If a party has information or proof that any local government is not properly enforcing or addressing specific property that is in violation of the uniform code, the department asks that that party provide such information to the division of building standards and codes, and that they also include, with the information, as much detail as possible, including, but not limited to, the address of the property, the name of the local government, the nature of the violation, the information already provided to local government, the information that the party has with respect to the manner in which the local government has addressed or attempted to

address the situation.

Article 18 of the Executive Law grants the secretary of state the power to investigate whether administration and enforcement of the uniform code complies with the minimum standards.

The department has an array of possible actions it may take, pursuant to Executive Law, to help ensure the health and welfare of occupants and users of the buildings within the locality.

If the secretary determines that the local government has failed to properly administer and enforce the uniform code, the secretary may take any of the actions set forth in Executive Law, including, but not limited to, issuing an order to local government compelling compliance with the minimum standards.

In the case of the Town of Ramapo, the secretary of state issued an order to the Town on April of 2016, compelling compliance with the minimum standards.

Thereafter, an oversight officer was assigned to the Town by the means of a memorandum of agreement on December 2016.

The oversight officer reviewed the Town's activities relating to administration and

enforcement of the uniform code, and used the previously-stated features as a basis of comparison.

In addition, the oversight officer was authorized by the agreement to review applications for building permits, accompany Town inspectors on construction inspections, review reports prepared by the Town inspectors of construction inspections, review building permits, observe court proceedings, and provide technical assistance and advice to the Town related to the uniform code.

In no case was the oversight officer responsible for administration and enforcement of the uniform code within the town of Ramapo.

Our oversight within local governments is limited to administration and enforcement of the uniform code and energy code, and does not cover issues such as land use, congestion, overcrowding of land, undue concentration of population, court proceedings, provisions for adequate transportation, water, sewage, power, schools, parks, or other public requirements.

Based upon the oversight's observations during the two-year period, which includes interviews with the Town building department staff and examination of the Town's code-enforcement

administration records, the observations made during site visits, the oversight officer and the division of building standards and codes recommended that the secretary find and determine that the Town had demonstrated compliance with the minimum standards.

Thereafter, on December 2018, the secretary terminated the memorandum of agreement.

The Town of Ramapo is now subject to normal oversight procedures of the department of state as on applied to all local governments statewide.

When the Legislature enacted Article 18, it established a system under which local governments administrator and enforce the uniform code.

This was a logical choice, since building construction is a local matter and local governments are already on-site.

Local governments are best able to coordinate enforcement of the uniform code with enforcement of local zoning and land-use laws.

With respect to new buildings, local governments are best able to monitor construction and perform construction inspections.

With respect to existing buildings, local governments are best able to observe local conditions, and identify and address problems.

With respect to periodic fire and safety and property maintenance inspections, the local government is familiar with the buildings, and the local government is best suited to create an inventory of their buildings.

If the matter is referred to a local court, the attorney for the local government will be familiar with the local practice of the court.

When the Legislature enacted Article 18, the Legislature declared that it is public policy of the State to encourage local governments to exercise their full power to administer and enforce the uniform code.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: I apologize for interrupting.

Can you just summarize, perhaps, the rest, if you're not near the end?

I know there are many questions that people have.

JOHN ADDARIO: Yeah, sure.

The department of state helps implement the public policy by assisting local governments establishing and implementing local code-enforcement programs, and by providing the training and technical assistance necessary to help local

governments fulfill their obligation, and enforce the uniform code and they do it in a proper manner.

Through the efforts of the 45 men and women in the division of building standards and codes, the department of state helps 1600 local governments in the state fulfill their responsibility to extend to the public protection from the hazards of fire and inadequate building construction.

Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much for your presence here and your testimony.

I know everyone up here is grateful.

I'm going to start broad, and then I'm going to get specific, if I may, and please keep answers as succinct as possible.

Let me first start with the codes council.

Are there any vacancies?

JOHN ADDARIO: Yes, there are.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Yes.

How many?

JOHN ADDARIO: I believe six.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: How long have they been

vacant for?

JOHN ADDARIO: I don't know that.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you know the longest

1 vacancy? Are we talking over a year? JOHN ADDARIO: That's fair to say, yes. 2 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 3 Who's responsible for filling the vacancies? 4 THEODORE W. BEALE: There are certain 5 positions that are appointed by the Governor, and 6 then confirmed by the Senate. 7 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, so all -- just to be 8 9 clear, all six of those vacancies require 10 appointments -- or, nomination by the Governor? 11 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes. 12 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you know why they've 13 been left vacant? 14 JOHN ADDARIO: I know it's a lengthy process. 15 I know we had some -- some, unfortunately, 16 some, you know, deaths on -- in -- on the council. 17 So... 18 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 19 There's been some talk about minimum 20 standards. 21 And, you know, with Ramapo specifically, the 22 department of state determined that they met, you know, minimal -- minimum standards of the building 23 24 code. 25 My understanding is that there -- you know,

there are no tiers of building code, where, okay, here's excellent compliance, here's, you know, minimum compliance.

So can you just briefly explain what the "minimum standards" are?

I mean, it might mean there are just standards. There aren't, you know, maximum standards, minimum standards; they're just standards.

So where does that phrase come from; what does it had actually mean?

JOHN ADDARIO: Well, it comes from our -
I believe, you know, our regulations set the minimum standards for enforcement and administration of the uniform code.

But keep in mind that -- that local governments can -- can increase that standard.

There's no -- there's no approval process that's done on the local level.

So, when we say "minimum standards,"

that's -- that's -- you know, that you have -- you
know, that you look into complaints, that there's

procedures and policies in place for that; that
there's a plan review, you're doing the proper plan
review; you're following through and issuing

certificates of occupancy correctly; you're doing your fire safety and property maintenance inspections.

All those things are the minimum standards.

But, again, local municipalities have the luxury of increasing those.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

We just heard from the previous witness -or, set of witnesses that there's only one
code-enforcement inspector in the entire city of
Mount Vernon of, approximately, 70,000 people,
I think.

Does that seem adequate to you?

Is there anything the department of state can do, speaking of standards, are there any standards in terms of, you know, ratio of inspectors?

Does the department of state believe -- should you be concerned when you hear something like that?

How can one person possibly inspect or, you know, provide safety on behalf of 80,000, 70,000, people, however many are in Mount Vernon?

Certainly, there are fiscal constraints, and we've heard them from Newburgh and others.

But what are your feelings, and what are the

1 department of state's feelings, what's your position, when you hear something, in my opinion, as 2 egregious as that? 3 JOHN ADDARIO: Yeah, there's no minimum 4 standard for the number of code-enforcement 5 6 officials at a municipality. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Should there be? 7 JOHN ADDARIO: You'd be asking for my 8 9 opinion. 10 I mean, I can't give you my opinion now. 11 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 12 Have any -- you mentioned that municipalities 13 can opt out of enforcement. 14 Have any opted out in New York State? 15 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes, there are municipalities 16 that are opted out, that it goes to the county. 17 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you know how many? Is it a small number? 18 19 JOHN ADDARIO: I want to say 240, about. 20 SENATOR SKOUFIS: And that then goes to the 21 county for enforcement, is that how it works? 22 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes. 23 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 24 Have any counties opted out? 25 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes, twelve.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And then that -- the 1 enforcement then falls to the State? 2 JOHN ADDARIO: To the State, correct. 3 SENATOR SKOUFIS: 4 Okay. Do you believe the department of state is 5 best suited for this oversight for code enforcement, 6 7 or would, for example, the office of fire prevention be better suited? 8 9 What's your feeling? JOHN ADDARIO: Yeah, I believe the department 10 11 of state is better suited. 12 I mean, we have a highly technical staff; architects, engineers, code-compliance specialists. 13 14 Yeah. 15 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 16 What do you do when you receive a complaint? 17 JOHN ADDARIO: Normally, a complaint -- and 18 there's two types of complaints: You've got a 19 complaint on a specific building or you've got a 20 complaint on a municipality. 21 Which, either one? Or --22 SENATOR SKOUFIS: A specific complaint? 23 JOHN ADDARIO: About a property or about a 24 municipality? SENATOR SKOUFIS: About a property. 25

JOHN ADDARIO: About a property, it usually comes in through our technical-support unit.

Technical support works in conjunction with our oversight unit.

We have a database system that, basically,

We have a database system that, basically, that that would turn -- depending on the issue of the complaint, if it's something that rises to a certain level, we say we would act immediately upon it, and call the municipality and say, Hey, there's a, you know, potential issue here.

We let them know, and then we follow up to see if they corrected it.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Do you make many of those calls over the course of, let's say, a year to municipalities?

JOHN ADDARIO: I couldn't give you -I couldn't give you a number.

I mean, I would have to look.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Are we talking thousands, though?

I mean, can you give me a ballpark?
Hundreds? Dozens?

JOHN ADDARIO: We deal with, we probably get about 2500 calls, you know, technical questions, a year, which result in, probably, about 20,000 return

calls, we get more information.

I would say, you know, there's a percentage of those.

I don't know what it is.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

Going to Ramapo, can you describe briefly
the -- sort of the day-to-day responsibilities, work
of the monitor, while she was there for two years?

What was she doing on a daily basis --

JOHN ADDARIO: Sure.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- typical day?

JOHN ADDARIO: Sure.

Just to make it clear, she was not running the building department. I mean, based on the memorandum of agreement, she was not the authority having jurisdiction.

She was monitoring, if you had -- I think -- I believe you got the work plan, there were some items there.

She was looking at the whole building department, how they were functioning. If they were properly issuing certificates of occupancy. If they were -- how they were doing the plan reviews, you know, the permit process.

Not specific properties, but, she was looking

at their process. Were they -- how they were 1 2 handling complaints. It was one of the things that we corrected 3 when we were there. 4 SENATOR SKOUFIS: So when COs were issued, 5 6 was, you know, she there, watching the COs be 7 issued? Or was it more of a systemic look that she was providing the Town? 8 9 JOHN ADDARIO: Well, it depends on the situation. 10 11 If they had a particular issue with one, and 12 then she may, you know, give them a hand, as far as 13 what they needed to do with that, or what -- you 14 know, what process they would need to go through. 15 SENATOR SKOUFIS: So it's fair to say that 16 she was there to try and address the problems 17 systemically? 18 She wasn't really involved in specific 19 applications? 20 Is that --21 THEODORE W. BEALE: That's fair. 22 SENATOR SKOUFIS: -- as a general rule 23 (indiscernible cross-talking).

JOHN ADDARIO: I mean, she didn't -- yeah,

she wasn't responsible for the particular property,

24

25

or anything like that, as far as what they -- she would review the process, yes.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: So if there were problems with an application that resulted from systemic issues, she would not really been aware of those specific problems?

JOHN ADDARIO: I don't know.

I wouldn't -- that isn't necessarily true.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: You don't know?

JOHN ADDARIO: Right.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

Are you aware that, while the monitor was there, that the chief building inspector,
Anthony Mallia, resigned in mid-2017?

JOHN ADDARIO: Yes.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. Are you aware that he was charged with approximately 188 counts, a felony-count indictment?

JOHN ADDARIO: Yes.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

When that occurred, did the monitor, or did the department of state, look back at any correspondences that he had with the department of state, with the monitor, to check that they were proper? That they were true?

JOHN ADDARIO: In what -- in what -- I guess
I don't understand your question, as far as --

SENATOR SKOUFIS: So, clearly, someone who, you know, resigned because he was improperly doing the work of a building inspector, chief building inspector, it begs the question, anything that he submitted to the department of state, any work he collaborated with the department of state on and the monitor, I would think should be checked for -- for validity after those charges came to light.

Were they?

JOHN ADDARIO: I don't know if they were specifically looked at, but I know that he was involved in the original correspondence when we determined that they weren't in compliance with meeting the minimum standards.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. Same sort of question about the Town supervisor who was arrested April 14, 2016.

You know, based on the, about, 600, 700 pages of correspondences that we received from the department of state -- and I want to thank you for that -- last week, there were many that were from the Town supervisor, where, after his arrest, did you go back and check for validity in those

correspondences?

Were those correspondences found to be true, confirmed to be true, after his charges came down?

JOHN ADDARIO: And, again, I'll refer to that, those correspondences that I saw were in regard to them meeting them, not -- you know, meeting the minimum standards.

There was some correspondence as far as, you know, where they were.

But we still, again, determined that they weren't meeting the minimum standards.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Are you -- do you feel obligated to check in any way, since the monitor has been removed, that the Town is still in compliance with the minimum standards?

JOHN ADDARIO: We still keep in contact with them.

Just because we ended the memorandum of agreement, we're still doing oversight like we do in all other municipalities.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay.

Are you aware that, when the monitor was removed, there were still 102 violations, cases, still pending in their court, code-enforcement violations?

1 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. Does that seem high? 2 Or does that -- to me, you know, to have over 3 100 cases still pending, it would be alarming -- it 4 is alarming to me that the monitor was removed when 5 there were, clearly, still substantial problems. 6 7 JOHN ADDARIO: The building department did --I mean, you're saying they were in court. 8 9 The building department did what they should be doing, is issuing the violations and having them 10 11 to go court. 12 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. Last, for now, certainly not least, is it 13 14 possible that the department of state will put the 15 monitor back in the town of Ramapo? 16 Is that something that the department of 17 state is open to? JOHN ADDARIO: If we see they're not meeting 18 19 minimum standards, I mean, that would be an option. 20 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay. 21 I'll turn it over now to Senator Carlucci. 22 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Thank you, Chairman.

appreciate it.

And thank you both for being here today,

23

24

25

Now, we heard from Assemblyman Zebrowski this

morning, he was talking about a case that we're familiar with, where one of the schools, to come into compliance, in working with the monitor, installed this temporary fire hydrant, that was then found to be non-working.

It just seems like an alarming situation.

And would you be able to give us some more clarity on that specific case?

JOHN ADDARIO: I'll clarify that, the oversight officer, there was some interaction with the oversight officer in that, but she was not in the capacity as an oversight officer.

I believe that was in New Hempstead, and she was providing technical support to them.

So, yes, I mean, we were involved, but not as the oversight officer.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay.

And this was under the advice of the department of state building monitor, that they put in a fire hydrant that just wasn't working?

ALEXANDRA CHURCH: We -- we -- like I said, we provide 2500 technical-support questions a year.

The answer that was given was -- was through technical support, not through the oversight officer.

1 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay. Now -- and we talked, Senator Skoufis had 2 asked, about the codes council, and the fact that 3 there's six vacancies right now. 4 5 6 process. 7 8 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And you had stated that there's a lengthy

Could you talk a little bit more about this lengthy process to get someone on the council?

JOHN ADDARIO: Yeah, I believe we look at their qualifications and, you know, the background, you know, stuff like that, and make a call on that.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: So what are we waiting for right now with these vacancies on this council?

JOHN ADDARIO: I don't know.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay.

And with the monitor in the town of Ramapo, you had a memorandum of agreement to bring the monitor there.

Is that something that the department of state needs in order to have an oversight monitor on the ground?

JOHN ADDARIO: I believe that was a legal decision.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: A legal decision.

But do you believe that the law does not give

the department of state the authority to come in and 1 have an oversight monitor in building departments 2 without their memorandum of agreement? 3 JOHN ADDARIO: I can't comment on that 4 because it's a legal issue. I'm not an attorney. 5 6 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Maybe your counsel could 7 comment on it? MATTHEW FERNANDEZ KONIGSBERG: 8 No. 9 SENATOR CARLUCCI: No? 10 Okay. 11 So -- okay, so we're not sure about that. 12 And one of the complaints that we've heard 13 from the Rockland Illegal Task Force that testified 14 earlier today, in regards to the monitor on the 15 ground, was the fact that they were not going out 16 and seeing these sites. 17 And Senator Skoufis did allude to this. 18 I just want to get some more clarification in 19 terms of, did the monitor ever go out and inspect 20 any properties while they were --21 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes. 22 SENATOR CARLUCCI: -- okay. 23 Do you know approximately how many, or --24 JOHN ADDARIO: It really depend -- it really 25 depends.

It depended on, you know, what her assigned tasks were that week.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay.

And could you comment at all about the current situation in Spring Valley, the monitor in Spring Valley?

JOHN ADDARIO: That's an ongoing matter. I can't -- I can't comment on that.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay.

Now, one of the complaints that I had during this process, was I was very excited that the department of state came down.

We wanted to have transparency and clarity to fix the problem and have best practices, going forward.

But the lack of communication just did not happen, or did not exist, and that's the same with the current monitor in the village of Spring Valley.

Is there a specific reason that they're not communicating with elected officials, like, state-elected officials?

JOHN ADDARIO: The oversight, you know, officer's role is -- is to monitor -- you know, to look at the building departments, you know, the way they, you know, are doing their operating permits,

issuing their certificates of occupancy.

I think we had reached out, and, you know, if they wanted to contact the department of state, we told everybody that.

I mean, as far as individual complaints, they should be going to the building department itself for properties.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: So if, in the village of Spring Valley, now that we have the monitor there, the complaints should be going, where?

JOHN ADDARIO: To Spring Valley.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: To Spring Valley, not to the department of state?

JOHN ADDARIO: If you have a complaint about the department itself, then I would say, yes, please contact us.

If it's about a specific property, please contact Spring Valley.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay.

And part of our understanding and belief was that there would be this outreach with the community to really understand what's going on in the community.

And I don't know if you heard the testimony earlier, the Illegal Housing Task Force was

concerned that there was no outreach to some of the advocates that have been very critical of the building department.

Can you speak to that, why that was not -why that didn't happen, to talk to actual -- the
Illegal Housing Task Force or any other entities
that were -- had major concerns on the ground?

JOHN ADDARIO: We had -- we had some meetings with them, and we told them, if they had issues with specific properties, and, basically, the same thing, please contact the municipality.

If -- if, you know, you don't get results there, then please contact us.

SENATOR CARLUCCI: Okay.

Thank you.

Senator Kavanagh.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

And I will try to keep this brief, and we do have another hearing that is scheduled to begin shortly.

And so for those who are here for that, we appreciate your patience.

I just -- I want to follow up the -- the -- this issue of counties and localities that opt out of enforcing the code.

You said there were about 240 localities that 1 are choosing not to enforce this code? 2 JOHN ADDARIO: Right. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And there are 12 counties. 4 5 Do counties only get into opting out at the point where there's a locality within that county, 6 7 or do -- can they opt out sort of independently? JOHN ADDARIO: They can opt out 8 independently. 9 There's no -- currently, right now, the 10 11 12 counties that are opted out, there's no 12 municipalities that have opted out. 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. And the 12 -- what 14 are the 12 counties that are opted out? 15 JOHN ADDARIO: I don't have a list. 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Do you know -- I mean, I'm 17 not -- I guess I'm not holding you to completeness, but can you give us some examples of some counties 18 19 that have opted out? 20 JOHN ADDARIO: Saratoga County. 21 Greene County. 22 There's others. 23 I'm sorry. 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 25 I -- I -- can we formally request that you

1 provide that? 2 JOHN ADDARIO: Sure, yes, we'll give you 3 something in writing. SENATOR KAVANAGH: I mean, what -- so --4 what -- if I live in a county that is declining to 5 6 enforce these basic codes, what is the department of 7 state's approach to ensuring those codes are properly enforced? 8 JOHN ADDARIO: Just to make things clear, 9 when a county opts out, the county is responsible 10 11 for their county-owned buildings. 12 So when a county opts out, then we're doing 13 enforcement in the county buildings. 14 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Only in the county-owned 15 buildings? 16 JOHN ADDARIO: Only in the county buildings, 17 yes. 18 SENATOR KAVANAGH: What about buildings owned by municipalities? 19 20 JOHN ADDARIO: Then they would be doing -- if 21 a county -- if a municipality opts out, then the 22 county would be responsible for enforcing the code in those localities --23 SENATOR KAVANAGH: So otherwise --24

JOHN ADDARIO: -- for all buildings.

1 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- otherwise, localities are responsible for enforcing the codes in their the 2 other own buildings, and counties are responsible 3 for enforcing the codes in their own buildings, and 4 if they choose to opt out, then the state --5 6 department of the state is responsible for 7 enforcing? 8 JOHN ADDARIO: Correct. 9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, but just -- in 10 the -- beyond that, to the extent this -- to the 11 extent these codes are applying to private 12 properties within a locality, there's no opt-out 13 provision for that? 14 JOHN ADDARIO: There is. 15 No, that's what I'm saying. 16 When a municipality opts out of enforcement 17 of the uniform code, it goes to the county, and 18 that's all the buildings within that municipality. SENATOR KAVANAGH: So all the buildings --19 20 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes. 21 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- not just the ones owned 22 by (indiscernible cross-talking)? 23 JOHN ADDARIO: Correct, correct. 24 I'm sorry.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I just want to make sure

1 we were clear. 2 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes. SENATOR KAVANAGH: So what is the department 3 of state's method of ensuring that these twelve --4 I mean, that's a fifth of all counties are choosing 5 6 not to enforce the code, which is surprising to some 7 of us. But what is -- what would the -- how does the 8 department of state ensure that these codes are 9 10 enforced? 11 I mean, do you --JOHN ADDARIO: Our authority is under 1202 --12 is Part 1202 of the New York -- NYCR. 13 14 And then we follow those procedures similar 15 to what's in 1203. 16 We do, essentially, what a municipality does. 17 We do the inspections. We do the -- handle complaints on the county 18 19 buildings. 20 We do the property maintenance and fire 21 inspections. 22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And you have offices in each of those counties? 23 24 JOHN ADDARIO: No, no, we don't.

We have regional staff.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. And the counties 1 are spread throughout the state? 2 JOHN ADDARIO: Correct. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And how many inspectors do 4 you have directly on staff? 5 JOHN ADDARIO: Off the top of my head, 6 7 probably five. 8 SENATOR KAVANAGH: So you have 5 inspectors whose job is to enforce these codes throughout 9 12 counties that are spread throughout the state? 10 11 JOHN ADDARIO: Correct. 12 SENATOR KAVANAGH: That sounds like an awful lot of travel time. 13 And to -- and in addition -- is that in 14 15 addition to -- are there additional inspectors that 16 are enforcing in the 240 localities? 17 JOHN ADDARIO: Those would be the counties. SENATOR KAVANAGH: So the 240 localities are 18 within the 12 counties? 19 20 JOHN ADDARIO: No, no. 21 No, they're separate. 22 We only do the county buildings in the twelve. 23 24 There's other municipalities that have opted 25 out to counties, that have -- that are doing the

1 enforcement for those municipalities. Not -- not the ones that we're doing. 2 So we'll only do county buildings. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I see. 4 If the localities have opted out, they're in 5 6 a county that is taking responsibility for that --JOHN ADDARIO: Correct. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- all of those 8 240 localities? 9 10 I understand. 11 Your -- you have training standards for 12 inspectors. I understand that one has -- if one is an 13

I understand that one has -- if one is an inspector, one has 18 months to complete all of the training standards after one has begun conducting inspections.

Is that correct?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JOHN ADDARIO: Yes.

They are -- once they're appointed to a code-enforcement official, then they have, there's an 18-month period where they can get their -- the certification.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: We heard testimony today that, in one case, there's a locality with a single inspector that's, presumably, responsible for all

matters that need to be inspected in that locality.

In another case we heard a large locality with only four inspectors, three of whom have been on the job only for a short period.

Why would it be that you can be an inspector for 18 months without completing the training in the basic standards that you're there to enforce?

JOHN ADDARIO: Again, that's a minimum standard.

Municipalities can say, you know what? We -- and I think what we heard, was that they -- through civil service or through the local municipalities, they can require them to be inspect -- you know, certified prior to being hired.

So like they had said, it was hard to find a certified inspector.

So right there is the case where you could say, you know what? We see somebody that's a -- either, you know, an architect or an engineer, and they can actually start enforcing the code, and then get their certification.

So it allows that flexibility that -- that -- where you're not tied to having somebody that's actually certified before they start.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: You think -- you think, in

most cases, uncertified inspectors are people in other professions, like engineers and architects, where there's -- where there's either an advanced level of education or a certification (indiscernible)? JOHN ADDARIO: It could be, but we don't set the minimum qualifications. It's up to the municipality, or the civil

It's up to the municipality, or the civil service sets it in some --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Like, from your experience, as the state agency overseeing this, is it your experience that -- and generally speaking, uncertified inspectors are people with, you know, advanced degrees in training, in architecture and engineering? Or do they tend to be more --

ALEXANDRA CHURCH: They can be from the construction industry.

They could be -- you know, it varies, it varies.

Depends on the municipality, and that's, I think, where the flexibility comes from.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Does the department of state have an ability to impose minimal standards on this?

Would the department of state have the

1 ability to say, you can't be a inspector for 18 months without being properly certified? 2 JOHN ADDARIO: That would take a 3 legislative -- you know, we'd change -- we'd have to 4 5 change the regulations, yes. 6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: A rule-making action --7 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes. SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- that would be within --8 9 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes. SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- the purview of the 10 11 sec -- the department of state? 12 Okay, I have many more questions. 13 We do appreciate your testimony today, but 14 I am going to cut it short, just in -- with respect 15 to the fact that we have another hearing. 16 But, thank you. 17 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Biaggi. 18 SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you, Chairman. 19 I only have a few questions, but I just want 20 make sure that I understand clearly what this 21 process is. 22 So, the department of state, you said, has no 23 enforcement of municipalities but they do have oversight of municipalities. Correct? 24 25 Okay.

1 No one -- so no enforcement of 2 municipalities, but does the department of state have enforcement of these rules and regulations over 3 the counties? 4 5 JOHN ADDARIO: I guess I don't understand 6 your --7 SENATOR BIAGGI: So --JOHN ADDARIO: -- as far as the reg -- you're 8 9 saying the regulations? 10 SENATOR BIAGGI: So you have no enforcement 11 mechanism, right --12 JOHN ADDARIO: Right. 13 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- over the municipalities. 14 But do you have an enforcement mechanism over 15 the counties? 16 JOHN ADDARIO: I guess I don't understand the 17 question. SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay, let me see if I can --18 JOHN ADDARIO: I mean, the counties enforce 19 20 the code in -- in -- for their building --21 county-owned buildings. 22 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. Thank you. 23 So you also said that the department of state sets the regulations for enforcement of the uniform 24 25 code?

JOHN ADDARIO: Correct. 1 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. And that minimum 2 standard that you're referring to --3 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes. 4 5 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- is part of that uniform 6 code? 7 JOHN ADDARIO: No, it's separate. The uniform code, or the actual construction 8 9 requirements. And then what we call is -- the 10 "minimum standards" are the -- you know, how they administer and enforce the code. 11 12 SENATOR BIAGGI: So is it a policy or is it a 13 set of regulations? 14 JOHN ADDARIO: It's a set of regulations. 15 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. 16 So a little bit earlier the Chairman 17 mentioned the ratio. 18 And I am the representative for Mount Vernon, who just testified before you. And they are the 19 20 municipality that has one code-enforcement officer 21 to a ratio of 80,000, which is an incredibly high 22 number. 23 So you had said that you were not able to answer the question of what the ratio should be. 24

So as the director of the division of

building standards and codes, who should I -- who 1 should I be asking that question to if not you? 2 JOHN ADDARIO: Well, I think the -- you know, 3 the municipality should be able to answer that 4 question, because we don't -- we're not --5 6 SENATOR BIAGGI: Well, the municipality was 7 here, and they were not able to answer that question. 8 9 So I'm asking you, since you are the director overseeing all of this entire program, who should 10 11 I --JOHN ADDARIO: I mean, I would agree one does 12 13 seem -- I'm concerned with that. 14 15 20-to-1, there is no set.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But to say, okay, there should be, you know,

SENATOR BIAGGI: But don't you think, when you set -- if you're -- if we're setting minimum standards in other capacities, don't you think that we should be setting a minimum standard for the ratio of representation, considering the fact that less representation could lead to higher risk and, therefore, higher incidents of death of firefighters or of civilians?

JOHN ADDARIO: I would agree with that, yes.

SENATOR BIAGGI: So we should set a minimum

1 standard for a ratio? And who should make that setting, and 2 determination? 3 JOHN ADDARIO: That would have to be a change 4 in the regulations. 5 SENATOR BIAGGI: So -- so if it's a change in 6 7 the regulations, then the department of state has the ability to change the regulations. 8 9 Are you saying that it would be the 10 department of state that would change the 11 regulations to set the standards for the ratio, and 12 that's something perhaps that the Legislature can 13 count on the department of state to do? 14 JOHN ADDARIO: I guess that would be -- you 15 know, that's something that could be done, yes. 16 SENATOR BIAGGI: So how long does it usually 17 take to set a minimum standard? JOHN ADDARIO: To change a regu -- update the 18 19 regulations? 20 SENATOR BIAGGI: Uh-huh. 21 JOHN ADDARIO: You know, it depends on the 22 rule-making. 23 You know, it would have to go through the 24 SAPA process.

SENATOR BIAGGI: I'm sorry?

JOHN ADDARIO: It would have to go through the State Administrative Procedures Act.

SENATOR BIAGGI: How long -- so how -- what's an estimated amount of time?

JOHN ADDARIO: There's a 90-day, there's a certain period, for public comment.

And then once you do that, then you can go into, you know, the notice of proposed rule -- you now, you go, notice of proposed rule-making. You can do a public comment period, is part of that.

And then you, you know, basically, set the effective date of the rule.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Got it.

So since we all are in agreement, it seems, that it's a matter of public safety to set ratios for the number of code-enforcement officers to the number of people and individuals in a city, can we, the Legislature, rely on the department of state and count on the department of state to set that ratio and to make that a priority?

JOHN ADDARIO: Again, I'm not sure if we have the authority.

I'd have to -- I'd have to look.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Well, you set the regulations; right?

JOHN ADDARIO: Right --1 SENATOR BIAGGI: So we've established --2 JOHN ADDARIO: -- for minimum standards. 3 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- that the regulations set 4 the minimum standards. 5 So this is -- this is a similarly-situated 6 7 analogous minimum standard. And so this is also, again, going back, the 8 ratio does allow for the reduction of harm, and 9 also, potentially, deaths. 10 11 So I'm asking again, can we have a 12 commitment, or is there a commitment from the 13 department of state, to set a minimum standard in 14 your regulations for this specific issue? 15 JOHN ADDARIO: We're open to further 16 discussions about it, but I can't make a commitment. 17 SENATOR BIAGGI: So then can we have a further discussion about it --18 THEODORE W. BEALE: Yes. 19 20 SENATOR BIAGGI: -- since it affects the area 21 that I represent? 22 JOHN ADDARIO: Yes, definitely. 23 SENATOR BIAGGI: Okay. 24 Thank you very much. 25 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Anyone else?

1 Thank you very much. 2 JOHN ADDARIO: Thank you. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Sincerely grateful for you 3 being here. 4 5 Next up, FASNY. We're on our list, F.J. Spinelli, 6 7 Jerry DeLuca, Joe Sauerwein, Travis Dawley. Is that who's here? 8 9 TRAVIS DAWLEY: We're here. 10 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, fantastic. 11 Welcome. 12 If you could please rate your right hand. 13 Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the 14 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, 15 so help you God? 16 (All witnesses say "Yes.") 17 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 18 Please proceed. 19 JERRY DeLUCA: Chairman Skoufis, Kavanagh, 20 and members of the Senate Investigation Housing 21 committees, thank you for the opportunity to present 22 testimony. 23 I'm Jerry DeLuca. I'm the director of 24 program and outreach for the Firemen's Association 25 of the State of New York (FASNY).

I'm presenting today on behalf of our president, Steve Klein, who could not be here.

We also have submitted written testimony which is more extensive.

FASNY offers testimony today because our members' best interests, as well as the state's residents' best interests, are served by having a strong, well-run, well-executed standard for building and fire prevention.

Our members and leadership are experts on this issue and live its realities every day.

Armed with the knowledge we possess, FASNY urges both committees to take swift and resolute action.

On January 23, 2005, three firefighters from FDNY died in the line of duty, a tragedy that has become known as "Black Sunday."

Two of those fighters died in a Bronx tenement.

Two of the apartments had been modified, specifically modified, illegally subdivided, using new drywall partitions.

Six firefighters on the fourth floor were trapped when the fire flashed through the door.

And unable to find their way to the fire

escape due to unanticipated barrier walls, they were left with no choice but to jump from windows from the fourth floor.

John G. Bellew and

Lieutenant Curtis W. Meyran, who was command of Ladder Company 27, were killed in this fall.

Brendan Cawley, Jeff Cool, Joe DiBernardo, and Gene Stolowski suffered severe injuries and disabilities which ultimately resulted in their being forced to retire.

The deaths of these firefighters did not have to occur.

Without question, the construction of illegal partitions and blocked fire escapes prevented these brave brothers from being able to escape from this fire.

In fact, New York State leads the nation in fire deaths in one- and two-family houses.

Our goal here today is to ask the Legislature to ensure that no more firefighters die tragic and needless deaths due to building owners making changes to homes and apartments that do not conform to fire prevention and building code.

As you've heard today, code enforcement is often looked upon as a nuisance, an annoying

requisite of local government, by elected officials, building owners, prosecutors, and magistrates.

But I'm here to underscore that codes matter.

The Fire Prevention and Building Code, its name alone tells you why it matters.

Codes are developed and implemented and enforced to prevent the loss of life, injuries, and the loss of property.

Just as important as illegal conversions themselves, is how the system presently deals with pervasive problem of code violations.

Building owners often see fines as a cost of doing business.

When illegal modifications are paying tens of thousands of dollars in rent in a single property, the fines that are imposed by the system are just trivial.

There's another significant aspect when it comes to the enforcement and prosecution of codes, it's the fact that they're violations. They're not crimes.

As not being crimes, they are not prosecuted by the local district attorney, but by the local city, village, and town prosecutors.

To addresses these problems, I urge that the

legislature take the following actions:

Establish a statewide tracking system for code violations.

Increase penalties for repeat violaters that cross jurisdictions.

Increase fines for a condition found to be an imminent threat to health and safety.

Increase fines for violations that impede egress. That would have saved the lives of those firefighters.

Authorize municipalities to treat unpaid fines for building-code and fire-code violations as unpaid real property taxes.

We heard it discussed here today about LLCs.

Penalize LLCs that illegally convert property by authorizing the dissolution of the LLC by the State Supreme Court.

Strengthen the penal code by establishing the offense of reckless endangerment of a firefighter in the first and second degree.

Provide training, and ensure training, of local prosecutors and magistrates on the importance of code violations.

And, also, ensure the inspections and follow-up of public and private-school inspections.

Finally, I must address one more important 1 issue. You've talked about it, you asked about it, 2 in your questions a few moments ago, Senator. 3 The State Code Council makes the code in 4 New York State, not the Legislature. 5 The council has seats designated for a 6 fire-service official and a code-enforcement 7 official. 8 9 Both seats have been vacant for two-plus 10 years. 11 I know that. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The gentleman sitting to my left was the last one to hold the code council seat for the fire service.

 $\,$ And I was suggested by FASNY to be the next person.

And for over two years it's been vacant.

I urge that the Senate demand that they be provided with appointees for both of these important constituencies.

The fire service and the building officials must be represented.

The significance of the outcome of this joint public hearing is hard to overstate.

FASNY commends the Chairs for undertaking

this massive and convoluted topic that is ripe for reform.

The choices of this committee, moving forward, will impact all residents of this state and their personal safety, not just firefighters, as well as the personal safety of our first responders.

Let us ensure that, moving forward, no tenant's life is put at risk because they cannot afford to live in a legal apartment, nor a first responder's life be put at increased risk because they responded to an illegally-modified building.

Let us strive to raise our standards for building ownership, begin to eliminate, once and for all, all those who value profit over well-being.

Maintaining the status quo is no longer an option.

This hearing has served as an opportunity to go on the record on this critical issue.

Now you have heard from our panels of experts on what needs to be fixed. The fire service must demand accountability.

If there are anymore lives lost, we will publicly question the failure to turn the suggestions put forth today into meaningful action.

A solution must be accomplished before the

next tragedy.

Thank you, and we appreciate your time.

Mr. Sauerwein.

JOE SAUERWEIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

I'm Joe Sauerwein, and I too am here from FASNY, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak before you.

I've been a volunteer fireman for more than 54 years, and for 27 of those years I worked for the Town of Brookhaven doing code enforcement, 19 of them as the chief fire marshal.

One thing I learned very early on was that you don't have to do both, but fire fighting and code enforcement are not mutually exclusive.

You could say I know a thing or two about code enforcement because I've seen a thing or two about code enforcement, and one of the things I know is that the worse the enforcement is, the worse the fires will be in number and in severity, and that more innocent people will die in those fires.

Now, I'd like to tell you just a little bit about the New York State Uniform Code because it's quite apparent that you individuals are well familiar with that code.

You have spoken about it extensively and asked a lot of the right questions.

In the interest of time, this is going to be short, to the point, and not too sweet.

Is the uniform code broken?

Let's see now.

The primary purpose of the code is to save lives.

Back in 1980, in Purchase, New York, probably just an about an hour away from here, the Stouffer's Inn fired killed 26 innocent victims.

As a result, your predecessors promulgated the legislation that was the impetus for the very first New York State Uniform Code. They made it a priority.

That "green book," as we called it, became the law of the land.

Then, in 2002, the State adopted the ICC family of codes, with some modifications to suit our needs in New York.

That was a wise decision, because that code is vetted by thousands, literally, thousands of people; designers, builders, code enforcers, firefighters, and building owners as well.

So the answer to the question is, nope, the

code's not broken.

It's not perfect, but it's pretty darned good.

What is broken is the enforcement of the code, or more correctly, the lack of enforcement of the code.

Some code enforcers lack the training, the certifications, and the qualifications that they should have.

Of late, it appears that there may be some remedies for that.

But there are more egregious causes for this lack of enforcement: municipalities who choose not to enforce the code.

It's too costly, it's too cumbersome, too much of a burden on the private sector, or they just plain don't want to enforce that code.

And, unfortunately, for those situations, there is no remedy.

There is no meaningful disincentive to those localities for failing to enforce the law of the land, or is there?

Is this committee the glimmer of hope that we have been waiting for and looking for?

We heard today from several communities who

apparently discovered that it would be in their best 1 interests to enforce the code. 2 But will it last? 3 What happens when the monitor leaves? 4 Will the committee expand its scope? 5 Does it have the resources and the 6 wherewithal to continue its work? 7 And what about the next community that 8 doesn't cooperate, what happens then? 9 10 And please understand, these are rhetorical 11 questions. 12 It is not my place to grill you, grill this 13 fine committee, not at all. 14 Further, is there any incentive for 15 municipalities to enforce the code? 16 There once was. 17 54-g money used to be provided by the State 18 to municipalities annually to help with code enforcement. 19 20 Code enforcement is not cheap. 21 It takes money, people, and resources, and that 54-g money did help. 22 23 But perhaps the ultimate insult to this issue 24 is what happens when there is enforcement, and the

responsible parties refuse to comply and are

subsequently brought before the courts?

All too many times the result is a mere slap on the wrist. A fine of \$250 is nothing more than the cost of doing business.

Pay the garbageman, pay the water bill, oh, yeah, and pay the court fine too while you're at it.

Some jurisdictions have stiff minimum penalties, especially for frequent-flyers.

But if you visit a courtroom for some of these session, you will hear cases where the minimum penalty is disregarded.

"Too severe," says the judge.

And who's going to argue with the judge?

Sit there a few days and you'll see turnstile
justice in action; the same violators being brought
before the Court for the same violations, at a
different location, or even worse, at the same
location, and getting the same insignificant fines.

Talk about no disincentive.

There's no reason not to violate the code.

So what does all this mean?

This all goes to demonstrate that effective enforcement of the New York State Uniform Code is too often not a priority.

It is readily apparent that there are those

at all levels of government, from the top down, who not only don't place a priority on the uniform code, they'd just as soon see it all go away.

You heard Mr. DeLuca talk about the Code Council.

What do I mean, "readily apparent"?

17 members make up the Fire Prevention and Building Code Council, and there's at least 5 vacancies.

The Fire Prevention and Building Code

Council, two of those vacancies are the fire

official and the building code official, for upwards

of three years.

The code council is the gatekeeper of the code, to keep it up to date for the benefit of everyone.

But they struggle to gather a quorum, not surprising, when almost one-third of their positions are vacant.

A weak and ineffective division of building standards and codes, a group of well-meaning individuals, who I believe are trying to do their best, yet for some reason, they are unable to adequately provide training for code enforcers, code interpretations to code enforcers, builders and

architects, and routine or board variances to building owners, except on a very limited basis.

The 54-g money for code enforcement, it went away, stopped, never to be seen again.

I'll bet it's still being collected.

Where is it going?

An attitude by the courts that these are just code violations, not real criminal acts, temper justice with mercy, yes, but understand that the primary function of the code is to save lives.

The code is not broken.

It's the process that needs to get fixed.

We need a process that makes the code a priority.

I talked about only some of the issues, and even hinted at some of the possible solutions.

There's no one thing that will cure all of the ills.

But one thing that will start the ball rolling in the right direction is for all of us, not all of you, but all of us; you, your colleagues, those of us in this room, those of us who couldn't make it to this room, for all of us, to make enforcement of the uniform code a priority.

Lacking that, unscrupulous people will

continue to disregard the code.

The fires will continue to rage, and the supreme injustice, our fellow citizens will continue to die in fires that didn't need to happen.

And so distressing for me personally, as it is for the thousands of brothers and sisters across this great state of ours, firefighters will continue to die, trying to save them from fires that didn't need to happen.

I would like to thank you for your time and attention, and especially thank you for trying to fix this problem. It's not an easy task.

And as much as you have accomplished so far, you have only just begun.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

Do you have remarks as well, each of you?

If you could please summarize, and please know that submitting written comments, you know, they are formally accepted and will be reflected in the record.

But, you know, please, because I know we've got some questions as well, if you could please summarize your remarks.

Thank you.

F.J. SPINELLI: I'll move as fast as

I possibly can many.

My name is F.J. Spinelli.

I'm a deputy chief in the Hartsdale Fire

District down in Westchester County, and reside in

Putnam County, and now in your district.

The purpose of my testimony here today was to highlight the ongoing issues that we're having as a training community in code enforcement.

I'm going to refer to the division of building standards and codes as the "codes division" from this point forward.

My comments are written and are being provided to you.

Currently, I serve as the chairman of the codes committee in the New York State Association of Fire Chiefs, and as such, was an active participant in a training workgroup that was convened in 2011 to establish the minimum standards for code-enforcement personnel and their training.

To say that I was dismayed when the actual rule was published, it didn't look anything like the decisions we had made as a group, and was far more restrictive.

The requirements of this rule, Part 1208, include restrictions on who may teach code and what

those code courses are, and what the content of those codes are. They are overly restrictive.

One of the options for in-service training involves you being able to take courses developed and presented by the department of state.

The director of the codes division has said that he does not have the staff to support in-service training, thus leaving this option empty on an annual basis.

Recently, there was a train-the-trainer course that was taught to those of us that are fire-service instructors in Montour Falls in the month of February.

During that instruction, we were given -- we were taking a 6-hour class, and we were given the instruction in one of -- only one of the three required codes categories.

When I asked the instructor why it wasn't in at least two of those categories, since we're required to do this in 3-hour blocks, I was told that there was no thought put into that. But when the program is put online as an online offering, it would be in two different categories and meet the needs of the codes community.

That has yet to happen.

When it comes to online programs, which are supposed to be unlimited, I actually wrote in here, to say that the online programs that are available are minimal, and simplistic at best, I compared them to eating cat litter, because they're that dry.

And, again, I'm trying to paraphrase what we have here.

There's a requirement that we have 24 hours of in-service training.

Getting that in-service training comes at great expense, and it comes at great expense to the local municipality or to the individual inspector.

You have to attend conferences, conferences have very large fees.

\$300 is a major fee for some municipalities, but that doesn't include food, lodging, travel, and all the rest of the things that come with it, not to mention the fact that these people aren't in the office for those three days at any given portion of the week.

There is a problem, there is a serious problem, when it comes to training in the state of New York.

There is a requirement that we have three hours of instruction in the energy

conservation code, annually.

Getting that instruction is unmerciful.

Each of the individual fire-service organizations that run conferences that involve code fight for scarce opportunity to have individual companies come in and teach the energy code.

If that company which you find does not have NYSERDA funding anymore, does not have State funding anymore, they charge \$1,000 for a 3-hour class.

That's not fair.

It's not fair.

This regulation has shifted a State responsibility onto the local municipalities, and nothing is being done about it.

I wrote a letter, which you will have a copy of, in 2017, asking for the secretary of state to suspend the training rule, the idea being that this rule needs to be revisited and changed.

To date, I haven't gotten an answer back.

You asked the question earlier, Senator, as to whether the division of codes should go to the office of fire prevention and control.

The office of fire prevention and control is headed by the State fire administrator, who's also the chief fire marshal in the state of New York, yet

he has no authority to administer the codes.

I firmly believe that the codes division needs to come out of the department of state, and go to the office of fire prevention and control within DHSCS, so that we can get adequate training, so that they can have the staff that they need to develop programs, so that we have worthwhile programs and educational programs for the people who are trying to enforce the code to the best of our abilities.

TRAVIS DAWLEY: I'll try to keep mine quick.

My name is Travis Dawley.

I'm the president of the New York State Fire Marshals and Inspectors Association.

Thank you for the opportunity today.

Two topics I wanted to cover is our code adoption process.

Right now the New York State Code Council adopts it through the Executive Law.

The code council's obligation is to maintain, periodically update, the Uniform Fire Prevention

Building Code, State Energy Conservation Code, and to adopt higher and more restrictive standards upon the recommendation of the local governments.

We currently also pass laws through legislative process.

When they're passed through the legislative process, it defeats the purpose of the code council and contradicts items that are already in the code.

Right now we currently adopt the ICC, and then amend it.

The ICC, as previously stated, is rigorously reviewed by multiple agencies all across the U.S, and adopted by government agencies all across the world.

Through this process, New York takes their published code, that is already defined as what I'm going to consider, personally, as a minimum-code standard, and we then remove portions of that code to fit New York State.

The removing of portions is not necessarily for the best interest of the people of New York. It might be for the best interest of individual organizations.

An example of this is the international residential code had a requirement for sprinklers.

Under our previous version of the code, we had no requirement for sprinklers in houses, but you had to have a one-hour separation between a garage and your living space.

When we adopted the 2015 I-codes, and then

amended them, we removed all requirements for the sprinklers that were already defined as a part of the minimum standard.

In doing so, they never put back a requirement that then requires a fire-rated wall between your garage space and your house.

So as new properties are built today, you have no time delay if a fire is to occur in your garage.

I best put this as an example of, when I was in college, we used to joke that you could get a D in a class and still graduate because you got the minimum amount required in that.

When we take and remove the minimum-amount requirements, in my opinion, that's an F in the class.

The other problem occurring is, when we're passing through legislative process, it's not looking at the overall conjunction.

A good example of this one is when we passed the residential and commercial CO laws.

We have two laws that have information, both applying to residential properties, that contradict each other of the requirements.

I don't think this was done in haste.

It was, just, we react very quickly as a state when there's a tragedy that occurs.

When trying to put anything through a proper process and make sure that the I's are dotted and T's are crossed takes a extremely long time, but has implications when not followed.

We are currently in the process of, hopefully, adopting a new code in the next six months.

I have significant concerns that this will never happen with the current lack of bodies on the code council.

If one person is absent from that, you don't have a quorum to vote.

Under the legislative laws, that code council is supposed to meet four times a year, once a quarter.

There has been cases in the past year or two in which the meetings are canceled days before because they don't have enough for a quorum.

Quick, in summary:

I think our system is broken.

I believe it can be fixed.

We need to have the necessary people appointed to the code council, fill the seats, and

do the job that they're appointed to do.

It would be my recommendation, that when the legislatures do feel the need to pass a law that will impact the code enforcement, that it be done in a manner in conjunction with the code council, so that the two can work together and properly institute the code, so it can be reviewed as each new series comes out.

The main idea behind this is, if you pass a (indiscernible) legislation through executive processes, when we go to adopt the next section of code, we're currently receiving what is known as the New York State Uniform Code Supplement.

The current manual is 208 pages of amendments.

Those are the amendments that are modifying the published code as provided by the ICC.

With those amendments, it's removing stuff to make it less restrictive, it's adding things making it more restrictive, and it's including the requirements of the executive laws because there's no other way to have them incorporated.

Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much.

I don't have any questions.

I'll just make one remark before turning it over to anyone who does have questions, and that is, first, thank you again for not only your testimony, but for what you do, and what your brothers and sisters do throughout the state each day.

And I know that I, and I think I can safely say, our committees are committed to advancing recommendations, legislation, whatever form it may take, to try and make your job safer, and to try and protect the people you're trying to protect a little bit safer as well.

I will just, the one item I do want to comment on, is that, to the point that was made a number of times, I will, and I suspect I will be joined by a number of like-minded colleagues, I will be demanding that the Governor does advance nominations to fill those vacancies on the code council by the end of our legislative session.

Thank you.

Who has questions?

Senator Biaggi.

SENATOR BIAGGI: Thank you.

Thank you, Chairman.

I echo everything that our Chairman just said, and I will second that all of the appointments

on the code council must be filled.

I have to say that I'm, like, irate from what I've heard, and I feel an incredible sense of urgency.

And I want each and every one of you to know that you have been heard.

We hear you, and we are committed, in the stead of our Chairman, to do what we can, whatever we can, to make this problem better and to ultimately solve it.

This is unacceptable for our government.

It's unacceptable.

And I'm just almost incredulous that this could even be the case.

Our -- our first responders are the most -- some of the most important individuals in our society.

And making sure that these laws are followed, and making sure that these seats are filled, is actually the action to take to prove that we actually value you.

So we value you, and we will make sure that action is taken.

Thank you so much.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Senator Salazar.

1 SENATOR SALAZAR: First, thank you all for 2 your testimony. I have sort of a clarifying question about 3 the code council and having quorum to vote. 4 Is this by statute that they need full 5 6 attendance in order to have quorum to vote, or is it actually due to vacancies on the council that --7 that it's like a percentage? 8 9 JOE SAUERWEIN: Well, there has to be. Any decision on the council has to be by a 10 11 majority. 12 SENATOR SALAZAR: Certainly. 13 JOE SAUERWEIN: But not a majority of those 14 present and voting, a majority of the council 15 members. 16 So if you have those five vacancies, that's 17 five strikes against you. 18 SENATOR SALAZAR: Right. 19 JOE SAUERWEIN: One guy gets sick, another 20 guy has another commitment (motions). 21 JERRY DeLUCA: Also, if you'll note, there 22 are no legislative appointees on the code council. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thanks for that note. 23 24 Senator Kavanagh. 25 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yeah, I'll just -- I'll

just wrap -- we will follow up with you, and we appreciate your testimony.

And I just will note that we're gonna -we're trying to wrap up because we have another -our second hearing in this room was supposed to
begin more than an hour ago, and I know we have many
witnesses who are here for that.

So we appreciate it, and we will follow up.

And I will certainly join my Co-Chair of this event in requesting that the Governor, you know, make those appointments as soon as possible, and follow up on many of the other issues you raised today.

But thank you so much.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much.

Okay, next up we have New York State Building Officials Conference.

We're going to try to move quickly.

We have two more, this one and one more.

Okay, thank you for being here.

The names I have are, Chris Jensen,
president; Mark Schwarz, first vice president;
Eric Famiglietti, second vice president.

Is that who's here?

UNIDENTIFIED WITNESS: Yes.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Very good. 1 2 Thank you. Can I have you raise your right hands? 3 Do you solemnly swear that you'll tell the 4 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, 5 6 so help you God? 7 (All witnesses say "I do.") SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 8 9 If I may respectfully ask that you try and consolidate your remarks into one person? 10 11 So can one --12 CHRIS JENSEN: Most of FASNY has, pretty much, said what a lot of our remarks are. 13 14 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, so who -- who will be 15 making the remarks on behalf of the panel? CHRIS JENSEN: 16 I'll speak. 17 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, thank you. 18 CHRIS JENSEN: My name is Chris Jensen. I'm a New York State-registered professional 19 20 engineer, ICC master code professional, the only one 21 in New York State; An interior firefighter for my hometown; 22 I'm a code-enforcement officer for the Town 23 24 of Canandaigua and the Town of Bristol within the 25 Finger Lakes region;

I'm president of the New York State Building 1 2 Officials, the parent chapter of over 19 regional 3 building official chapters, consisting of thousands of code officials throughout the entire state of 4 New York. 5 6 SENATOR SKOUFIS: (Inaudible) if you're 7 having conversations, can you please just take them outside. There's a big echo in this room. 8 Thank you. 9 10 Sorry. 11 CHRIS JENSEN: Thanks for having us here 12 today. 13 The issues that have been discussed in many 14 of our NYSBOC delegate meetings are: 15 Lack of support at the State level, generally 16 due to lack of staffing at the State level; 17 Lack of funding from the State; 18 Lack of representation at the State level; the code council, variance boards; 19 20 The inability of local municipalities to 21 financially support code-enforcement functions, 22 training, code books, software, violations, 23 remedies, court costs, legal fees; 24 And the lack of overall guidance and

structure from the State level.

25

The main purpose of all the NYSBOC chapters is to provide a pure network for its members, to provide assistance to one another in performance of their duties, and to conduct training programs to meet their yearly training requirements.

We really exist because we had to create our own support structure and provide the necessary training to our own members.

We're not provided resources like the other law-enforcement agencies in the state.

I can touch on the 54-g money.

Around 1982, Section 9108 of the New York
State Insurance Law, and Section 54-g of New York
State Finance Law, provides that all monies
collected from a fee imposed by commercial fire
insurance shall be used for State aid to
municipalities.

They were supposed to be distributed to the municipalities.

But since 1991, none of these funds have been distributed.

They're still being collected. They're sums of 20 -- 12 to 20 million dollars per year.

Again, to reiterate on a lot of the points:
There are processes in places, there's laws

in place.

The local municipalities, it's a home-rule state, so they adopt their local laws, they adopt the fines, they adopt they're going to do the -- enforce the code.

Ratio, I would say, should have one code-enforcement officer for every 10,000 residents, about that.

I mean, I work for a municipality that has 12,000 residents.

We have two code-enforcement officers, but we also take care of flood plain, MS4 program, zoning codes, and stuff like that.

So, anyways, I'll close on that.

And I don't know if you guys have any other comments.

Mostly everything was touched on by the FASNY guys.

UNIDENTIFIED WITNESS: I just think that it is very crucial for the filling of the vacancies, because it's not just the vacancies on that.

There's also regional boards, and there's five regional variance boards, which have lack of seats fulfilled. And that causes delays in the municipal grants of the variance processes.

1 So even that, it's not just a regular code council. 2 3 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. I just have one question. 4 How many building officials are there in 5 6 New York State? Do you have a number? 7 CHRIS JENSEN: I would say, we have a list of about 8,000 members that are just part of NYSBOC and 8 the 19 different chapters. And those are members of 9 our organizations that pay, I don't know, we're like 10 11 a \$100 a year to be a member. And then if you go to 12 our conferences, it's \$365. 13 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Are most building officials 14 members? 15 I'm just trying to get a sense of where we 16 are now, building officials, versus where you think 17 we need to be, what the number ought to be, in New York State. 18 19 CHRIS JENSEN: I would say a ratio of one for 20 every 10,000 people in a municipality. 21 As far as, how many there are in 22 New York State? 23 Like, you spoke earlier to one of the towns,

"We have one person," they said, "and we'd like to hire two."

24

25

That town should have eight, I think. 1 I mean, I'm being honest. 2 It's -- but they don't have the funds to, and 3 it all comes down to money. 4 I'm sure they'd love to have eight, but where 5 6 is that coming from? Where are they getting 7 support? And are they getting trained people? They touched on, you could work for 18 months 8 without training, it's a civil service. 9 Yeah, there are flaws in the system, but the 10 11 codes there, and the laws are there, on -- I'm 12 not -- my town's great. They support me, everything 13 I do. 14 But, there are a lot of towns that do not. 15 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you. 16 Anyone have any questions? 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: No, I'll just defer, 18 given -- again, given the very late hour for our 19 prior -- or, our next hearing, that we're more than 20 an hour late. 21 But I appreciate your testimony. 22 We will review it, and probably follow up 23 with you with additional --24 CHRIS JENSEN: As far as vacancies on the 25 code council, we have put forth names, and stuff.

They've never actually asked for names. 1 We've put forth names, and stuff. 2 So if you have our contact information for 3 NYSBOC, please call us. 4 SENATOR SKOUFIS: When did you do that, when 5 6 did you put forward those names? Do you remember? 7 CHRIS JENSEN: Oh, once every six months, for the past three years. 8 9 I mean --SENATOR SKOUFIS: Unbelievable. 10 11 Well, okay. 12 Thank you. CHRIS JENSEN: -- they've been trying to go 13 14 through -- but contact us. 15 We'll have a vote among us to pick someone to 16 put forward to you, to place on the council. 17 SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much. 18 CHRIS JENSEN: Same with FASNY, I believe. SENATOR SKOUFIS: And thanks for what you do 19 20 as well. 21 CHRIS JENSEN: Thank you. SENATOR SKOUFIS: Okay, we have reached the 22 conclusion here. 23 24 If she's still here, Elizabeth Zeldin, 25 director, Enterprise / Cities Rise.

Thank you very much for your patience.

ELIZABETH ZELDIN: (Inaudible), and I'll talk quickly.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: If I -- just to be consistent, can you please raise your right hand?

Do you solemnly swear that you'll tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

ELIZABETH ZELDIN: I do.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you.

ELIZABETH ZELDIN: Hi.

My name is Elizabeth Zeldin, and I'm director of Neighborhood Impact with Enterprise Community Partners, a non-profit affordable-housing organization that's worked to create and preserve affordable housing here and nationwide for over 30 years.

Since our New York office opened in 1987, we've committed nearly \$3.6 billion in equity loans and grants to help create or preserve over 63,000 affordable homes for over 167,000 residents across the state.

On behalf of Enterprise, I would like to thank Chairs Skoufis, Kavanagh, and the State Investigations and Government Operations Committee

for convening this hearing on code enforcement today.

In 2017, Enterprise Community Partners

launched the Cities Rise program, cities for

responsible investment and strategic enforcement, in

partnership with the New York State Attorney

General's Office.

This ground-breaking program provides

16 participating municipalities with the

data-analytics platform, BuildingBlocks, integrating
existing municipal data into one comprehensive,
interactive database with mapping capabilities.

Each municipality received technical assistance from leading experts in the field, and engaged in peer-to-peer exchange, all with the goal of making code-enforcement activities more strategic, proactive, and equitable.

Ten of the original municipalities are now participating in Phase 2 of the program, receiving deeper one-on-one technical assistance from staff at the Ash Center for Innovation at Harvard University, as well as guidance on community engagement around code enforcement from Hester Street Collaborative.

This summer, the Phase 2 municipalities will be submitting applications for innovation grants to

implement their best ideas on strategic and equitable code enforcement.

Enterprise looks forward to seeing these ideas come to fruition.

So Cities Rise was funded through bank settlements negotiated by the New York State Office of the Attorney General.

These are one-time funds which we're deploying to demonstrate new models and best practices.

We're hopeful that some of the innovations will be sustained through other sources of revenue, both local and State.

An important lesson we've learned is that different solutions are needed for different scenarios.

A well-meaning, but under-resourced landlord could benefit from assistance in the form of repair grants, counseling, or simply guidance through existing programs and resources.

To support the needs of these landlords,

Enterprise recently announced the launch of our

Upstate Landlord Ambassador Program, which will

build on a successful pilot from New York City, and

support five to six non-profit affordable-housing

developers across the state, to identify small-scale landlords and walk them through the process of existing affordable-housing programs to stabilize their properties.

While we're excited about this initiative, the program can only succeed when there are programs available to meet landlord needs.

And there are currently not enough State resources to fund repairs for one- to four-family homes.

We urge the state Legislature to explore ways of supporting this important stock of rental housing affordable to households of low and moderate income.

For the population of landlords who put little effort into maintaining their housing stock, the tools needed to improve the housing should look different.

The municipalities need additional resources to enforce code violations, including out -- building out a stronger legal team and bolstering the court system.

Of course, enforcement of rental-housing codes can only work well when tenants have the freedom to work directly with code-enforcement officers without fear of retribution.

Enterprise urges the state Legislature to pass good-cause eviction legislation to empower tenants to improve their own housing.

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

ELIZABETH ZELDIN: Yeah, exactly (motions).

Finally, all code-enforcement work should be undertaken under the fair-housing lens.

Strategic, proactive code enforcement must evaluate whether resources are allocated equitably, and whether code actions disproportionately affect different populations.

This level of analysis requires dedicated time and is difficult to accomplish in a reactive under-resourced environment.

Cities Rise municipalities are doing their very best to improve conditions in their communities, given constrained resources throughout the state.

One very important way the State could support the work of the municipalities, improving their code-enforcement practices, is to provide funding directly for code-enforcement work.

Enterprise is happy to assist the Legislature in crafting parameters for potential grant awards, which could range, from building out a stronger

legal and court system, to enforce existing codes, to deepening analytic capability among municipal staff, to creating low-cost repair programs to help landlords and homeowners make necessary fixes, to building out a stronger network of counselors and social-service providers to help residents caught up in code actions.

Thank you very much for your time.

We look forward to continuing to work with the Legislature, and ensure that New Yorkers across the state have access to safe, high-quality affordable homes.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much for your testimony.

I suspect that we'll be following up.

ELIZABETH ZELDIN: Happy.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And much of what you said is also a natural and nice segue into what we're about to start talking about.

But before, I just want to check, does anyone have any questions?

Neil?

You're all good?

SENATOR MYRIE: Can I just say?

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Yes.

1 SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you for your patience. 2 ELIZABETH ZELDIN: No problem. 3 SENATOR SKOUFIS: And thank you very much. ELIZABETH ZELDIN: All right, thank you. 4 5 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Just before we conclude, 6 you know, thank you, and thank you, all the 7 witnesses, and also the folks who are here for the next hearing. 8 9 We did -- you know, we've been here since 9:30, and had, you know, testimony on a lot of very 10 11 important issues, including, already, several people 12 testifying on good cause. 13 The folks that run, you know, the tech 14 operation of this, that make sure that people who 15 are not in this room can see it, need about 16 five minutes to switch gears so we can begin the 17 next hearing. So we will begin promptly, as soon as we 18 19 adjourn this, in about five minutes. 20 So, with that, that's -- I thank my Co-Chair 21 of this event, James Skoufis, and, again, all the 22 staff that put so much work into today, and all the 23 people who have testified. And I'll leave it at that. 24

25

Thank you.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: And I'll just echo, I want to thank Senator Kavanagh and my colleagues who are here and our two committees. There is more to come, and it will be coming shortly. We heard a lot of good testimony today, and now we look forward to doing something about it. Thanks, everyone. (Whereupon, the public hearing concluded, and adjourned.) ---000---