1	BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE SENATE
2	STANDING COMMITTEE ON HOUSING, CONSTRUCTION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
3	
4	PUBLIC HEARING:
5	RENT REGULATION AND TENANT PROTECTION LEGISLATION
6	
7	
8	Town of Greenburgh Town Hall 177 Hillside Avenue Greenburgh, New York
10	Date: May 28, 2019
11	Time: 10:00 a.m.
12	PRESIDING:
13	Senator Brian Kavanagh Chair
14	CHair
15	PRESENT:
16	Majority Leader Andrea Stewart-Cousins
17	Senator David Carlucci
18	Senator Peter B. Harckham
19	Senator Shelley B. Mayer
20	Senator Zellnor Myrie
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

			2
1	SPEAKERS:	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2	Kenneth Finger	11	17
3	Member of the Westchester County Rent Guidelines Board, and	11	Ι,
4	Chief Counsel to the Building and Realty Institute, and,		
5	The Apartment Owners Advisory Council		
6	Jerry Houlihan Chairman	11	17
7	Apartment Owners Advisory Council		
8	Tina Jackson Member	41	53
9	Elizabeth McGriff Member	41	53
10	Gail Williams Organizer	41	53
11	Rochester Citywide Tenants Union		
12	Sojourner Salinas Member Leader	60	70
13	Zeltzyn Sanchez Gomez Member	60	70
14	Community Voices Heard, Westchester County Chapter		
15	RuthAnne Visnauskas	80	87
16	Commissioner NYS Homes and Community Renewal	80	0 /
17			
18	Ava Farkas Executive Director	111	121
19	Metropolitan Council on Housing		
20	Reverend Joya Colon-Berezin Minister of Christian Education Scarsdale Congressional Church	111	121
21	_	105	1.40
22	Christopher Schweitzer Supervising Attorney Logal Sarwigas of the Hudgon Wallow	127	142
23	Legal Services of the Hudson Valley (Yonkers Office)		
24	Tamara Stewart	127	142
25	Tenant Representative Westchester Rent Guidelines Board		

3	

			3
1	SPEAKERS (Continued):	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2			
3	Fidela Vasquez Member	148	155
	Norberta Guerrero	148	155
4	Member Teodora Reyes	148	155
5	Member Make the Road New York		
6			
7	Carol Danziger Managing Member Arthur Court, LLC	157	181
8			
9	Silvio Solari Former Landlord Westchester County	157	181
10	-		
11	Kenneth Nilsen Owner Nilsen Management Co.	157	181
12	-	0.0.5	0.1.0
13	Laura Case Systems Advocate Westchester Disabled on the Move	207	212
14	Patricia Weems	213	
15	Community Engagement Committee Greenburgh Central School District		
16	Karen Heim	213	
17	On behalf of Dennis Hanratty, Executive Director	213	
18	Mount Vernon United Tenants		
19	Lisa DeRosa A Landlord	226	245
20		0.0.5	2.1.5
21	Mike Nukho A Landlord	226	245
22	GEM Management Partners		
23	Gene DiResta Member	226	245
24	Building and Realty Institute		
25			

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for being here, and welcome to this hearing of the Senate Standing Committee on Housing, Construction, and Community Development.

I'm Brian Kavanagh, Chair of the Committee.

I am joined at the moment by

Senators Harckham and Mayer, and, Senator Carlucci
is also here and will be rejoining us in a moment.

We have a very long witness list, and we also will have a number of senators joining us throughout the proceedings.

It is a busy day, and there are several other hearings going on simultaneously.

This is our fifth hearing on this topic, which is rent regulation and tenant protection.

And, as many people know, the laws that currently protect -- that govern and regulate rent in New York City, and, in selected counties, in Nassau and Westchester and Rockland, expire on June 15th.

And, in addition to considering ways we might strengthen those laws, we are also considering other ways we might protect tenants.

We are joined, I note in the audience, by Representative -- Senator Tom Abinanti, whose

district we sit in.

Sorry, did I say -- did I call -- I think
I demoted him to senator.

That would be Assemblymember Tom Abinanti.

And, also, Assemblymember Amy Paulin.

And we do have a representative of Senate

Majority Leader Andrea Stewart-Cousins, in whose

district we also sit, and she is expected to join us

in person shortly.

So, we're gonna -- actually, let me begin by just asking if -- any of my colleagues, if they have any opening comments or remarks before we begin with the (indiscernible) witness?

SENATOR MAYER: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank you and our leader for making sure we had a hearing here in Westchester; the only one of the ETPA counties in which the hearings have taken place.

And, certainly, something that -- for myself and Leader Andrea Stewart-Cousins, who have 27,000 rent-stabilized units in our district, is of extreme importance to us, and has been throughout our respective times in the Legislature.

So I look forward to hearing from all who are

stakeholders in this issue.

I think some of -- some of our positions have been known by the bills that we've co-sponsored, but I look forward to hearing from all today, and having a productive conversation on behalf of this very important issue.

This bill expires on June 15th, so it's absolutely imperative that we move forward and reach a resolution before that date.

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just, very briefly, I want to echo what Senator Mayer said.

Thank you very much for hosting and holding this hearing in Westchester.

It's extremely important, and as someone who's worked with a lot of these stakeholders for years, I really look forward to the testimony today.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And, Senator Carlucci.

SENATOR MAYER: Excuse me.

Someone in the audience indicated they could not hear us well.

So if there's a way you could turn up the volume, I'd appreciate it.

Thank you.

Thank you.

8 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Carlucci. 1 2 SENATOR CARLUCCI: Well, yeah, I too want to thank everyone for participating today in this very 3 important hearing. 4 I want to thank you Senator Kavanagh, the 5 Chair of the Housing Committee, for bringing the 6 7 hearing here to Westchester County, to hear the concerns, particularly in the Hudson Valley. 8 9 And look forward to working with my colleagues Senator Mayer and Senator Harckham, to 10 11 make sure that we deliver a plan that works for all of our residents. 12 13 So look forward to hearing the testimony 14 today; thank you for being here. 15 Thank you. 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 17 Okay, so without further ado, let's bring up

our first witnesses.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we have Tina Jackson of the Rochester Citywide Tenants Union, and Elizabeth McGriff, also of Rochester Citywide Tenants Union, and Gail Williams as well from the Rochester Citywide Tenants Union.

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. Should we skip to

```
1
        the next panel, perhaps?
 2
               Okay.
               Is -- so are Sojourner Salinas and
 3
        Zeltzyn Sanchez Gomez here?
 4
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Indiscernible.)
 5
 6
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: They're also
        (indiscernible).
 7
 8
               Okay.
 9
               Let's see.
10
               Do we want --
11
               SENATOR MAYER: Yeah, that's okay.
12
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.
13
               So why don't we -- is Kenneth Finger and
        Jerry Houlihan and Ted Sannella in the room?
14
15
               KENNETH FINGER: I'm Kenneth Finger.
16
               I don't think Jerry's here.
17
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Come on up.
               Okay, so just -- while they're getting
18
19
        settled, just ground rules.
20
               Yes, if you have written testimony, we will
21
        take that and distribute it, and include it as
22
        part -- yeah, if you could bring it up to the panel.
23
               JERRY HOULIHAN: We only have one copy.
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: That's fine.
24
               We will -- we will consider any written
25
```

testimony part of the record today.

Each witness -- we have a very long witness list, so we're going to have your, sort, main testimony, we're gonna have an 8-minute period.

There is a clock that witnesses should be able to see.

We will kind of signal you if you're getting to the end of that time.

And then there will an additional period for questions from any senators that have questions.

That will be about a 5-minute period for each senator, for each panel.

And I do ask -- this is our fifth hearing.

There are some very strong views on this topic.

We do ask that people-- this is a public hearing. We do ask that people refrain from reacting.

If you hear something that you like, that's great.

If you hear something that you don't like, you know, we're here to hear different views.

But please do not applaud, you know, boo, any of that sort of thing, during the course of this hearing.

We appreciate that.

So -- and then, each witness, if you could begin by stating your name and any affiliations you want us to be aware of for the record, and then just begin your testimony.

So, Mr. Finger.

KENNETH FINGER: Mr. Houlihan will go first, if that's okay.

JERRY HOULIHAN: Okay. Good morning.

I am Jerry Houlihan. I'm a real estate broker, commercial real estate broker, commercial property manager, commercial mortgage broker, and, the seated chairman of the Apartment Owners Advisory Council of Westchester County for the past several years.

I'm here to testify against any further tightening or restrictions of the ETP -- ETPA law in Westchester County.

As you probably know, one of the components of the ETPA law is to allow the rent regulations to eventually dissolve, and naturally bring the rental market to a healthy free-market.

These proposals brought forth by the Senate and the House is going against that component of the law.

The programs that some of these representatives want to eliminate or minimize; namely, the MCIs, the IAIs, the vacancy bonus, et cetera, are the very programs that were put into place in the 1980s and the 1990s as a result of the poor housing policies in the 1970s.

As some of you probably are old enough like me to remember the 1970s, when owners were walking away from their buildings 'cause they were burning, not only because of crime, but also because the expenses to run these apartment houses.

These apartment houses, on average, were built in the late 1920s and 1930s, so they're approaching 100 years old.

The expenses were too high, and a lot of them, because they couldn't make a profit and they were losing money, walked away from these buildings.

Addressing affordability through the strengthening of these ETPA laws is going to produce the bad re -- a bad result for the tenants, and the economy as a whole.

The programs, the MCIs and the IAIs, et cetera, have brought these buildings to the best shape they've ever been in.

MCIs produce new windows; new building

components, such as boilers, roofs, plumbing, electricity, et cetera.

When an apartment vacates, individual apartment improvements allow the owners to go in and completely gut renovate an apartment.

Removing these programs will do just the opposite. It's not a way to address affordability.

And, in doing so, you're going to put these apartment buildings that are nearly 100 years old into, possibly, bad condition again.

And it's just, we believe, the wrong way to address affordability.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

KENNETH FINGER: Thank you, Senator.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to address you.

My name is Kenneth Finger. I'm a landlord member of the Westchester County Rent Guidelines
Board for 19 years.

I'm also the chief counsel to the Building and Realty Institute, and, the Apartment Owners Advisory Council.

In addition, my law firm has a very active landlord-tenant practice, so we are more than

familiar with the plight of the Westchester landlords.

As Mr. Houlihan has pointed out, most of the regulated housing in Westchester is in excess of 75, 80, and 100 years old.

This is housing that is the only real affordable housing in Westchester.

And, this is not New York City.

There are about twenty-five to twenty-seven thousand ETPA units here, as distinguished from over a million in the city.

I have enclosed, as part of my submission that you have before you, an executive summary of a rather lengthy analysis that was done in Cambridge, before -- when Cambridge went out of rent controls.

The sky did not fall, and housing in Cambridge actually got better and more affordable and more available.

The -- I've also -- I've enclosed for you, a copy of the ETPA Guidelines.

And the last year was 2 and 3 percent, and that was reasonable, and that was actually supported by the tenants.

I've also attached a copy of the figures given by DHCR, which show that the increases in

Westchester have been under the CPI increases for this area.

While we don't know what the 2020 census will show, the 2000 census showed that there were approximately 390,000 housing units in Westchester, of which 377,000 were occupied;

In 2010, there were 415,000 units, of which 390,000 were occupied;

Or, a vacancy rate of Westchester, of 6.1 percent.

In Greenburgh, at that time of the census, the vacancy rate was 4.4 percent -- excuse me, 4.4 percent; Mount Vernon, 9.4; New Rochelle, 5.5; Peekskill, 6.7; Rye, 7.3; White Plains, 6.0; and, Yonkers, 7.3.

This is not New York City.

This is Westchester County, where we don't have the kind of high rents that people are looking forward to seeing when they get vacancies.

The rents here have pretty much hit a top, and the market is what it is.

There are very few affordable housing units here of over \$2700.

And it doesn't pay any landlord to eliminate tenants or evict tenants just for getting an

increase that they can't get.

I'm also attaching a copy of the Rent
Guideline Board increases for the last 18 years,
which, if you look at, will show they've been very
modest.

Finally, the -- there are do-or-die issues that we believe must not be promulgated, to avoid a complete collapse of the affordable-housing market in Westchester.

If you -- as Mr. Houlihan has said, we need these MCIs and the IAIs in order to keep housing not only affordable, but to keep it in the condition that we want our tenants to have.

The areas that, in our judgment, will destroy the housing market in Westchester are:

Reinstitution of ETPA to previously decontrolled apartments;

Elimination or further restriction of reimbursement for MCIs or IAIs, which will lead to a deterioration of the regulated housing stock;

Elimination of the ability of restoring preferential rents to legal regulated rents on vacancies, which would not hurt existing tenants;

And the total elimination of the vacancy allowance, it is already limited.

1 We think that, if you look at the housing market in Westchester, and the ability of landlords 2 here to keep it in the condition we all want it to 3 be at, affordable housing will remain. 4 And we hope that there will be responsible 5 rent reform, not destructive rent reform. 6 7 Thank you very much. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you; thank you both 8 9 for your testimony. 10 KENNETH FINGER: Okay. 11 If there are any questions, we're here. 12 If not, we'll rest on our statements. 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I think we'll have a few 14 questions for you, and let me begin. 15 Just, you both spoke about affordable 16 housing. 17 Do you believe it's a legitimate goal of 18 state legislation to promote affordability in our 19 communities? 20 KENNETH FINGER: Do we think it's a 21 legitimate goal? Obviously, yes. 22 JERRY HOULIHAN: Absolutely. 23 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

KENNETH FINGER: And it's been in effect

since 1943 with the Rent Control Law, since 1974

24

25

with ETPA.

And we're supportive of that.

What we're not supportive of, is restricting the ability of a landlord to get income to maintain that housing.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: But do you think -- is there some tension between -- I mean, you've said a couple times, that certain reforms that are on the table would destroy the housing market --

KENNETH FINGER: That's right.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- which is, you know, quite a strong assertion.

Just -- so let's just talk about IAIs for a moment.

KENNETH FINGER: Yes.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: (Indiscernible) the purpose of IAIs are to encourage landlords to invest in individual apartments, to improve the quality of those units when -- typically, when they're vacant. Right?

KENNETH FINGER: Yes.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

And that the amount of the investing gets rolled into the rent for the next tenant, typically, at a rate of 140th of the total value of the

investment, per month, is added to the rent each month, indefinitely.

KENNETH FINGER: That's correct.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So, roughly speaking, if a landlord spends \$40,000 on an apartment, the rent will go up \$1,000 a month, indef -- the legal rent will go up \$1,000 a month, indefinitely?

KENNETH FINGER: Yes, but the quirk on that, is that -- which you just added, is that the legal rent will go up.

You could raise the legal rent up to any number, and possibly even get out of control.

The Westchester County market does not support rents of 2700, 3,000, 3500, in 100-year-old buildings.

And if you want to be able to maintain those apartments, and maintain them -- and these are very, frequently, apartments where tenants have been there for 20, 30, or 40 years.

You have to renovate the apartment and bring it up to condition, so that a new family can move in and have the best possible housing.

Once you eliminate that ability of doing that, you're eliminating the ability of a landlord to maintain and perfect the housing.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And why is not -- why is it not sufficient to have -- you have a Rent Guidelines Board, you sit on that Rent Guidelines Board.

Each year you assess the cost of maintaining housing in Westchester --

KENNETH FINGER: Yes.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- and then you set rents that you think -- rent increases that you think are reasonable to accommodate the need of landlords to invest in their buildings, to maintain their housing.

Why is that system not sufficient?

Why do we need these add-ons through IAIs or

MCIs?

KENNETH FINGER: The system is not sufficient for a number of reasons.

Number one: If you look at the increases, and I've given you the figures over the period of years, it hasn't even kept up with the cost of living.

The Rent Guidelines Board in Westchester

is -- is -- I won't be critical of it because one of

my members is sitting here, but it's been much more

tenant-oriented over the years.

And if you look at a comparison in the increases between Westchester and New York City, it's much less in Westchester over the years than it has been in New York City, not even enough to keep up with inflation.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Do you believe that, when the Rent Guidelines Board is making these decisions, they are factoring in the fact that there are other ways rents go up -- IAIs, vacancy bonuses, MCIs -- when they're considering how much to raise the base rent?

Are they aware that there are other ways that land -- other things that are being paid for in other ways besides that increase?

KENNETH FINGER: Yes, I think that's so.

And I think they probably also consider that there was a 20 percent vacancy, or 18 percent vacancy, increase, that's available also.

So, yes, that's a mitigating circumstance, which is exactly why you need the MCIs and the IAIs, because it is factored in by the guidelines board as one of the elements that enables a landlord to maintain his or her building.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, but isn't it possible that you and your colleagues on the Rent

Guidelines Board, if there were not routine increases in rent upon vacancy, based on vacancy bonus and other things, that this sort of necessary cost of maintaining buildings would be -- would be considered by the Rent Guidelines Board, and you wouldn't need these very generous add-ons?

KENNETH FINGER: I don't think the situation -- I've sat on that board for 19 years. I don't think that would ever happen.

I think that the -- you need these increases to maintain your buildings, and to -- to keep them -- these are 100-year-old buildings, to keep them up to condition that people want to live in, and move into.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

I think my time is just about up.

I'll see if any other senators have questions?

JERRY HOULIHAN: Well, I just want to say, too, is that, you know, when an apartment has been in occupancy for a very long time, and the rent is, let's say, 600 or 700 dollars a month, and you go in and you spend thirty or forty thousand dollars to renovate it, you're bringing that market -- that apartment up to market.

If you don't have these programs, you're not going to do that, and you're going have an old apartment.

I mean, you got to have the incentive in there for a landlord to go in and gut it, and then bring the -- the rent up to market.

I mean, the average cost in
Westchester County to run an apartment is about
eleven or twelve hundred dollars a month.

So if somebody's paying six or seven hundred dollars a month, then, okay, if they're senior citizens and they have limited income, we understand that. But you got to remember, we're losing six or -- five or six hundred dollars a month on keeping that apartment running.

So when they vacate, you have to keep that program in place, so that you can improve the apartment, improve the living condition, and allow us to run a building without a loss.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And, presumably, your -presumably, landlords in Westchester, as landlords
in New York, mostly, have not been running for a
loss -- at a loss over the long term in recent
years.

JERRY HOULIHAN: Well, I don't --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Just from our -- just -- I do want to yield my time to others on the panel.

But just -- I mean, there's -- I think

there's one -- it's one thing to say, you need to

get the apartment to be in a -- maintain the

apartment in a reasonable condition, and another to

say that it's necessary that it be gutted and, you

know, changed into an apartment that rents for a

much higher rent.

And I think, for some of us --

JERRY HOULIHAN: I said "market rent," not
much higher rent.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- okay.

Again, if you're gutting it -- if you're gutting -- how much does it cost to gut an -- gut renovate an apartment?

JERRY HOULIHAN: Uhm, it -- the number you quoted was pretty accurate.

KENNETH FINGER: About thirty to forty thousand.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So, again, just so we understand, you're asserting that, if we change or eliminate IAIs, we will, you know, in your words, destroy the rental market and, you know, prevent people from making a profit.

It's just hard -- I think it's hard for some of us on the panel to understand why a legal -- you take your \$700 apartment, why a -- while legally increasing that rent to 1700 is necessary in order to maintain decent quality, and maintain -- and maintain landlords as a business, where people can afford --

(Indiscernible cross-talking)

JERRY HOULIHAN: Well, again, I mean, you have to put some flexibility in there.

If we spend twenty thousand dollars, as opposed to forty, you know, then we're not raising it to seventeen hundred. We're raising it to thirteen or fourteen hundred, which is, maybe, a hundred dollars over what it takes to run the apartment.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Right.

Okay, so --

KENNETH FINGER: And you have the cost of the renovations, which is not factored into 140th, in terms of the interest cost, in terms of borrowing the money.

You're up-fronting -- you're up-fronting the full dollar amount at the beginning.

By some calculations, we believe that, if an

IAIs is made, and the landlord recoups the full 1 legal rent after that, that they -- the return on 2 3 the sort of -- unleveraged return on that investment 4 is 22 percent a year. 5 So, I mean, again, some of us are skeptical that it's --6 7 JERRY HOULIHAN: I'd like to see those numbers, Senator. 8 9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, well, they come from various sources (indiscernible) industry. 10 11 JERRY HOULIHAN: Well, I'd like to see them. 12 SENATOR KAVANAGH: But, we appreciate the -again, because -- again, because you're getting 30 13 14 percent of the amount of your investment back each 15 year, indefinitely, if you're -- if you're able to 16 charge the legal rent. 17 JERRY HOULIHAN: I don't believe those numbers, Senator. 18 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, again, it is a fact 20 that --21 JERRY HOULIHAN: I don't see it as a fact. 22 I'd like to --SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- let me -- I'll speak, 23 and then you speak, if you would. 24 25 It is a fact that the legal rent goes up at

140th of the total value, which is, 12/40ths, is 1 2 30 percent. 3 So if you spend \$40,000, as we've discussed --4 5 JERRY HOULIHAN: Right. SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- you get to a \$1,000 6 7 increase in the rent, which is \$12,000 a year, which is, 12,000 is 30 percent of 40,000. 8 9 So if you are able to recoup the full legal rent, the rent -- the cash flow from the apartment 10 11 goes up 30 percent of the amount you spent on IAIs. 12 That's just arithmetic. 13 JERRY HOULIHAN: Yeah, that is, and that's 14 fine. But the actual market rent may be less. 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: That -- that's -- again --16 JERRY HOULIHAN: And that's what we --17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- what I -- what I --18 again, in your example -- I mean, again, if -- if landlords -- if land --19 20 (Indiscernible cross-talking) 21 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- and I do want to end this, and a lot of my -- I'm sure my other 22 23 colleagues will continue this dialogue. 24 But, just, if -- if -- if you're not able to 25 collect the legal rent, in some circumstances, it's

hard for us to understand why you would insist the legal rent needs to go up to that.

And if you can collect it, you know, it raises serious concerns for us about affordability.

JERRY HOULIHAN: Well, that's something to look at.

KENNETH FINGER: Well, because, at some point, the market may increase.

So if the legal regulated rent does go up, and you have a 2008 situation where it was -- it tanked, maybe, by 2018, you then can get back up to where it should be.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So if you are getting the legal rent, then you're getting this kind of return, and, you know, changing the apartment to an apartment that is fundamentally different from an affordability perspective.

But, I will leave it at that, and see if my colleagues -- Senator Mayer?

SENATOR MYRIE: Yeah, I have several questions.

So, you know, one of the challenges is that, through the vacancy allowance, so, the vacancy decontrol, approximately, 3,000 units of rent-stabilized housing have been lost in

Westchester, according to HCR, between 2015 and 2018.

And I wondered, since you are calling for, basically, no changes in that provision, and yet you support the policy of rent stabilization as a way to preserve affordability, what is your response to this, units leaving the program in significant number, every year, as a result of this?

KENNETH FINGER: Well, I think the -- if you look at the number of units, I think I gave you one of my charts here, it is not (indiscernible) -- you had -- in 2017, you had 25,789 rent-stabilized units. You had 875 that were vacant.

That is not the kind of numbers that I think I just heard from you.

On permanently exempt from a high-rent vacancy, where 146, that's 146 units, out of 25,789, due to high-rent vacancy.

That is nowhere near the kind of numbers that you're proposing, Senator.

SENATOR MAYER: Well, I'm not proposing them.

I'm saying --

KENNETH FINGER: I mean, that you cited.

SENATOR MAYER: -- I cited the HCR's Office of Rent Administration, by year, in 2015, 330 were

```
permanently exempt.
 1
               KENNETH FINGER: Right.
 2
               SENATOR MAYER: That's how I got to my
 3
        10,000. I mentioned it was over four years.
 4
               243 in 2016, 146 in 2017, and 187 in 2018,
 5
        which is a collective total of about 3,000, which is
 6
        about 10 percent of Westchester's rent-stabilized --
 7
               KENNETH FINGER: No, It's 1,000.
 8
 9
               JERRY HOULIHAN: Yeah, that's 1,000.
               KENNETH FINGER: It's a thousand -- I'm
10
11
        sorry, Judge -- Senator.
12
               It comes out to about 1,000.
13
               And if you go back to 2013 --
14
               SENATOR MAYER: Well --
15
               (Indiscernible cross-talking.)
16
               SENATOR MAYER: -- yeah, okay.
17
               KENNETH FINGER: -- 2013 was 140, and 2014
        was 293.
18
19
               I have the same chart.
20
               You, fortunately, have a year more than I do.
               SENATOR MAYER: Well, it's not the same.
21
               KENNETH FINGER: I'm only on the board.
22
               SENATOR MAYER: We have different numbers.
23
               The bottom line is, for those of us that
24
25
        represent these communities, like myself
```

representing Yonkers particularly, the loss of affordable housing by these units be -- coming out of the system is a critical loss for our constituents who are looking for affordable housing.

And I'm asking you: What is your answer, while you support rent stabilization as being a legitimate state policy, to the loss of these units?

You are proposing no change in this program.

KENNETH FINGER: Well, you're -- you're saying that there's a loss of the units in terms of affordability.

I don't think that's necessarily so.

There may be -- there may be loss from the ETPA, but there are very few units that you can rent in Westchester, in 100-year-old buildings, for \$2800 a year -- a month, which is what the number is of these days.

So I think that the high-rent vacancy, although it may take it out of ETPA, doesn't take it out of affordability, because the market rents, generally --

Again, I emphasize, this is not New York City.

-- the market rents, generally, are less than the actual ETPA rents that are exempt due to high

rent.

And that's a 1,000 over a period over 6 years -- 5 or 6 years.

SENATOR MAYER: Four years.

KENNETH FINGER: Well, all right --

SENATOR MAYER: In my -- in my --

KENNETH FINGER: -- four years. Okay.

1,000 over 4 years, of 25,000.

And we submit that a large number of those are still being rented at affordable rents, because that's what the market is.

SENATOR MAYER: Okay, two points.

My "3,000" number is the loss of rent-stabilized units totally, not just vacancy decontrol, over that period.

And the second point is, the issues of rent stabilization deal not only with rent, but also the opportunity to renew your rent; the right to renew your lease.

And while you may say the apartment may still be so-called "affordable," no -- the tenant has no right to renewal, which is an absolutely essential factor for our constituents.

So, I would quarrel with your description.

But let me just move on to another thing.

On the MCIs, one factor you have not discussed, is the fact that the percentage increase applied in Westchester, of 15 percent, is certainly more than double the New York City percentage allowed of 6 percent.

Would you -- in the modifications of the program, if we leave an MCI in there, and -- would you agree to lower your percentage to be consistent, statewide, with the New York City percentage of 6 percent?

KENNETH FINGER: I don't think it's equivalent because, in New York City, you're starting off with a much higher base and a much higher rent.

I think here we have older stock, smaller rents, and we need it to maintain the buildings, and to bring -- to do the capital improvements; the roofs, the windows, the pointing.

Pointing an apartment house is hugely expensive.

And those type of numbers, you to have the full increase for an MCI.

SENATOR MAYER: Well, with all due respect, that "6" and "15" did not come out of a policy discussion like you're suggesting.

It came out of, basically, a mistake in legislation, where they put it in for New York City, and they left out.

The cost of pointing an apartment I'm sure, in New York City, is equal, if not greater, to that in Westchester.

So my question is: Will you, representing the owners' community and the landlord community, agree to have a consistent number that is in sync with what New York City has?

KENNETH FINGER: Well, I would submit that the number that should be -- for one thing, I think you would do a great favor if you eliminated the Rent Guidelines Board.

As far as I'm concerned, there are a lot of other things I think many of us would like to do with our evenings.

But putting that one aside, rent control in New York City is done by HCR. They submit a percentage increase each year, and that's what it is.

You could easily do the same thing with the ETPA.

SENATOR MAYER: With all due respect, Mr. Finger, I'm asking you about the MCI rate

increase.

Would you accept 6 percent?

KENNETH FINGER: No. I think, 6 percent, you couldn't do a building for 6 percent.

SENATOR MAYER: Okay.

And, now, I also want to ask you about the permanence of the MCI, which is a great sore spot among tenants, as you know, and I know, and you've heard -- you and I have differed on this before.

What is the policy argument for continuing the MCI to be permanent past the point of repayment, to explain to a tenant?

Just, like, when they -- when they fix something, and they borrow the money, when they pay it off, they don't pay it anymore.

So can you explain why a tenant would have to pay this MCI permanently?

KENNETH FINGER: Because, a number -- there are a couple of reasons.

Number one: A number of the things that you do have to be redone in a certain number of years, whether it's a refrigerator, or something of that nature.

So if it goes on for 40 months, or 84 months, or 90 or 108 months, where some of the --

1 Is it MCIs --2 JERRY HOULIHAN: That's right, yep. KENNETH FINGER: -- have to go on --3 Is it 90 -- for 108 months. 4 It's not only 40. 5 6 The 40 is only the IAIs. 7 The MCIs, I believe, are 90 and 108. SENATOR MAYER: Yeah. 8 9 KENNETH FINGER: But -- so you're talking, there, 9 or 10 years, and you have to do repairs, 10 11 you have to do a lot of things, that you can't get 12 MCIs for. 13 And what the DHCR makes you do, is they make 14 you do the 100 percent of everything. 15 If you have to do a sidewalk, for example, 16 and you only need half a sidewalk, you can't get an MCI for half a sidewalk. 17 18 SENATOR MAYER: But with respect to my 19 question, to a tenant, who is paying permanently, 20 and the amount is added on to their base rent when 21 an MCI is granted, you -- I'm having trouble 22 understanding what you believe is the real reason

Yes, of course, there may be subsequent repairs, and that's why, so far, MCIs have been

why it should be permanent.

23

24

25

authorized.

What is the reason while the repair, for which the landlord has paid, is not terminated once it is paid off?

KENNETH FINGER: Because they're getting the benefit of the repair as long as they live there.

It's not a repair that ends, or the MCI doesn't end in the 8 years, or 10 years, that DHCR has allowed.

It goes on, as does the value of the benefit to the tenant.

SENATOR MAYER: Well, they are getting housing.

But I will -- I'll -- I'll yield my time to someone else, and may come back.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Harckham.

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just following up on Senator Mayer's line of questioning, you had spoken in your testimony,

Mr. Finger, about, let's find responsible -- let's do responsible rent reform.

So what would a responsible middle ground be, to you?

You know, assuming we have tenants' advocates saying one thing, and, obviously, your organization

and others on the other side, what do you think is the responsible middle ground?

KENNETH FINGER: Well, one thing I think might be responsible middle ground is, for example, when we have preferential rents.

I understand there is an effort to eliminate the ability to come back to legal regulated rents.

I think that might be okay while the tenant still lives there.

But then, when it becomes vacant, to give the landlord the opportunity to come back to a legal regulated rent at that point in time, that has taken many years to get up to.

I think that would be one area.

We can go on if you want.

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Yeah, please.

KENNETH FINGER: Other areas, I think there are areas where you might eliminate the Rents Guidelines Board, as I've suggested.

I think that it's a statistical.

We have surveys that HCR does, they send out, in February or March, and it's supposed to be computerized now.

And they just sent out a notice last week, that they're not even going to -- they're giving

people till May 31st.

You know, you're wasting a huge amount of administrative funds and effort in regulating a system that doesn't need a guidelines board. It just needs a statistical -- statistical methodology.

So that would be -- those would be two ways where I think you could have responsible rent reform.

SENATOR HARCKHAM: All right, one other question.

We were talking about losing 1,000 private-sector apartments in Westchester County.

During the federal housing settlement, we -when I was on the county board, and you remember
those days, we made a full-court effort, and built
800 units of affordable housing.

And we've lost 1,000 in the private sector, so we weren't even keeping up.

So how -- how -- how do we, in keeping with the private sector, which is certainly more cost-effective than spending the money we spent on those 800 units, if -- if -- if you are advocating the IAIs and the MCIs stay as is, and other increases out of ETPA, how does the private sector

in Westchester help preserve affordable housing?

KENNETH FINGER: Because what you have to do is, incentivize people to invest in real estate.

If you start eliminating every ability of a landlord to either make a profit, which is not a dirty word, and -- or to maintain and improve their buildings, that's how you will get more housing, by incentivizing it.

That puts aside the issue of having government tax credits, and things of that nature, that would also incentivize landlords being able to (indiscernible) private landlords.

So you don't have new apartments coming on -on board on 5,000-dollar-a-month rents. You have
them coming on board on 1100- and
1500-dollar-a-month rents.

So I would think, if you could incentivize landlords to invest in real estate, you would have much more private investment and much more affordable housing in the county.

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Other questions or

comments for this panel?

Okay.

Thank you very much for your testimony.

1 KENNETH FINGER: Thank you very much. 2 JERRY HOULIHAN: Thank you. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next up, do we now have 3 Tina Jackson and Elizabeth McGriff and 4 Gail Williams? 5 6 You guys ready? Terrific. 7 SENATOR MAYER: (Inaudible) saw that 8 9 Paul Feiner, the supervisor of Greenburgh, was -stuck his head in at the end. 10 11 And I just want to thank Paul, and the 12 Village of -- the Town of Greenburgh, for being such 13 gracious hosts, as always; and, thank you. 14 And Paul certainly may be back. 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And before we begin the 16 next panel, I just want to acknowledge that we've 17 been joined by Senator Zellnor Myrie of Brooklyn. 18 Again, so if you -- if each of you could 19 state your name and your affiliation, and then 20 proceed. 21 TINA JACKSON: Hi. My name is Tina Jackson. Good evening -- well, good morning, everyone. 22 23 My name is Tina Jackson, and my statement 24 is -- my name is Tina Jackson, and I'm a member of

the Citywide Tenant Union of Rochester, and I've

25

lived in Rochester for over 43 years.

I'm here to speak about statewide tenant protection, and can increase the quality of our housing, reduce homelessness.

We have a massive (indiscernible) crisis in Rochester, with over 8,600 evictions filed in Rochester City Court each year.

I have personally been a victim of no-fault evictions on three separate occasions.

I'm going to tell you about one of those horrible ordeals.

When I was living on Garson Avenue in Rochester, with my son and my daughter, when I -- when the landlord refused to make repairs.

The knob came off the stove. He wouldn't make repairs on them.

The refrigerator stopped working and all my stuff spoiled. He refused to repair it.

My apartment was infested with roaches.

The leaks started coming through the ceiling, and mold and mildew was growing in the kitchen and bathroom.

Things got worse.

There was no ventilation in the apartment.

First the time -- first time in my life

I started having breathing problems, and my son and I got sick. Were diagnosed with asthma.

After four months of the land -- after four months, the landlord refusing to make repairs, I began to call Rochester City Code Enforcement.

The landlord stated I was going to be evicted if I continued to call and complain.

But I had to call them in to enforce my legal rights.

So that mean I didn't give up.

After their (indiscernible) -- after their (indiscernible) -- after their (indiscernible) -- they cited the landlord, and had to make repairs; however, despite being up on the rent, the landlord said he wouldn't renew my lease.

Without giving a reason, known as a "no-fault eviction," I became -- I was evicted and became homeless, and had nowhere to go. In a shelter with my son and daughter.

It was an awful experience.

This is why we need good-cause eviction protection and rent stabilization.

No one should have to go through what I went through.

I feel that no one should be homeless or in

the street.

Everyone should have a safe, quality place to go.

No one should be sleeping under a bridge.

No one should have to be without, no matter what their circumstance is.

I believe housing is a human right for every woman, man, and child.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thanks.

ELIZABETH McGRIFF: Hi. My name is
Elizabeth McGriff, and I'm an organizer with the
Citywide Tenants Union.

And my job is, I go out to speak to tenants, and, you know, learn about their conditions, and what they're living in. And we try to help them, to kind hear -- have -- have their voices heard.

And the reason why I came into this work is because I went through foreclosure, and I went through the trauma of that, in dealing with, you know, where you're going to live, you know, where you're going to lay your head at night.

And, to me, I've always lived in, you know, a very good conditions.

I had parents that took -- that, you know, made sufficient funds.

And so when that kind hit, it was a traumatic experience for me, because I had two young sons, that I had to find a place to live, and a place to lay their head at night.

So when I think of "home," I think of the comfort of being at home. I think of, you know, it's the safety, it's a safe place for me, where my kids can be themselves.

And, so, when a person kind of goes through the traumatic experience of, they have an eviction, it's like: Where do I go?

What do I do next?

You know, what happens to me?

What's going to happen to my family?

Is DSS going to be involved?

Is -- you know, you go through all these traumatic things.

And, with having supports in place, like, just-cause eviction and home stabilization, it gives people that opportunity, okay, I have an opportunity to figure out what's going to happen.

So, going back to my situation:

My home went through foreclosure.

And so then I got involved as a tenant organizer.

I lived in the community for many years, and I've seen the transition of people going from home ownership to becoming renters.

One individual that I worked with, was helping to save his home, and he didn't know his home was sold to an investor.

He didn't know.

And he, you know, paid his mortgage, was free. Got behind on the taxes. And now he -- he was in a situation, now he's renting his home he's lived in for 30 years, paid off.

So -- and the landlord wanted to evict him from his home, and it was very devastating for him, because he hadn't made plans to move anyplace else, he hadn't made plans to live anyplace else.

This was his home, this was his -- his -- his investment in -- for his self.

And I also met individuals on Monroe Avenue, who had -- who have lived there, you know, 15, 18, 20 years in their apartments, and then they were given a 30-day notice.

And the landlord put on his Facebook page, you know, he's going to cure -- remove the cancer from the area.

That was his thought of what he was doing; he

thought he was doing something good.

But he was evicting people out of their homes for many years, and a lot of them were on disability, they didn't have any other income, and they had no place to go. They're traumatized by this situation.

We were able to help them, but, still, there was that trauma, that one person had anxiety. So this was completely devastating to them.

So our system is supposed to be set up with a system of checks and balances; a system that protects those who are vulnerable, and not people that are renters -- I mean, not people that are investors, that are just in it for a profit.

The average investor in the city of Rochester, in the city they get 20 percent on their investment; a 20 percent return.

But it's to move out, you know, a lot of the Black and Brown folks that have lived in that area for many years.

So -- and just two weeks ago, at 275 East Main Street in the city of Rochester, the tenants didn't do anything wrong.

The land -- the investor came in, he said,

I brought (sic) these buildings. It was new -- a

new investment for him. Gave everybody a 30-day notice.

You know, same situation, people have lived there for many years.

Because he could get a 35 percent increase in rent, so he kicked everybody out. And I think there's only four people that still remain in the building.

But, we want families in our community to stay safe.

We want a different alternative.

We want people -- if it's possible for tenants to own their property when the landlord doesn't keep it up; for the tenants to gather a cooperative, and to purchase their building from the landlord, and to run it themselves, and have a community land trust.

Which is, my home was part of becoming a home in the community land trust, which gives the community the opportunity to build on, the community to say -- have a say-so of who they want in their community, who they want to live in their community.

And I just think that's one of the ways we can stop the bleeding that's happening to a lot of folks in our communities, to change the situation

around.

So, there has to be a stop for the investors.

If there isn't, then people are in the streets.

People die young in the streets, because they don't have the opportunity for housing, because they can no longer afford the place that they lived for 20 years. They can no longer afford, because investors want to make money.

You know, that's the bottom line.

And that's, pretty much.

GAIL WILLIAMS: Good morning to everyone.

I'm Gail, and I represent the city -- I'm sorry.

I'm Gail, and I represent the Citywide Tenants Union of Rochester, New York.

I'm also here to represent the poor, disabled, disadvantaged, seniors, single parents, victim of domestic violence, the fatherless, the widows, the homeless displaced children and adults, as well as any other group who cannot advocate for themselves.

I'm here to, hopefully, appear to the human side of all of you.

My family consists of two people with

disabilities. We lived in Rochester, New York, for five years. We lived in a multifamily unit that consisted of 400-plus residents.

The building was infested with black mold, asbestos, poor air quality, and no ventilation.

The building failed Section 8 inspection.

The health department documented their findings.

The owners refused to remediate the black mold, or, address any of the condition.

They found a way to evict my family without just cause.

As a result, we lost major opportunities, and endured financial hardship.

I'm sure you may be asking yourself why you are here?

My belief is that you have been chosen by the creator of the universe to be here.

You are in the right place at the right time because the prayers of the many has created this day for positive results concerning the issues that are placed before you.

You can go back to your other Assemblymembers or senators, and challenge them to make history by passing these two bills, which would benefit the

people you are all here -- have been called to represent.

Also, you will go down in history for changing the laws that are oppressing many, and, in the process, make it a strong statement, that housing is a necessity and a human right.

Here's some stats in Rochester, New York:
Rochester consists of 63 percent renters.

Emergency shelters consist of 70 percent of people who have been evicted.

In the courts, each year, as you have heard, there have been upwards of 8,600 eviction cases.

20,000 or more people a year have been in court facing eviction, because landlords have been given power, by law, to victimize the poor.

50,000 people have been compelled to move each year in Rochester.

These numbers do not include the ones that never make it to court.

This has resulted in increased homelessness, instability, mental-health issues, educational problems in the school system, and genocide.

It is also largely been (indiscernible) -- responsible, I'm sorry, for an increase in crime rate, dysfunctional families and community, which,

1 in turn, places a strain on our economy. Most written laws have the rich in power in 2 mind, and not people like us. 3 Prayerfully, today is a new day. 4 5 I'm here to represent a young lady who is 59 as well. 6 7 I'm the tenant president of my building. She couldn't be here. She's, literally, 8 became -- she, literally, became visually challenged 9 10 within two years or so. 11 She said: 12 "I'm Bridget (ph.). I'm visually-challenged, 13 blind. 14 "I have been given 30 days to move out. 15 "Now that 30 days is 3 days from today. "I have no violation or missed rent payments. 16 17 "I have nowhere to go, me and my daughter. 18 "I was discriminated against, and my disability rights' special accommodation was 19 20 violated. 21 "I now live in a one-bedroom. 22 "When I remind management for my need for a 23 two-bedroom, I was told not to hold my breath, and that she just rented out the two-bedroom. 24 25 "Then the manager looked me in my face and

stated, that my lease would not be renewed, even 1 after my doctor wrote this letter. 2 "The doctor stated, from Rochester Regional 3 Health: 4 5 'Bridget Houston currently has uncontrolled 6 Type 2 diabetes, with both eyes affected. 7 'Please consider the patient for a two-bedroom, accommodated her disability needs for 8 her and her caregiver.'" 9 At this point, we're fighting for people like 10 11 Bridget, to have an extension. 12 When we pass these two bills, we are part of 13 the nine-bill package to create, expand, universal 14 rent control. 15 We can get Bridget, and thousands more 16 others, that are blind and disabled protection. 17 So my question to you guys: What is good-cause eviction? 18 What is rent stabilization? 19 20 And how can everyone benefit? 21 Please ask yourself, which side of history 22 will I choose to be on? 23 You choose. 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 25 I suggest, for context here, you know, we are here in Westchester, where the Emergency Tenant

Protection Act permits localities to opt into the

rent-regulation system.

But, in Rochester, that's not the case.

Only in the counties of Rockland and Westchester and Nassau and, of course, the city of New York, is that available.

So just, can you give us a sense --

Thank you; thank you for your testimony, and for all of your work in Rochester, and for making a very long trip to be with us today.

-- can you just talk about, this phenomenon of landlords -- of investors purchasing buildings, and then seeking to push the people who live in those buildings out, in order to increase their profits, as you've described, is that a growing phenomenon in Rochester?

Has something changed in recent years?

ELIZABETH McGRIFF: It has. It's changed in the last couple of years.

There is an apartment complex, the city has lost a number of its population.

So, in order to increase it, they've opened themselves up to a lot of investors, and a lot of developers. And it's kind of changed -- changed the

face of the city. A lot of Black folks are being forced out of the area that they have lived in there for many, many years.

And it's causing -- it's causing a lot of homelessness.

You can see, I -- Linda has mentioned, a lot of the homelessness in our communities have gone up, because people can't afford to live in these apartments anymore.

Rent -- the particular one that I was talking about, the rent was five to six hundred dollars a month, it was affordable. A lot of the recipients were on fixed income, DSS, SSD benefits, disability benefits.

And so, now, the investors are coming in and they're saying, Well, we can get a higher price because this is an up and coming city.

So they can get more money.

So the whole complex, you know, 30-day notice, "get out."

You know, and some have lived there for many, many years. Paid their rent on time. Didn't cause any problems.

So it's definitely increasing in our community.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Do you want to answer?

GAIL WILLIAMS: I would just like to state that these buyouts are horrible.

I'm not sure, technically, do Rochester,

New York, or any taxpayer, have an idea what's going
on.

This particular building that, literally, caused me and my family to move out, just, had nothing there.

No, anything. You just have to go.

These people received \$1.3 million in tax breaks.

I thought about that, because I'm only five years here in New York, and I was, like, well, then why do we have such high property taxes, because we're paying for this?

We're paying for developers to come in, and it's a joke, because what they do, and what I really found out after going to the code inspectors, or office, or whatever, in my building, I had to go pull the code, because I couldn't believe that I'm here four, five years, and, surely, there's no ventilation; surely, the black mold is everywhere. People are really, literally, sick.

I went there and I looked, and I was, like,

nine -- within nine years, no code. None.

And then I looked and say, What is this game that the investors are playing?

Playing, mainly, the corporate.

I can't speak for those who are just really good landlords, so we're not talking about that.

I watched that building go down and down and down, and the joke is, it's like a cycle.

Let the building go down, because we can come to the mayor, the City, we can come to the senators, and say, Oh, Rochester is great.

Rochester is great.

But at the same time, these buyouts, they know they're going to get this money to so-called repair, and go, oh, yeah, by the way, we helping these poor people.

But where you let the building go down for 10 and 20 years, that's the game.

It's a cycle in Rochester, New York.

And my concern is, also, it's, like, how do we keep giving them a pass?

How do even our senators, which we have spoken to over and over again, who have, not, not stood up for Rochester, New York.

And it's my understanding, they're saying,

oh, we're fine.

How are you fine, when you have 50,000 families a year being rotated and put on the street?

And you know what?

I kind of -- you know, at one point, I was, like, you know, this is just about Black people.

When I look, it's all faces.

You poor, you got to go, it's nothing personal.

So when we talk about investment, I hope everybody in this room completely understand, there's nothing more devastating, to be somewhere 22 years, 20 years, and 10 years, and pay taxes in this city, and work.

We're not talking about someone that's on the street with a sign, saying, Okay, could you feed me?

I think people have a misconception of what that's about.

We're talking about college students, who possibly have to sleep on their mother's couch until they get a job. Or we talking about, you know, people who, they retired, and the disability is low.

So I'm stating here today, please, for all investors, please understand something:

It's one thing to get an investment; it's 1 another thing to kill people. 2 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 3 Any questions from the panel? 4 Senator Harckham. 5 6 SENATOR HARCKHAM: Yeah, thank you. 7 And thank the -- to the three of you for coming down from Rochester, and thank you for your 8 9 testimony. You said that the people who purchased that 10 11 building had 1.3 million in tax breaks. 12 Were those state tax breaks, do you know, or were they local tax breaks? 13 14 GAIL WILLIAMS: State. 15 SENATOR HARCKHAM: Those were state tax 16 breaks? 17 GAIL WILLIAMS: State tax breaks. 18 SENATOR HARCKHAM: All right. 19 Thank you very much. 20 GAIL WILLIAMS: Okay. 21 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Any other questions? 22 Thank you very much again for your testimony. 23 GAIL WILLIAMS: Thank you. 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, I would like to just 25 be -- first -- first of all, acknowledge that we

have been joined by our Majority Leader, 1 Andrea Stewart-Cousins, who -- in whose district we 2 3 sit today. And she will, perhaps, give some remarks as we go forth, but has suggested that I proceed by 4 5 calling up the next panel of witnesses. 6 So we're going to have -- we're going 7 to have, next up, Sojourner Salinas and Zeltzyn Sanchez Gomez, both of Yonkers, of 8 Community Voices Heard. 9 And, great, whichever of you wants to go 10 11 first, if you'd just state your name and your 12 affiliation, and proceed. 13 SOJOURNER SALINAS: Good morning -- can you 14 hear me clear? 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes. 16 SOJOURNER SALINAS: Thank you. 17 Good morning, Senators. My name is Sojourner Salinas. 18 I'm a member leader from Community Voices 19 20 Heard, and I represent Westchester County Chapter. 21 Community Voices Heard is a member-led 22 organization, multi-racial organization, principally 23 comprised of women of color and of low-income

We tackle tough issues, and we build power to

families across New York State.

24

25

secure racial and social and economic justice.

Through grass organizing -- grassroots organizing, leadership development, and policy changes, and creating new models of direct democracy, Community Voices Heard is creating a truly equitable New York State.

We have chapters in New York City,
Westchester County, Orange County, Dutchess County,
and Rockland Counties (sic).

Together, with Housing Justice for All, we are fighting for universal rent control, and we ask you all to pass all nine bills.

I now live in a stabilized apartment in New Rochelle for now, but I have personally faced horrific housing obstacles since 1992.

If it were not for the grace of God, I would still be facing housing insecurities.

I have dealt with NYCHA mold -- NYCHA's mold, unjust rent increases, lease-renewal issues, preferential rent and vacancy bonus, fraudulent schemes, and burglary.

My income couldn't keep up with the unjust rent increases, and I was evicted, became homeless.

I had to leave The Bronx where I was born and raised to live with the family in Mount Vernon.

If they had not taken me in, I would have been subjected to going from shelter to shelter.

I lived with them for two years, until they themselves were evicted, along with other families who lived in their home.

It was 2010, and the owner of that home lost their home to predatory bank lending.

I found myself homeless once again, until I was relocated again, to another city I knew nothing about, White Plains.

While living in White Plains, I dealt with harassment and intimidation from my landlord.

Moreover, she refused to provide me with a lease renewal. And without any protection, I constantly feared where I would be -- when I would be evicted and become homeless once more.

As someone on a fixed income, unjust rent increase might as well have been an eviction notice for me.

For four years, between 2013 and 2017, the stability of my entire life was at the discretion of my landlord. This constant stress took a massive toll on my health and my peace of mind.

My story of housing insecurities is not unique. Millions of people across New York State

face similar obstacles.

Throughout Westchester, cities, towns, and villages are being gentrified.

Rent-law loopholes are being systemically exploited to drive up rents, leading to the displacement of families and communities.

Landlords are discriminating against low-income tenants because of our source of income.

We have a right to truly affordable housing.

Across Westchester County, and the rest of the state, rents are skyrocketing, and the low-rent housing stock is diminishing, leaving tenants few choices if they are priced out of their current rent-regulated apartments.

It's not okay that profit is being put before the people.

As a member of the State Legislature, you are empowered to pass all nine rent-protection bills.

This would be a step in the right direction towards easing the burden far too many New Yorkers face when grappling the housing crisis.

We need you all to sign on to and pass universal rent control in the nine bills.

Housing justice is racial and an economic justice.

We need you to protect and preserve our communities.

If New York State Senate does not pass all nine bills, and ensure universal rent control, then you will be allowing low-income tenants and families to face the same insecurities that I have, and other New York State tenants have as well.

I urge you, and implore you, to be on the right side of history, and stand with over 5 million renters and tenants in seeking housing statewide.

We have your back.

Thank you very much, and may God bless you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

ZELTZYN SANCHEZ GOMEZ: Good morning, everyone.

My name is Zeltzyn Sanchez Gomez.

I am a 20-year-old Port Chester resident, a youth coordinator with Westpac, and a board member of Sustainable Port Chester Alliance, and new CVH (Community Voices Heard) member.

I am here today to testify that gentrification and displacement are not only happening in New York City, but also in Westchester County.

Real estate firms are building and acquiring

properties throughout the Hudson Valley and driving up rents.

In Port Chester, Village government is planning a village-wide rezoning that will pave the way for major development downtown.

Construction of new luxury apartment buildings made possible by this rezoning is likely to both directly displace residents and cause rents in the area to rise, leading to the indirect displacement of many more residents.

I, and many of my peers across the county, fear soon there will be no place for us in Westchester.

We are unable to afford the rent, much less become homeowners, in the towns and villages where we've grown up.

My aunt and uncle have been living in Port Chester for over 20 years; this is their home.

My aunt is a housekeeper, and my uncle, a new U.S. citizen, is in the process of joining a union.

They have four kids together.

The youngest one is graduating from Head-Start.

And the oldest one is going to the middle school, which, in Port Chester, the middle school

is, literally, falling apart, and it's super-overcrowded.

My family and cousins were being kicked out of their home on Grace Church Street, unless they paid a \$500 increase on top of their already high rent.

They've been looking tirelessly for a place to live, and have yet to find anything close to affordable.

The owner now plans to sell the home, and my aunt and uncle and cousins all have to move, regardless.

All of the new housing in Port Chester is unreasonably expensive, and so-called "affordable housing" is not affordable.

We need good-cause eviction so that tenants like my aunt and uncle don't face massive, unconscionable rent increases.

My young cousins need you to step up and sign on so that they are not displaced out of their home.

There are some who say the rent laws are just a New York City issue, but I assure you that we know better in Port Chester.

We need these laws in place now, and will need them even more after the rezoning.

Around 400 apartments in Port Chester are rent-stabilized through the Emergency Tenant Protection Act.

This is not enough.

Units are rapidly being destabilized, and 400 more families are at risk of losing their housing.

I have also personally experienced housing insecurity and complex living situations.

Growing up, my mom, a single mother of two, would struggle to find clean and decent housing for the both of us.

We would live in apartments with two of my aunts, their partners and babies at the time; three families all shoved into a two-bedroom, one-bathroom apartment.

I lived in an attic room while I was in elementary school, with my brother and my mom.

During middle school I lived in a basement on South Regent Street.

Every few months someone would come to inspect the house, and the landlords would force us to leave the house while they covered up any sign of living.

This meant that the kitchen and the bathroom

were covered with giant pieces of wood so it would seem as if no one was really living there.

Our belongings would be stacked up so it looked like the basement was being used for storage.

Now I live with my mom, my brother, his girlfriend, and a two-week old baby.

We have a decent space, but I worry about where I will go when I decide it's time for me to leave my mother's house.

I can't afford a \$3,000 luxury apartment, and buying a house is not an option for me.

I should have the ability to stay and thrive in the community where I grew up in, and I want to continue to contribute to that community.

In the fall of 2018, Community Voices Heard member leaders from across New York State gathered as a member congress and determined that, although wages have stagnated, rents continue to soar.

Working-class families across New York are forced to pay more and more of our income towards rent and mortgages.

Real estate developers prey on opportunities to increase land and housing prices, driving our displacement.

Currently, 88,000 New Yorkers across the

state are homeless. Many of us who pay a mortgage or rent an apartment are just one paycheck away from joining their ranks.

This contributes to an already pervasive attack on working families and the working poor in our neighborhoods, as well as toxic and unsafe living conditions in public and private housing.

These conditions have resulted in making many of our families sick.

Housing is cheaply made and codes are not enforced.

On top of expensive rent and unhealthy conditions, tenants face various forms of harassment, neglect -- and neglect from landlords.

For our members, it is clear that the market, where greedy landlords buy and sell homes for profit, has failed to meet the housing needs of our communities; therefore, we are committed to building power to improve the unacceptable conditions of housing and homelessness we face today.

I am fighting for my community, my family, and myself.

I urge to you sponsor and pass all nine bills in the Housing Justice For All platform.

We need you to stand up and protect tenants.

We need you all to defend and prove and expand rent regulations, and join us in fighting for truly affordable housing.

We are looking to you all, as our leaders in Albany, to stand with tenants and pass all nine bills.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, both.

Appreciate the (indiscernible).

We're going to try to ask people to sort of refrain from reacting to testimony today, just so we can move through and get everybody up here.

Just -- so, both of you are currently living in communities that have the Emergency Tenant Protection Act, and you have some rent regulation in communities.

But it sounds from your testimony like you have a broader problem in your housing market, where evictions are still a big part of the difficulties that tenants experience.

And, so, you're talking about -- you're talking the benefit of adding good-cause eviction, which is one of the bills that -- the nine bills that we're talking about today.

Can you just talk about how, in your -- from your personal experience, or from your experience as organizers and -- and -- and -- and neighbors, how landlords use evictions to increase their profits, and how that affects -- how that affects people that live in your communities?

SOJOURNER SALINAS: Yeah, well -- well, I can say, I personally have been affected by a landlord, where, like I said, I was evicted -- I was evicted.

And I couldn't keep up with -- my income couldn't keep up with the rent.

And because -- like I -- I wasn't familiar with the jargon, like I know now --

So, because I know now what the jargons are and what they mean.

I had no clue what the landlord was doing, and why I couldn't keep up with the rent.

-- and now I see why, because of these vacancy bonuses, and the preferential rate, and the major cap -- major capital improvement, that was happening to me is not fair when you in a low-income bracket.

And when you're -- when the market rate is set at a certain rate, and you're low-income, that's what you're -- you're faced with.

But when a landlord is already being given incentives -- receiving incentives to use this money to build -- to build on that, he's getting extra on top of that by using the vacancy bonus, the IAIs, and the MCIs.

And then, not only that, when you need lease renewals, you sometimes are unprotected from that, because if you can't meet the rent, there's no way that you can even get good just cause because of your -- you can't keep up with it.

So it's really -- it's really -- it puts a -- you're in between a rock and a hard place.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: In your view, the rent-regulation laws are not doing their job of ensuring that apartments that are affordable now kind of remain affordable for the people that --

SOJOURNER SALINAS: They're not -- they're not affordable for any low-income New Yorker in New York State, nonetheless Westchester County, being one of the wealthiest states (sic), first, and then comes New York.

You understand?

So we are at disadvantage when it comes to New Yorkers.

Like I heard the landlord say, we're -- wipe

out, wipe out, RGB.

You know, I know we're not in New York, but that's what we typify. We usually base off everything from New York.

So, how dare you say such a thing.

You literally saying, wipe out the low-income bracket.

That's -- that's an insult.

I'm sitting right in the room, and you got millions of people who are faced with that -- with that notion.

To say something like that is preposterous.

It doesn't make sense.

And for him to babble that on record, it's oblivious.

But, anyway, you know, that's -- that's just what I believe should -- should take account, because this is not just me. This is millions of people across New York State, and Westchester County.

ZELTZYN SANCHEZ GOMEZ: And also -- could you -- can I just talk?

Also, in -- you know, Westchester County is one of the richest counties in all of New York State. Right?

And a lot of the housing that's being made is at Westchester County area median income; not Port Chester area median income, or New Rochelle area median income.

Which means that, someone like

Hillary Clinton could definitely buy an apartment at
a Westchester area median income, but I won't be
able to because I don't make as much money as
Hillary Clinton.

So that's an issue that we've kind of been dealing with.

And, back to your question about the good-cause eviction (indiscernible), it gives tenants the right to renew their lease, depending on what the landlord has, and all of that.

But, something that we've been seeing in

Port Chester, is that a lot of business owners -
Shelley Mayer just had a Latino business-owner

roundtable.

And what I heard from them was that, they've been having their businesses for many years. And they have -- they want to improve, they want to expand, they want to renew. And every time they go to the landlords, the landlords are, like, we don't want to renew with you, because we want to empty out

the building and sell it out to a bigger developer that has money and that's going to do something with the building.

So they're not renewing leases.

And they should have the ability to renew since they've been here for so many years.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

Are the questions or comments from the panel? Senator Mayer.

SENATOR MAYER: Well, I just want to thank you both for coming, and making the story personal, and explaining the differences in our communities.

And as Zeltzyn explained about Port Chester, when you have a community that's really right in the middle of transition, with a lot of, yes, we have ETPA.

But I guess I would ask you specifically, in your experience, in living in different rental housing, was -- did you live in any rent-stabilized housing during that time you described?

ZELTZYN SANCHEZ GOMEZ: No, because we were undocumented, so you're unable to apply because you don't have a Social Security number.

So that's also another issue, of how undocumented people find housing is completely

different.

SENATOR MAYER: Okay, that's a good addition to the conversation.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Harckham.

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just following up on this notion of tax
breaks from last time, we see in New Rochelle and
White Plains and Port Chester, and Peekskill, which
I represent, IDAs, which give, essentially, public
money, or borrowing at public rates, to developers,
to develop, and, generally, they are exceedingly
high-rate apartments.

And you had mentioned that this puts pressure on the other apartments in the area, because those rents are so high.

Could you talk about that a little more?

SOJOURNER SALINAS: Yeah.

Uhm, as we see today, the rents are skyrocketing. We see that everywhere.

We see that, in every neighborhood, there's more gentrification, there's more luxury buildings being put up everywhere, in every city, every village.

There's less in -- there are less buildings

being developed that is -- actually strive for incomes that fit the bracket for the neighborhood.

So in a community where you have, say, like, in Port Chester, in certain areas where there's other a Dominican or Hispanic neighborhood, where the income bracket at a certain level, they're going to put a luxury building in that area, where you know the community is not fit to meet that need.

So they gonna build a luxury building in that area, as opposed to meeting the need of the community.

Right?

So instead of doing that, they rather -- they rather put a luxury building, why? Because it's more profitable to put it there.

So, now, then that pushes out the community, so now you have no more of a community.

So that's why we're in fear -- where the people are in fear, because now the communities are being lost, you don't have a community anymore.

Now you have all these luxury and corporate properties, where the rents for a studio is 3500, 4600, and going up and up and up.

And who can afford that in this time and age, when you have low-income individuals not even making

\$15 an hour, not even making \$10 an hour.

Home health aides, nurses, you got people working in delis; these are all low-income-bracket individuals, and these are the people that we're fighting for.

I'm a low-income individual, you understand.

People on fixed income, disabilities,

veterans, you've got the senior citizens.

So this is the problem.

The developers that -- there's no problem with making a city thrive. Okay?

I was a part of the work -- the Westchester (indiscernible) Thriving Family in Westchester.

We want to make Westchester thrive, but how can you make it thrive when you only building luxury?

That's not diverse.

You need to make a community diverse.

ZELTZYN SANCHEZ GOMEZ: So to also add on to that, I believe that the IDAs have not been really fulfilling what their mission is, which is to, you know, grow our economy, create jobs, create housing, for people.

And they're not really fulfilling that, because they're just giving tax breaks to big

developers to come. And these are multi-billion-dollar developers that are coming in, that should be able to pay that money.

And, you know, what Sustainable Port Chester
Alliance has been doing in Port Chester, is
advocating for community-benefit agreements to be
implemented, and so that the IDA can come up and
say, this is the community-benefit agreement that we
have.

And developers should come to the table and agree to come and build a certain percentage of affordable housing, a certain percentage of space that is used for community cultural, arts, programs, or anything like that.

So, I believe that community-benefit agreements should be included in IDA discussions, and all of that, too.

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

Any other comments or questions from the panel?

Okay.

Again, thank you very much for your testimony.

SOJOURNER SALINAS: Thank you.

ZELTZYN SANCHEZ GOMEZ: Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next up we are going to have Commissioner RuthAnne Visnauskas of New York State Homes and Community Renewal.

Very happy to have the Commissioner with us today. And I think, perhaps, some of her staff may be joining.

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Good morning.

I was going to read some testimony, and then I'm happy to take some questions?

Great, thanks.

Good morning, everyone -- or, good afternoon,

I don't know what time it is.

Senator Kavanagh and members of the

Committee, I'm pleased to be here with you today on

the last of five hearings that you and the Committee

are holding on this topic.

And I want to say I'm very grateful for your dedication and your interest in offering as many people as possible; tenants, advocates, building owners, all like, the opportunity to testify about this critical issue.

It obviously sends a strong message that we're ready to work together to strengthen our rent laws, which are already among the strongest in the

nation.

In communities across the state, rental housing that is of good quality and affordable is in very short supply, and depending on the region, the factors that contribute to that shortage vary.

That is the reason, in part, that we launched our \$20 billion, 5-year, 100,000-unit housing plan.

The plan is meant to spur the production of new affordable rental and home-ownership housing across the state, and to preserve the existing stock that has served the state for decades, but which is in -- oftentimes, in need of investment, upgrade, and repair.

Our programs are tailored to serve renters and homeowners and municipalities, both large and small, rural and urban.

They finance new construction as well as preservation.

They serve families and seniors and veterans and those with special needs. Sometimes they serve all of those populations in one building.

And they cover manufactured-home parks, and municipalities that are struggling with zombie properties, and small towns that want to revitalize their downtowns.

It's an ambitious and comprehensive plan, and as you can see from our reports to you each July, we are proud to be on target after two full years of production, deploying our resources in all corners of the state.

We also know the production of affordable housing is not the only need or the only tool.

We have consistently sought and fought for more, including funding for foreclosure counseling, the creation of land banks, and, passing source-of-income legislation with the Legislature this past March, a tool to allow those who are seeking housing to be protected from discrimination.

And last, but not least, we are less than a month away from the expiration of the rent laws that govern New York City, Rockland, Nassau, and Westchester counties.

I believe that, now, more than ever, we have a better than ever opportunity to pass strengthened rent laws that will ensure that tenants have the right and a fair chance to stay in their homes, and that the homes that they will rent are those that they desire and that they can afford.

At HCR, we look forward to working with you to arrive at a set of comprehensive and workable

reforms that will strengthen tenants' rights, and allow for continued existence of good quality, affordable housing across the state.

As you've heard me say in the past,

Governor Cuomo has spent his entire adult life

fighting to increase access to affordable housing

and homelessness, and protect New Yorkers' rights,

including creation of the state's first

tenant-protection unit.

On rent regulation, he has raised the deregulation threshold twice, limited the frequency and extent of the vacancy bonus, and increased civil penalties for those who break or skirt the anti-harassment law.

What is more, he spearheaded the creation of the tenant-protection unit which has reregulated over 75,000 units since its creation.

Each time that the laws have come up for renewal under the Governor's leadership, they have been strengthened in favor of tenants, and 2019 will be no different.

In New York City, which is where the majority of rent-registered apartments currently exist, there are 912,045 apartments registered as subject to rent stabilization at the end of 2016.

These apartments house almost 2 1/2 million tenants.

Who lives in these apartments?

Rent-stabilized tenants are more likely to be female, Hispanic or Black, or foreign-born.

More than 60 percent of households living in rent-stabilized units are low or moderate income.

That translates to about 600,000 households in New York, and their median household income was about \$44,560 in 2016.

That's some \$22,000 less than renters in private, non-regulated stock, and half the median income of homeowners.

Why do we need this stock?

Because rents continue to outpace incomes.

According to the U.S. census data, since 2007, the median rent in New York City, adjusted for inflation, has increased by 18 percent, while the median inflation-adjusted income for renter households has only increased by 6 percent, leaving many New Yorkers struggling to afford ever-increasing housing costs.

While we have successfully advocated for legislation to protect tenants, it is clear that there is more work to do.

We are fully committed to working with you and the tenant and landlord communities to strengthen protections to rent-burdened tenants, while also balancing needs in upstate communities and encouraging private investment in the housing stock.

You've heard the Governor talk publicly about rent reform many times, and he consistently commits to eliminate vacancy decontrol, to limit rent creases -- limit rent increases for building and apartment improvements, to make the preferential rent operate as the legal rent for the life of the tenancy, and to ensure that landlords aren't rewarded financially for schemes to force tenants out.

Taking these steps as part of the broader rent reform will stop the exit of units from this system; reduce the speed at which rent-regulated rents are rising; remove incentives that reward tenant turnover, that may result in harassment; and ensure that owners are still able to maintain the quality of their properties through investment.

I've worked in this sector for a long time, and I've traveled a lot in this very diverse state.

And no matter how many groundbreakings

I attend, or ribbons I cut, or tenants that I meet, the shortage of quality, affordable rental housing persists everywhere.

We know that the security and sense of belonging that a home provides is invaluable and irreplaceable.

But for those who are rent-burdened on a limited income have fallen into homelessness, for whichever of the reasons that exist, whose neighborhoods have endured disinvestment or displacement, "home" takes on a very different meaning.

Rather than convey a sense of stability, it becomes a source of stress, living in substantial conditions, skipping meals or medication in order to afford the rent, is no way to live, and yet we know that many do.

It is these people, our fellow New Yorkers, for whom we seek to provide a stronger set of protections, and I believe that we can do this.

We remain committed to serving the people of New York as we administer the state rent laws, and hope to continue the track record set by this administration to continue the fair expansion of rent regulations to protect tenants and keep homes

affordable for New Yorkers.

Thank you, and I'm happy to take questions.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you very much.

And thank you for joining us today.

Just to begin, you said that New York has the strongest -- some of the strongest rent laws and tenant-protection laws in the country.

Do you -- is that -- do -- is that a statement about the laws generally throughout the state, or -- or do you think that's particular to the rent -- the sort of rent-stabilization system?

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: I think we are -- we benefit from having rent stabilization, which, obviously, not all states do.

And I think we are now sort of on a precipice to make those even stronger than they've been in the past -- since their inception, perhaps.

And I think other things, like source of income, which, granted, we're not first in nation on source of income, but adding to our sort of stable of laws, I think.

And there are other conversations, I think, being had around manufactured-home parks, and sort of other places where there are needs.

But I think that the consistency is that

there's sort of a goal around making sure that, as 1 2 New York, as the economy grows, that everyone has an opportunity to benefit of that, and part of that is 3 making sure they have stable and affordable housing. 4 5 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. So just -- and focusing on the rent-stabilization system, you 6 7 talked about how actual, you know, inflation-adjusted rents have gone up more rapidly 8 than inflation-adjusted income, by a quite 9 substantial margin. 10 11 That's -- that -- that is true for the 12 rent-regulated stock, as well as for the broader 13 stock; right? 14 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: I believe so, but 15 my data on here is about the rent-regulated stock. 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: It's the overall -- the 17 overall. 18 And in New York City, at least, roughly, half of the stock is rent-regulated? 19 20 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Yes, almost 21 a million apartments. 22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Right. 23

So -- and you mentioned a few areas where the

24

25

Governor has come out, and I'm not going to ask you to, you know, get out ahead of the Governor here

today.

But, can you talk about -- you -- you -- you -- you -- you -- you talked about removing the deregulation provisions, and setting the preferential rent for the duration of the tenancy, and you talked more vaguely about the restrict -- about limiting IAI and MCIs.

Can you talk a little bit about why that -- why the current law needs to be changed in such a way that it would be limited?

Why -- why are -- why are the current restrictions on MCIs and IAIs not sufficient to achieve the goals of the rent-regulated system?

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Uh, yes, I'm happy to talk about that.

We certainly believe that all the aspects of the law should be looked at sort of together, and comprehensively as a package, because there's a fair amount of interplay between the different parts.

But I think what you have -- I have watched much of the testimony from your other hearings, and so you have sort of heard this consistently, and I certainly hear it when I meet with stakeholders, as I'm sure you do too, and constituents, that the MCIs and IAIs are causing a burden for many

renters in New York City.

And, so, I think you sort of have to take them separately.

But I think, on IAIs, is you sort of are all -- are familiar, IAIs happen in two ways:

They happen in place for tenants who -- who approve the actual IAI. And it is not processed unless the tenant agrees to it.

But then they also happen on turnover, and those are not regulated by HCR. They are submitted by the landlord. And unless it -- in the context of an overcharge, we don't review those.

So I think that there is a strong feeling that IAIs are causing a lot of the units to come out of system, because they are, somewhat, unchecked.

So I think you probably heard that a lot from people who have come and testified.

So I think that's on the IAI side of that question.

I think, for MCIs, the increases that many tenants are -- feel -- or, that they receive as a result of MCIs are too big for them to accommodate.

And so I think there's sort of a discussion

that everyone is having right now about, sort of, how to lessen the burden of MCIs on tenants.

So I think that's the -- that's sort of the driver that you hear.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And I think this hap -- we had the conversation with some landlords, landlord representatives, earlier. I think it was before you arrived.

But, on the IAIs, the current rate at which the dollars invested in an IAI are recouped is very rapid, even compared to MCI.

So, 1/40th for buildings under 35 units, and 1/60th for larger buildings; meaning, that in a smaller building, the landlord recoups the entire value of the invested, assuming they can collect the legal rent, in three and a third years.

We've done some math, and estimate that to be, roughly, a 21 percent return on their investment, assuming -- again, assuming they can collect the full legal rent.

Do -- beyond the fact -- and you discussed the very important question, of whether that could be properly regulated and overseen, and you're not currently really overseeing them, at least prior to the work being done.

But is it -- does it -- does it appear to you that the incentives to do IAIs are too -- are more generous than are necessary to incentivize landlords to invest in their buildings?

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: I think that there certainly is a lot of discussion about extending out the amortization period, which is the -- what you spoke about, the 1/40th, which seems like a good part of the discussion.

As I said, they are -- we get about -I didn't say this, but we receive about 14,000

IAIs in the system as registered each year, but
only review them in the context of an overcharge for an incoming tenant.

So I think, to the extent which -- that the structure of the IAI itself is lengthened, you might see less of them, but I don't think we know until we change the laws.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And just going back to the -- and I'll make this my final question -- but going back to the question of the housing stock beyond the rent-regulated stock, and, of course, that includes units within the ETPA region, as well as around the rest of the state, you know, there are about -- I think about 6 million rental units in the

state, a little over a million of them currently rent-regulated.

Do we -- and you -- you were -- as you note, your agency does a lot of work to renovate, and to invest in new housing, and rehabilitation, all over the state, and perhaps a subject for another hearing, but, you know, there's certainly been a great deal of effort in that area.

Do we have a crisis in lower-income neighborhoods, that is -- that extends to communities across the state, as we heard?

Do you agree with that assessment?

And -- and -- do we need additional protections beyond what the rent regulations offer?

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: It's a very complex question, and I think probably the answer depends a little bit on where around the state you are, and what's sort of the -- the particulars of that neighborhood look like.

I can certainly say that, certainly, there are many towns and cities upstate that have suffered from a down economy. Right?

There's many cities that were built for twice the number of people that live there. So there's this sort of a fair amount of disinvestment that has

happened over time.

So, as you nicely say it, we have worked for the last two years, and will continue through the course of the housing plan, to make sure we are investing in communities around the state, to make sure that, as their economies grow, there is affordable housing, both new construction and preservation.

I think, oftentimes, upstate people talk a lot, and what -- certainly what I hear from people, is that they talk more about quality.

And so that there's sort of a real need to make sure there is investment into the housing stock, so that the, sort of, basic quality standards can be brought up to a level.

It's not exactly an area that we sort of have governance over, but it is certainly something that I hear a lot as I travel around the state.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Is eviction itself -- a frequent eviction (indiscernible)?

We have cities that -- where the stats suggest it's a very high rate of turnover, of involuntarily moving from one place to another.

I mean, is that -- is that a -- obviously, that's an effect of people's incomes not keeping up

with the rents, with at least the rents that landlords are desiring to charge them, and maybe effective landlords pushing people out for other reasons.

Is that, in your view, a cause for concern, as well a cause of poverty, a cause of people having difficulty living the lives you were talking about that come from a stable home?

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: We are very focused on ensuring that as many people can live stably and affordably in the state of New York with the tools that we have.

And, certainly, I think everyone would agree that, whether it's getting evicted and moving multiple times, whether it's getting evicted and being in a homeless shelter, that's sort of cycling in and out of housing, moving children in and out of different school districts, you know, certainly, is not the type of housing that we want people to be able to have access to around the state.

Right?

We really want people to be able to live stably in addition to being able to live affordably.

So that's very important to us.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So I'm going to give

1 someone else on the panel an opportunity to jump in. Questions for the Commissioner? 2 3 SENATOR HARCKHAM: Yeah, thank you. And good to see you again. 4 5 Thank you. Earlier we had a discussion about the loss of 6 7 ETPA apartments here in Westchester. During the period of the federal housing 8 settlement, I was on the county board. 9 We spent well in excess of \$60 million to 10 11 build 800 units. There were millions of dollars of 12 State money contributed as well. 13 And at the same time, we lost 1,000 units of 14 ETPA housing. 15

So, we weren't even keeping pace.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what are we collectively, as government and as an economy and as a housing market, doing wrong, that we're spending tens of millions of dollars to subsidize affordable housing, and we're losing ground?

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: I mean, I think that there's sort of two pieces to that. Right?

One is, from our perspective of our housing plan, we are working as best we can around the state to make sure that we are both building new housing

and preserving existing housing through our financial tools.

But the other part of that is, you know, as we are sort of here talking about today, is sort of strengthening the laws, to try and retain units in the stock, and so that they aren't exiting at a pace that is so fast, if that pace is, in fact, a result of, sort of, the system being too generous.

So, we have to be vigilant, I think, on both of those sides.

SENATOR HARCKHAM: We -- we've heard some testimony about finding a responsible middle ground in this discussion, between the right to prevent tenants from evictions and from unaffordable increases that they have no say or control in, versus a landlord saying that they need to be able to reinvest in their buildings.

To your mind, and to the administration's mind, what is that responsible middle ground?

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: I think that much of the discussion that you have sort of heard from folks, and that is in the conversation already now, is sort of taking all of the tools that are in the existing law and reforming them all, or pulling them all back, to sort of de-escalate the loss of units.

1 So I think that's sort of the primary focus of the strengthening of the laws. And, obviously, 2 3 we all hope that that will then, you know, reverberate, and that we'll see less units exiting, 4 5 and rents staying down. 6 SENATOR HARCKHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 7 Thank you. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Leader Stewart-Cousins. 8 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Thank you so 9 much. 10 11 Thank you so much, Commissioner. 12 Thank you for being here in my wonderful 13 district. 14 I know that Senator Kavanagh said that he 15 didn't want to have you get in front of the 16 Governor. 17 I don't necessarily want you to do that, but, you know, people are talking about all nine 18 19 components of a package that -- that, you know, many 20 tenants feel will change their lives for the better. 21 Is there any part of this package that you 22 feel, you know, in terms of a statewide perspective, 23 would be something, you know, must do, shouldn't do?

Is there any piece of it that you feel is,

24

25

say, unworkable?

1 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: I mean, as 2 I said, we are very --Thank you for the question. 3 -- we're very supportive of a comprehensive 4 look at sort of -- as it relates to sort of the rent 5 loss, specifically, at looking at all those -- the 6 7 various pieces. We talk about the main ones; vacancy 8 9 decontrol, preferential rents. 10 There are also a lot of other, sort of, 11 smaller provisions that impact people. So I think, you know, we are -- there's much 12 13 discussion going on about the entirety, sort of, of 14 the rent laws. 15 And so we are clearly very in support of 16 significant and real change and reform across that. 17 I think maybe the other two things you might alluding to, which are the big, sort of, discussion 18 19 points --20 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Right. 21 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: -- are, expansion 22 of the ETPA and --23 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: And "good cause." 24 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: The good-cause 25 eviction.

So, I think that we have spent a lot of time thinking about those, and talking about those, and they are important, and they certainly support, notionally, of having stronger protection for tenants, and allowing people to rent stably -- to live stably in their communities that they call "home."

I think for, good-cause eviction, I think that -- I think for both of them, that I would say that the communities upstate are diverse also, and they are different from New York City.

And so I think, as we think about all those, we always want to make sure that there aren't any unintended consequences of a law, and also that the law is actually getting at the thing that we're trying to address.

So, I think that we are, you know, in discussions with folks on those, and I think they are very important. And we're trying to balance, to make sure that there's sort of the right medicine for the symptoms, so to speak, and that we're getting at, really, sort of the underlying, foundational issues, whether it be around eviction, or -- you know, or whatever the issue, that they address those.

But, you know, we are sort of thick in the conversation, and happy to be there.

MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Good.

The other thing, and, again, this is just something that I put out there, and I'm hoping we could do, Mitchell-Lama were -- you know, we all know Mitchell-Lama, and there were state legislators back in the day.

And I am wondering if there will be some point, I would certainly hope so, that we could again, as a state, advance a conversation that actually puts in place some mechanism, where there -- you know, there are opportunities for low-, poor, moderate-income people to have some kind sustained understanding that -- that -- that we are committed to housing everyone.

And so I'm just putting that out there.

I think that we're trying to play catch-up.

We're trying to, you know, stop bad things.

Obviously, all of us want to make sure that the investment in housing stock of all levels continue.

But we do seem to be losing ground, in terms of creating, or, potentially creating, the opportunity to make sure that we are housing all of

New York.

So I'm hoping that we can work together to try and get to some -- some -- some modern-day

Mitchell-Lama.

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Yeah, we would love that.

We -- people are very affectionate about

Mitchell-Lamas in a way that I think is wonderful as
a housing stock. People are very attached to it.

And we have been working very hard to preserve every Mitchell-Lama that's in our portfolio, to make sure that it doesn't just serve the generations of the past, but that it also serves the generations of the future.

And are happy to -- we have about 8500 Mitchell-Lama apartments that we've been working our way through our pipeline, and we're just about done with that, sort of, older stock.

I guess what I would say is, you know, we were so thrilled with the Legislature, to be able to get funding for our housing plan two years ago.

And it takes 18 months, 2 years, to build a building.

And so I think many people can sort of see
the fruits on the new-construction side of a lot of

those efforts. 1 2 But it is certainly my -- fills in my hopes and dreams that, sort of, going forward, as those 3 units continue --4 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: And I don't want 5 6 it to be a Mitchell-Lama. I want it to be whatever the --7 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Yes --8 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: -- current 9 configuration --10 11 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: -- version of 12 that is. 13 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: -- yes, yes, of 14 the Senate, the Assembly, and as well as the 15 Governor, creating some sort of new program that 16 meets the needs of today. 17 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Absolutely. MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Because, I'm 18 19 sure, you know, when that was created all those many 20 years ago, their housing situation was no more dire 21 than ours are today. COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Agree, agree. 22 23 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Thank you. 24 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

25

Senator Myrie.

2 SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you.

Thank you, Commissioner, for your testimony.

I just have a couple of questions, and one is more of a comment.

We've heard a lot of testimony around MCIs and IAIs, and particularly from property owners that, as you know, there are a full range of proposals that range from, eliminating them in their entirety, to reforming them.

We've heard that, touching them at all, would wreak havoc on the economics of investing and maintaining property.

And I just -- I know that you have expressed that you and the administration are in support of some sort of reform here.

And I just wanted to -- I'm wondering if you can just speak to whether or not reform of MCIs and IAIs will, in fact, lead to this cataclysmic disinvestment?

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Well, I can't see into the future, but I would say that, what I think is important, as it relates to MCIs, is that, you know, of the 40,000 buildings and the million apartments that are owned -- that are operated in

New York City under the rent-stabilization system, they are operated by private landlords.

And so I think what we want to make sure is that, landlords will still invest in boilers and roofs and, you know, the major capital elements, sort of, the buildings.

I think that, you know, as the Governor has said, and I have echoed, I think we need to reform the existing system.

But I think we do want to make sure that people invest in buildings because, when they don't, you know, obviously, that the tenants are the first people who bear the brunt of a boiler that goes out all the time.

So I think it's important to us, to make sure that -- that those landlords are still allowed to make investments in their building, but I think we all agree that some of that -- that the system itself could be reformed.

SENATOR MYRIE: Okay.

And my second question is related.

Part of the impetus for us to reform these, or change them, has been the fraud and abuse that we've seen.

Some of this has been made very public, and

some of it is, I think, more everyday, and a lot of things that people don't see.

And in these discussions, we have brought up the possibility of strengthening HCR's ability to root out this fraud and to root out this abuse.

And I'm wondering if you could speak to whether or not you think you currently have the capacity to attack abuses?

And if you do not, what we could do to help put HCR in the position to do so.

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: I would say two things.

The tenant-protection unit, which is a very mean, lean machine of staff, has brought back
76,000 units into the system, units that should not have left the system; that they investigate and bring them back.

So I think, in 2018 alone, we brought back about 11,000 units into the system.

But I would -- I would also say that we were extremely thankful to get 95 new FTEs into ORA as of the budget last year.

That is more new staff than we have had in

ORA since the early 1990s.

So, we were incredibly thankful to be able to get that.

We will have, probably, half of those staff on-site and on-boarded probably within the next 60 days.

We are actively recruiting now, but you have to go, sort of, through the civil-service system.

But our -- you know, it would be amazing for us to have over half of the 95 in place -- the budget was April, so, April, May -- so, three-ish months after the approval. And we are working very hard to keep that pace going.

And so I think that will go a long way to strengthening ORA's work, to actually be, not only sort of backup to some historic levels, but to really have an infusion of new staff into the -- into the office will go great lengths.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Just one follow-up question.

You -- so you've mentioned a couple of times that the tenant-protection unit, by its -- and that's a specialized unit that reviews, sort of, systemically reviews large -- typically, larger landlords for -- that appear to be misbehaving in

some way, and kind of -- and tries to address the situation.

And the result of that work is 94,000 units have been added back into the system that had been previously improperly deregulated.

I mean, can we -- that's almost 10 percent of the system.

I mean, can we -- would it be fair to conclude from that, that there are at least -- there are a substantial number of landlords, of a good scale, that, when given the opportunity to -- for lack of a better word, to cheat, to remove units from the system contrary to the rules, that will -- we'll do that on a systemic basis?

Isn't that an indicator that there's something really broken about the way landlords have approached this system to date?

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: I think that -- I'll say a couple of things.

Just to correct the -- it's about 75 -- a little over 75,000 units, not 95,000 units, but, just to be on the record.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: My short-term memory must be --

COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: That's okay.

I think that the -- obviously, that the tenant-protection unit does sort of an incredible amount of very, very important work in bringing those units back.

It can often be units that -- and I -- sorry.

And I guess I would address, I don't know the statistics, as to whether or not those are largely from larger landlords versus smaller landlords.

But I guess what I would say is that, there are not enough -- there -- one could argue that, perhaps, there are not enough penalties in the system for not following the law, and that there need to be some less opportunities for that to happen.

And I think those are probably two of the guiding principles people are looking at as we look at the rent laws together, is how to, sort of, reduce the number of opportunities for people to take advantage of the system.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: But a substantial willing -- putting aside whether it's larger landlords or smaller landlords, (indiscernible) it's a substantial willingness to -- to put it nicely, decline to comply with the law, unless there's somebody properly policing the system?

1 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Yes, so for someone who does not, you know, register their unit 2 3 with us, there is not a penalty for not registering. So, you know, there are not enough, sort of, 4 5 safeguards probably built in to make sure that 6 people do follow the rules. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And those -- and those penalties were -- there -- in a previous -- there 8 9 were previously penalties in place, and those were repealed during the course of earlier renewal 10 11 efforts to the law, as I understand, I mean, some 12 years ago? 13 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: I think it was --14 I think it's been quite some time --15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: In the '90s --16 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: -- since there 17 were --18 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- right. 19 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: -- penalties in 20 place for not following the law. 21 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 22 I have no further questions. 23 Any other questions or comments? 24 SENATOR HARCKHAM: Just a quick follow-up. 25 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Harckham.

1 SENATOR HARCKHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm -- getting back to the number of units 2 that have been recovered into the system --3 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Uh-huh? 4 5 SENATOR HARCKHAM: -- do you know how many of those were in Westchester? 6 7 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Of the 76,000, I don't. But we could get back to you with that 8 9 number. 10 SENATOR HARCKHAM: That would be great. 11 Thank you. 12 Thank you. 13 COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: You're welcome. 14 SENATOR KAVANAGH: If there is nothing 15 further on the panel, thank you so much for joining 16 us on the panel here in Greenburgh today. COMM. RUTHANNE VISNAUSKAS: Thank you. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next up we're going to 18 have Ava Farkas, the executive director of Met 19 20 Council on Housing, and, Reverend Joya Colon-Berezin 21 of Scarsdale Congressional Church, if she's here. REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: She just stepped 22 23 out. 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Reverend, why don't you 25 come up, and we'll see if somebody can find Ava.

So if you're -- yeah, if you're prepared, why 1 don't you go ahead, and we'll bring Ava Farkas up. 2 Somebody -- I think some of my staff is 3 looking for her now. 4 REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: All right. 5 6 Thank you. 7 Good morning, Senator Kavanagh. And thank you to the members of the 8 9 Committee. My name is Reverend Joya Colon-Berezin, and 10 11 I'm a minister at the Scarsdale Congressional Church 12 in Scarsdale, New York. 13 I'm here today in support of universal rent control for all New Yorkers. 14 15 I'm here today because my faith compels me to 16 be here. It calls me to stand with those who are 17 the most vulnerable and have the least protections. 18 I'm here today to fight for those whose backs are against the wall, whose voices have been 19 20 silenced. 21 And, this may actually be shocking to some, 22 but one of these vulnerable populations today are the low- and middle-income tenants of 23 Westchester County. 24

I myself am a tenant. I am a voter and a

taxpayer.

I moved to White Plains about two years ago and went through the process myself of looking for an affordable place to live.

Between my spouse and I, between the two of us, we do have a high enough income, we have high enough credit, we have light enough skin, to be able to secure suitable housing; yet, I'm all too aware that many in this same immediate area have not been that fortunate, including a staff member of my congregation.

In December of last year, one of our staff members was displaced from his rent-stabilized apartment in Yonkers due to a fire, no fault of his own.

Nonetheless, he was placed by DSS (the department of social services) in a shelter for four months.

During that time he received a loud and clear message that he could no longer afford to live in Westchester.

He was able to pay as much as 1500 a month in rent.

He searched for four months, and could not find a two-bedroom apartment that was suitable for

himself and his disabled father.

"Being priced out" is not a figure of speech.

It is a growing and literal reality.

And to respectfully disagree with a comment made earlier by a landlord advocate, indeed, the sky is falling for tenants in Westchester.

After four months of searching, he was forced to take an apartment in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

The worst part is that he was not alone.

Many of the others that he met in the shelter system were in a very similar situation, and many are continuing to live in the shelter, unable to afford the rents here in Westchester.

To you all, and our other representatives, now is the time to pass universal rent control for all New Yorkers.

Now is the time to expand renters' rights and protect tenants.

Now is the time to pass good-cause eviction legislation to bring renters' rights to all unregulated tenants, including those in smaller buildings, with six units and under, who have, as of yet, been not part of any kind of rent protections.

This crisis is not some distant future reality; it's our present reality.

We've waited too long. These fights have been going on for decades.

And it's now time for our elected officials to act boldly.

And I will close with this:

In 2006, I was living and working in New York
City, and I came up to White Plains with a
delegation of community organizers on Election Day
to campaign for a promising, progressive candidate
that was challenging the Republican incumbent.

A group of us spent all day making sure that Andrea Stewart-Cousins would win this Senate seat, because we believed that, someday, she would be our voice, not only a voice here locally in this district, but a voice for the entire state; a voice for working families and the most vulnerable among us, to demand that all New Yorkers get to call this place "home."

I pray that day has come.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Ava.

AVA FARKAS: Good morning.

My name is Ava Farkas, and I'm the executive director of the Met Council on Housing.

We represent 900 dues-paying members

throughout New York City, and we help 4,000 tenants a year through our telephone hotline and walk-in clinic.

Our members are taxi drivers, school aides, social workers, and artists. They are college students who are new to the city, and retirees who have lived there their whole life.

They are all able to call New York City
"home" because they live in a rent-stabilized or
rent-controlled apartment.

For the past 60 years, our members have fought to preserve, strengthen, and expand rent regulation as the best means to keep rents affordable and the private housing market in check.

This fight is so important to our members, that they took time off work to travel to Albany two weeks ago to rally with 2,000 tenants statewide.

And they have given their weekends to canvas in strategic districts, going door to door, to sign petitions and educate other tenants.

I began at Met Council four years ago during the last rent-law renewal, and despite

Governor Cuomo's public statements in favor of many of our reforms, in the end, he negotiated a deal that continued the status quo.

So I totally disagree with the commissioner's characterization that the Governor has consistently passed the strongest and most pro-tenant legislation.

Since that time, four years ago, dozens of New York City neighborhoods have been rezoned, including mine.

Inwood and Washington Heights is a neighborhood that has the highest amount of rent-regulated apartments, and it's also the home of a vibrant working-class Dominican immigrant community. It's one of the last affordable neighborhoods of city.

Since the rezoning has passed, we already see corporate landlords, like Barberry Rose, buying up 32 building portfolios, and systematically evicting tenants through non-primary-residence cases, and rehabbing buildings through individual apartment improvements and major capital improvements; all of this a part of the playbook to maximize profits by exploiting the loopholes in the rent laws.

For my neighborhoods, strengthening rent regulation will be the only lifeline for the working-class community.

Senators of the Housing Committee, in the

next three weeks, you have the chance to make
history by righting the wrongs of 22 years of bad
neoliberal economic policy by passing the nine-bill
platform we call "universal rent control."

The dismantling of rent regulation, which began in the 1990s, has wreaked havoc on our cities and suburbs, and made our communities less secure and stable.

Rents have risen, while wages have not.

I want to highlight a number of the bills of the nine-point platform that we really need you to go to the mat for, because we're concerned that they will be heavy political lifts.

The first, S2591, the bill sponsored by Senator Stewart-Cousins, will repeal vacancy decontrol and re-regulate deregulated apartments.

While there appears to be consensus, even from the RSA, that this will pass, we are concerned about the re-regulation of the lost units.

We want to stress that, for our members, this is a priority.

Rent regulation is a complaint- and tenant-driven system. It only works when tenants stand up for their rights, and they are more effective when they fight as a group.

In many buildings where we organize, and in gentrifying communities across the city, we find that there is a group of regulated tenants and unregulated tenants.

The power of collective action is weakened when there's a segment of tenants that have second-class rights, and everyone is harmed as a result.

We've heard the argument made, Why do we need to protect tenants who can afford to pay \$5,000 rent?

The real question is, Why do we need to protect landlords who are charging \$5,000 rent?

As we hear on our hotline every day, often, these deregulated units are being split by roommates, three to four students or young people. They can only afford such a high rent by splitting it multiple ways.

Re-regulating lost units would be hugely transformative to New York City and the suburbs.

We urge you to be uncompromising on this issue.

A second bill I want to highlight is relief for rent-controlled tenants.

A large percentage of our members are

seniors, and many of them are rent-controlled.

If they worked for the City, they have a pension that is higher than the SCRIE cut-off, but they are by no means well-off.

Burdening them with a 7.5 percent increase is unconscionable, and means that, oftentimes, their rents are way higher than their rent-regulated neighbors.

Bringing relief and fairness to
40,000 households that are mainly seniors should
be a no-brainer for the New York State Senate.

In closing:

I urge the New York State Senate to work directly with the Assembly to pass the nine-bill package as-is, and put the bills on Governor Cuomo's desk.

Allowing Cuomo to be part of negotiations will be a big mistake and will result in a watered-down package.

He was not a friend to tenants four years ago, and he is not a friend to us now.

In November, tenants helped vote in a democratic State Senate.

We are counting on you to vote with tenants on June 15th.

1 Thank you both for your testimony.

Reverend Colon, is it?

REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: Sure.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I wasn't sure how to -- whether to use the --

REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: Just call me Joya.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'll call you Joya.

Reverend Joya.

The -- can you just talk a little bit more about how -- so you -- you -- repre -- you come from a community that has rent regulation through ETPA.

And, as you note, come from a part of our state that many people view as a wealthier part of the -- wealthier part of the state.

You know, to the extent that sometimes folks tell us that, you know, everything is fine in some communities.

I think some of the communities in this area are often cited as -- as -- you know, not -- and I think even the testimony from one of our landlord representatives earlier, was to suggest this is not -- this is not New York City, so we don't need the kind of protections that we're here to talk about today.

Can you just talk about, from your

experience, how widespread is housing instability and security in -- in -- in the community -- in the communities that -- that -- that you come from?

REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: So I serve a congregation that's in Scarsdale, New York, which is the Beverly Hills of the East Coast. It's an incredibly affluent community.

And most of my congregation are homeowners, and they are not affected by any of this, any of these legislative changes.

That is not representative of

Westchester County, where you have hundred -- like,

tens of thousands of tenants that are deeply

impacted by these kind of legislative protections.

And, you know, I think that, as -- as -- as legislators, as elected officials, it's your job to look to those populations, that are the ones that need advocacy and the ones that need a voice.

I worked for many years as a organizer in

New York City, where most of the -- many -- many

more people were impacted by these rent-regulation

issues.

And so that's why, if you had this hearing in New York City, there would be a lot more people,

I think, filling these -- these seats.

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Well, that's not hypothetical, because we did, in fact, have a hearing in Brooklyn, and it lasted for eight hours. And we had to be kind of kicked out of the building in order to get to us leave.

But we did hear from a great many people there.

REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: Yeah, so I think --I mean, I'm here speaking on the moral issues, and the moral issue is, that there is a definite right and wrong when it comes to tenant protections.

And doing the right thing means protecting tenants.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And I just want to observe, I really appreciate you bringing up the rent-control issue, which is a very important issue, because, numerically, not as -- you know, there are about 22,000 or so rent-controlled units, and about a million rent-stabilized units.

But it is -- it is one -- it is an agenda item that we often don't -- haven't been, kind of, in the foreground during these hearings. But it is -- it's important to remember that that is also something that we are looking into.

So I think I'll end there.

If my colleagues have questions or comments?

MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Well, I just wanted to certainly say, thank you, for your efforts on my behalf back in the day, and thank you for representing my district now, because I have Scarsdale as well, I'm sure you know.

And the one thing that I say, the reality is, that -- well, the district is gerrymandered, but, there is no place in my district that affordable housing is not an issue.

And even in Scarsdale, where the homeowners' children can't necessarily live there, or, the seniors are trying to figure out, you know, once they become empty-nesters, where do they go?

So the reality is, is that the affordable-housing issue is happening everywhere, it's just on different levels, obviously. You know, it's not -- not the same intensity.

But, I think about -- I think about everybody, and nobody, you know, wants to leave their -- their community.

And so I just want to take the moment to thank you, and to tell you that I think your efforts were well-placed, obviously, because we are in a position of having, not only as the majority been

able to do a lot of important things, we will 1 continue to do a lot of important things, and give 2 voice to those who count on government to do the 3 right thing. 4 5 So, thank you. 6 REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: I guess 7 (inaudible) --8 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Go ahead. REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: -- I suppose my 9 10 point was, that, you know, it's not -- it's not a 11 false idea that Westchester -- that many affluent 12 homeowners reside in Westchester. That's a reality. 13 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: No, that's real. REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: Yeah. 14 15 And, yet --16 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: But I like to 17 tell people that -- that, you know, everybody's --18 everybody's thinking about this. 19 And so it's incumbent upon us to be clear 20 that it's an issue --REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: Exactly. 21 22 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: -- for everybody. 23 REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: Even though that exists, people have a tendency to let that reality 24

cloud many of the other realities that also exist

1 here --MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Exactly. 2 REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: -- which is that 3 there are a lot of poor and low-income people that 4 are being displaced. 5 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: I know. 6 REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: And so I thank you 7 for being a voice for us. 8 And we believed in you back then, and we 9 10 still believe in you now. 11 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Well, thank you. 12 REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: And we'll be 13 praying for you. MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: You I believe in 14 15 you too. 16 We -- we -- I think -- I think we are 17 embarking on, you know, something. 18 Like you said, this has been going for over 19 two decades. 20 And, you know, we're at this -- this moment, 21 where we obviously understand that it is an 22 important space for us to occupy, and we want to do 23 it right. 24 So, thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

REV. JOYA COLON-BEREZIN: Thank you. 1 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next up, do we have 2 Christopher Schweitzer here? 3 And, also, Tamara Stewart, if she's here. 4 5 Great. Thank you. 6 CHRISTOPHER SCHWEITZER: Thank you. Good afternoon. 7 My name is Christopher Schweitzer. I'm a 8 9 supervising attorney of housing in the Yonkers 10 office of Legal Services of the Hudson Valley. 11 I've spent the last several years 12 representing tenants who cannot afford an attorney 13 in landlord-tenant court, trying to prevent 14 evictions. 15 In response to the request of the 16 Committee on Social Services, Legal Services submits 17 the following information on how the proposed resolutions will affect Westchester residents facing 18 19 eviction: 20 Legal Services of the Hudson Valley has four 21 offices in Westchester County. In these offices we have 19 attorneys who 22 23 represent Westchester residents in housing court;

11 who solely practice in housing, 11 who -- or,

8 who serve special populations, including the

24

elderly, veterans, and people with mental disabilities.

These attorneys cover the city's five city courts and 37 town and village courts.

Under current law, most tenants can be evicted even if they have done nothing wrong and are up to date with their rent, and most landlords can impose rent increases without limit.

The proposed changes to the law would strengthen tenants' rights and help prevent these unnecessary evictions.

Going to the specific proposals:

S2892, prohibiting evictions without good cause, would prevent homelessness and improve stability.

It's heartbreaking to have to tell a client they can be evicted for no reason.

When an eviction can commence upon the expiration of a lease, or upon one month's notice when there is no lease, the best outcome you can get, even with an attorney representing you, is not very good.

The best you can get is to ask for time.

Because tenants can be evicted from most apartments in Westchester without cause, they're

limited in their ability to assert their rights even while living in their apartments.

We've observed tenants living in substandard housing because they have to move precipitously, and don't always have time to check and find out if an apartment is in good condition before they move in.

Tenants being hampered in their ability to assert the right to a safe and habitable apartment because they fear being evicted for calling the building department or making other complaints, and the defense to retaliatory eviction is not very strong.

Tenants with Section 8 vouchers standing to lose their vouchers because they have to find a new apartment on such short notice.

And, tenants who cannot move and end up with eviction proceedings on their record, which causes prospective landlords to reject them because of these records for evictions that never should have happened to begin with.

And evictions that can damage their credit report and cause other issues in their lives.

Lastly, eviction-prevention agencies, designed to help pay arrears when tenants fall on hard times, generally look to see if a tenant has a

lease before agreeing to pay rent arrears, to ensure that it saves the housing and isn't going to result in an eviction a month or two later.

A lot of times this can result in an eviction or unpaid rent arrears, simply because they don't have a lease, and because the housing can't actually be saved, because there's no right to remain in the apartment.

It's particularly important that good-cause eviction is passed in New York State, and that it excludes non-payment of rent as good cause for eviction when there's been an unconscionable rent increase, to prevent landlords from circumventing the law, by forcing tenants out by making apartments intentionally unaffordable.

Landlords will often increase the rent, you know, two, three, four times, just to force tenants out and make sure that they can't afford it, or that their Section 8 voucher will no longer cover the rent, so that they have to move.

And we need to close these loopholes.

The next proposal, eliminating the 20 percent vacancy increase of the Emergency Tenant Protection Act, would remove a tremendous incentive for landlords to turn over apartments as quickly as

possible.

The ETPA, as you know, requires annual lease renewals with limited rent increases, absent good cause, which is a critical protection to prevent unnecessary evictions.

When a vacancy increase happens, a landlord can increase the rent by 20 percent, and an additional increase if it's been more than eight years since the last vacancy increase.

And each vacancy increase brings the apartment closer to deregulation.

This provides landlords an incentive to turn over apartments as quickly as possible, to raise legally regulated rents until they reach decontrol levels and come out from under ETPA regulations.

At Legal Services we have seen weak allegations of lease violations, just to get tenants out, specifically to get the vacancy allowance and get apartments closer and closer to decontrol levels.

Currently in Westchester, 5 of 6 cities and 16 towns and villages have adopted ETPA.

As you know, it only applies to dwellings with six or more units and buildings that were built before 1974.

But eliminating the vacancy increase would substantially protect these buildings from turnover.

The next provision, creating permanency in preferential rents, can further prevent abuses from ETPA regulations.

Currently, tenants are generally offered preferential rents to move into an apartment, and then the preferential rent is pulled a year or two years in to their tenancy, at which point the apartment becomes unaffordable, and they're forced move out, again, giving the landlord the vacancy amount so that they can get the apartment closer and closer to a decontrolled level.

Lastly, we see that the preferential rent is used as a tool to hide overcharges.

Tenants are given a preferential rent amount so that they don't go look at the rent-registration history, so that they don't find out that the landlord's been registering the apartment at a higher amount than is legally permissible, so that they can decontrol -- get the apartment decontrolled without anyone ever filing a complaint.

As the commissioner of HCR stated, they go, essentially, on an honor system.

Until someone files a complaint, everything

filed by the landlord stands.

So, if they can keep offering a preferential rent, and no one files the overcharge complaint, they're never going to check those records until after the apartment is decontrolled and it's too late.

So it's incredibly damaging that apartments become decontrolled, simply because they offer preferential rents, just to purposely decontrol the apartments and prevent tenants from filing overcharge complaints.

Lastly, removing individual apartment improvements is connected to the economic incentives for landlords to turn over ETPA apartments.

IAIs require tenant sign-off, unless they are done while an apartment is vacant.

Tenant complaints of the enforcement mechanism, with a four-year look-back period, but rent tenant burdens are incredibly frustrated with their ability to challenge IAIs that are instituted, drawing vacancy.

They can't challenge them, as well, if they're imposed before the tenant moves in.

Repealing this provision would likely reduce how quickly apartments are deregulated and prevent

unjust rent increases.

Eliminating the major capital improvements would remove another mechanism to increase ETPA rents, and have a similar effect for removing the IAIs.

All of these things contribute to an apartment exceeding affordability, and exceeding what a Section 8 voucher can pay.

Legals Services often sees apartments, even under ETPA restrictions, that is simply unaffordable for our clients.

Removing and changing these laws would help improve the affordability of housing in Westchester.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Great. Thank you.

TAMARA STEWART: Good afternoon.

MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Good afternoon.

TAMARA STEWART: My name is Tamara Stewart, and I'm a tenant representative on the Westchester Rent Guidelines Board, in addition to being a member of Mount Vernon United Tenants, as well as Community Voices Heard.

I'm also a tenant representative of Westchester Plaza Tenants' Coalition in Mount Vernon.

My testimony is going to be an actual follow-through on the testimony right before me.

But before that, I'd like to thank Majority

Leader Andrea Stewart-Cousins; Housing Committee

Chair, Brian Kavanagh; and the Senate Democratic

Conference, for taking a leadership stance with

regard to addressing New York State's housing crisis

and the dire plight of millions of tenants in our

wonderful state.

Now, more than ever, tenants need relief from the current system in which owners have almost all of the power and tenants have almost none.

We need you to expand tenant protections statewide, and close the worst loopholes in the rent-regulation laws which owners have been exploiting for decades.

I urge to you pass all nine bills that have been proposed to provide relief to tenants.

Westchester Plaza Tenants have firsthand experience with the debilitating effects of ETPA having been intentionally weakened since 1997.

Westchester Plaza is comprised of almost 700 apartments in 4 buildings. It is the largest rental apartment complex in the city of Mount Vernon.

While most of the apartments at Westchester Plaza are rent-stabilized, more and more units are losing that protection status every year, largely due to the owners taking advantage of the large loopholes in the current regulations.

Four of the most egregious loopholes being employed to hike rent-stabilized rents are the 20 percent vacancy bonus, individual apartment improvements, major capital improvements, and impermanent preferential rents.

Here's just one example of how these loopholes are often employed in combination against tenants:

Exhibit A, which is in the copies that you -I submitted at the desk, is a rent-stabilized lease
offered to a new Westchester Plaza tenant in 2017
for a two-bedroom apartment.

According to this lease, the legal regulated rent for the prior tenant was \$1,671.92 a month, which is on page 10.

A statutory 20 percent vacancy increase of \$334.38 was then added to the rent, followed by another \$110.35 because the prior tenant had been in residence for more than eight years.

Just these two basic additions brought the

rent for this apartment up to \$2,116.65 per month.

However, management at Westchester Plaza habitually performs IAIs on vacant apartments, whether they're needed or not.

In this case, the owner claims that it performed renovations to the kitchen, bathrooms, doors, windows, electrical work, sheetrock, floors, alarms, and air conditioners of this apartment, totaling \$28,697.13.

I find it hard to believe that renovations this extensive were performed without the need for any permits from the building department.

There are none on file.

Permits notwithstanding, 1/60th of the owner's claimed IAIs ratcheted up this apartment's rent by another \$478.29, for a new legal rent of \$2,594.94.

By exploiting existing loopholes in ETPA, the owner was able to permanently raise the allowable rent on this apartment by almost \$1,000 in a couple of months.

Recognizing that \$2600 a month for a two-bedroom apartment in Mount Vernon is high, the owner chose to offer the new tenant a discount, and only asked for \$2,075 per month for the apartment,

inserting a preferential rider into the lease.

Many of my neighbors have preferential riders in their leases, and many of them are seeing their rents go up by \$100 or more every time their lease renews, which is in Exhibit B.

Please eliminate the 20 percent vacancy bonus and IAIs, and please make preferential rents permanent during each tenancy.

With regard to MCIs, all four buildings in my complex are expecting to have to fight against a slew of MCIs.

The building that I live in was the first recipient of MCI paperwork for the building's new roof.

Westchester Plaza tenants have filed, and been granted, nine rent-reduction orders by DHCR in the past three years, following decades of neglect by the current and prior owners of the complex.

We started filing building-wide rent-reduction applications after we couldn't get the owner to address outstanding maintenance issues related to required services.

It was only after we filed papers with DHCR that the owner began to make the needed repairs.

The owner has since filed numerous inaccurate

replies, appeals, premature rent-restoration applications, and even a modification-of-services request two years after they removed our pool without prior permission.

Tenants have had to hire an attorney, collect hundreds of signatures, file repeated complaints with the building department, gather documentary evidence, take pictures, secure affidavits, and pay tens of thousands of dollars to an attorney to secure our rent-reduction orders, and fight against our rents being restored prior to the restoration of all of our required services.

If it's this hard to fight against unscrupulous owners when tenants have rights, I ache for my fellow tenants who are forced to deal with shameless landlords without the benefit of legal redress.

Beyond closing the loopholes that I have discussed in detail, tenants implore you to pass the other proposed measures.

We ask you to end vacancy decontrol.

And, in fact, we need you to re-regulate decontrolled units to increase the rapidly dwindling number of rent-stabilized apartments that are available.

Many rent-regulated apartments, like my previous example, are just one vacancy away from becoming decontrolled under the current rules.

Tenants also need you to extend the look-back period to at least six years, because the system unfairly relies on us to enforce the law.

We ask you to provide relief to your rent-controlled constituents because many of them are just as rent-burdened as their ETPA neighbors.

And because it's not just downstate tenants who are experiencing housing emergencies, please remove the geographic restrictions in ETPA, to allow tenants throughout the state to fight for rent controls in their communities.

Last, but certainly not least, please pass the good-cause eviction legislation to help protect all tenants from unfair landlord retaliation.

All New York State renters deserve safe, decent, and affordable housing.

Good-cause eviction legislation will provide a minimum protection to all tenants who seek to get repairs done, or want to fight being evicted, simply because an owner can get more rent out of another tenant.

Tenants are asking you and your Assembly

colleagues to pass all nine bills without negotiating with Governor Cuomo.

His track record demonstrates that he would be prone to attempt to weaken the proposed legislation.

You must not let that happen.

And once again, thank you for convening these public hearings, and for taking the time to listen to my testimony.

New York's worsening housing crisis is causing immeasurable pain, misery, and desperation.

Many tenants like me are handing over every other paycheck to our landlords and we're not receiving all of the services that we're paying for.

Many of our children can't concentrate in school because they don't know where they're going to sleep that night.

Many of our seniors, like my mom, run out of food a week or more before the end of the month because the vast majority of their Social Security income goes to pay rent, with leaving little for other necessities.

It's time to provide some balance in our rent-regulation system to stem the exploitation of tenants by owners.

1 Please pass all nine of the proposed bills.

Tenants are counting on you to do the right thing.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Ms. Stewart.

Thank you, both of you.

So thank you both for some very important, and very focused and specific, testimony today.

I'm gonna focus -- I want to focus my questions particularly on good-cause eviction, because you both mentioned it as an important priority, and because I think we've heard less of -- less of that perspective here, and in some of our other hearings as well.

So you both believe that good cause -- that the passing good-cause eviction is important here in Westchester, even though it's a county where you already have ETPA in many parts.

Can you just talk a little bit more -- more about why that, in your view, is really critical?

CHRISTOPHER SCHWEITZER: Uhm, yes, there's -there is ETPA housing in Westchester, but it's
simply not enough.

I've worked in Yonkers and -- in our White Plains office, which covers many of the

justice courts. And outside of Yonkers, most of the housing is unprotected.

Being able to end a tenancy on a 30-day notice or on the expiration of a lease causes great instability for families. You know, having to uproot a family causes instability for children, causes disruptions at work, causes disruptions for medical care, it causes any number of disruptions in a family's life, and, allowing landlords to just continually turn over apartments without reason.

You know, a lot of times the rent is paid up, they're good tenants. They haven't really done anything wrong to violate a lease.

They just simply want the tenant out of the apartment, without reason.

It just -- it creates instability, and it gives all of the power, essentially, to the landlords, and none of the power to the tenants.

So there's a large stock of housing in Westchester where there's really no protections.

Even if you have a Section 8 voucher, they can terminate your lease on 30-days notice, and then your Section 8 voucher is at risk if you don't find another apartment and lease-up within the amount of time that HUD gives you to find a new apartment and

lease-up.

So I think good-cause eviction in Westchester would make a great deal of difference.

There certainly is, as you said, there's ETPA housing, there is HUD housing, but there's a lot of unprotected housing.

And good-cause eviction will make a great difference to those tenants.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And you've been in court with, you know, the -- obviously, the tenant bar, but also with the landlord lawyers.

What do you say to people who tell us that this will be -- this will make -- this pro -- the provision in this bill will make lives of landlords just extraordinary difficult; that they won't be able to, you know, manage their own housing effectively; they will never be able to get tenants out, even bad tenants?

How -- how would this work, in practice?

CHRISTOPHER SCHWEITZER: I mean, good

cause -- instituting good-cause eviction is designed

to keep tenants, who are paying the rent and not

violating the lease, in their housing.

It is not designed to keep tenants who are violating the lease or are not paying the rent in

their housing.

So, in that respect, it doesn't really change things.

You know, if you're paying the rent and you're not violating the lease, why does the landlord want you out to begin with?

You know, so if -- if a tenant's violating the lease; if a tenant -- you know, if the lease says you can't have animals in the apartment, and you have a whole bunch of animals in the apartment, they're still going to be able to go to court and get you, likely, out of the apartment for that reason.

You know, if they say, you can't do this, and you are doing this, it doesn't change that.

You can still go to court and say that a tenant is doing this, and get a trial, and try to get a tenant out.

It doesn't change that.

All it does is add protections when you have paid the rent and you are not violating your lease.

That's the point of good-cause.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And are you familiar with the provisions in the bill regarding unconscionable rent increases?

CHRISTOPHER SCHWEITZER: Yes.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Can you talk just a little -- I mean, again, there's concern that this is just, you know, a back-door way of doing rent control, and it's going to be very problematic for the housing market as a whole.

Can you just address that concern?

CHRISTOPHER SCHWEITZER: Yeah, I think the problem is -- from a tenant's perspective, the problem is, if a landlord wants someone out, they're just going to raise the rent, from \$1,000, to \$2,000, and say, I know you can't afford that, so you're gonna have to move anyway.

But putting in a protection, that they can't raise the rent, I don't know what the percentage in the bill is off the top of my head, but putting in that percentage, I mean, why does the housing costs need to go up that much in one year anyway?

What is the justification behind that for a landlord?

It doesn't appear that housing costs, the landlord's cost of doing business, is going up that quickly.

You know, incomes are not going up that quickly.

_ _

So, the landlord, to me, it doesn't make sense that they can justify raising the rent more than the percentage in the bill, in one year.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And the current bill has that percentage. The standard is a rebuttable presumption.

Can you -- as an attorney who's been in eviction cases, in a circumstance where a landlord has an opportunity to rebut a presumption, do you imagine that judges would unreasonably interpret that in favor of tenants?

CHRISTOPHER SCHWEITZER: Judges are, generally, not very tenant-friendly.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So you think, if a landlord has -- if there's a standard in our bill that says, a rent above a certain -- a rent increase at a single year, above a certain amount, is considered uncon -- there's a rebuttable presumption that that's unconscionable, if landlords have some explanation of why they need to raise the rent larger, because of increased costs, or some other factors, do you think that it's unlikely to, sort of, fundamentally alter the outcome of cases like that?

CHRISTOPHER SCHWEITZER: Yeah, I don't think

it would create any great hardship for a landlord to 1 beat that rebuttal presumption. 2 3 If they have a real good reason that the rent needs to go up, you know, larger than normal amount, 4 I don't think that's going to create any great 5 6 disadvantage for them in court. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. I appreciate that. So my time is up. 8 9 Do my colleagues have questions? 10 Okay. 11 And we very much appreciate both of your time 12 and your testimony today. And we will 13 (indiscernible). 14 TAMARA STEWART: Thank you. 15 CHRISTOPHER SCHWEITZER: Thank you. 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next up we have, 17 Norberta Guerrero (ph.) and Teodora Reyes and 18 Fidela Vasquez, and I believe a translator as well. 19 Okay, again, thank you -- and thank you for 20 your patience. I know you've been here for a while. 21 But, if you could begin. 22 FIDELA VASQUEZ: Hello. 23 Hello. My name is Fidela Vasquez, and I'm the member of Make the Road New York. 24 25 And I live in White Plains, and I am lucky

that the owner of the place where I live is a good landlord, and I have no problems in the place where I live.

But there are many of my acquaintances, including my daughter, who do not have this luck.

That is why I'm here in support of the good-cause proposal.

Today I'm here to share the story of my daughter in the situation she has endured, to not having protection as a renter where she lives.

My daughter, like me, lives in White Plains, and has been living in her apartment for two years with her partner and her 10-months-old daughter.

To move to this place, they asked for the amount of almost \$5,000.

Since then, every year they raised \$100.

The point has come that the cost of living there is very expensive, and they are looking for another place. But, the prices are so high, that they do not know what they are going to do.

If the good-cause proposal will be approved, they could plan for the increase which could be less and uniform.

They could be more confident that, next year, they will have the opportunity to keep their

apartment.

Prices are currently so high, that is very difficult to find options to live.

She has looked for apartments in the area, and not many do not accept her because they have a baby.

She has not found anything less than \$2,000.

I worry that my daughter rent continues to rise unexpected increments, and she might become homeless.

I know that my daughter is not the only one in this situation, and that there are thousands of people who are going through this same thing.

Every day I hear stories from my neighbors and other community members about that drastic increases in rent and the inability to do anything about it.

We need to protect our area renters instead of pushing us elsewhere.

Please, support the good-cause proposal.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

NORBERTA GUERRERO: (Speaking Spanish.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

Hello. My name is Norberta. I live at

73 Hamilton in Yonkers with my four children who are

13, 11, 9, and 7 years old.

I am here in support of the good-cause proposal because, at this moment, the place where I live does not offer me protections as a renter, and this puts me in difficult and not ideal situations.

(Speaking Spanish.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

My apartment has a mold problem on one of the walls of my children's room, so I have to put up plastic to cover it.

The water keeps coming in, and the smell and appearance is very annoying.

This is obviously not healthy, especially with my children, because it can affect their health.

I have asked the owner several times to fix this, and he says, yes, but does not come around.

(Speaking Spanish.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

In previous time, I've had to stop paying rent to get attention to my complaints, because, if I do not do this, nothing happens or gets fixed.

When I have done this, it was been out desperation because I know that, without

protections, and without having the right to a lease renewal, the owner can throw me out of the apartment due to these complaints and holding back rent.

We live lease to lease, hoping that we do not get a huge raise that would basically be the same as an eviction.

But there is no way to prepare or feel confident that we will be able to continue living in our home of eight years.

(Speaking Spanish.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

It is necessary that we all have protections, and feel the right and empowered to ask for repairs to our apartments when things are wrong.

We all need a decent place to live, and that is why I ask you to support the proposal of good-cause, so that thousands of families like mine can feel security and have the right to a decent life.

Thank you.

TEODORA REYES: (Speaking Spanish.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

Hello. My name, Teodora Rosas (ph.)(sic).

I'm a single mother of three, who works various odd jobs in order to earn money and, at the

same time, have time to take care of my three children.

As you can imagine, this is hard work to balance, but I made time today to be here to support the good-cause proposal because it is very important to me and thousands of others.

(Speaking Spanish.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

I have lived in Westchester for over

13 years, and live in a multiple-family house in
White Plains, but do not have protections because
this house does not fit the requirements for
protections at the moment.

However, if good-cause were to pass, I would finally have protections, and housing would be one less thing to worry about constantly.

(Speaking Spanish.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

I have been living with my three kids and brother in the same house for the last seven years, an attic that was repurposed as an apartment, as many places in the area.

The owner gave me a lease when I first started, but has not given me a new one for over four years now.

This makes it harder for me to prove where 1 2 I live and to have paperwork for various procedures. 3 (Speaking Spanish.) (Translated to English by a translator.) 4 My rent has been increased twice already in 5 6 the last three years, without previous notice, which 7 has sent me into a frenzy each time it happens. Since the apartment is, technically, an 8 attic, the insulation is improper. 9 It is extremely hot in the summers and too 10 11 cold in the winters. 12 When I have brought this up to the landlord, 13 he dismisses me and tells me that I can leave if 14 I don't like it. 15 More recently, my refrigerator broke down and 16 was not working for about three months. When I complained, the owner told me I should 17 buy a new one out of my own money, but, if I left, 18 I could not take it with me. 19 20 I finally found help with Make the Road 21 New York, and they help me send a letter to the 22 owner. 23 He finally replaced the fridge, but raised my

rent again this time for this.

(Speaking Spanish.)

24

25

(Translated to English by a translator.)

I have tried to look for help, and called various offices around the county, but have been told that there is no regulation, and that the owner can kick people out whenever they want.

It seems as the owners have rights when it comes to housing.

As a tenant, what can I do? I don't have any rights.

It is too hard to find another place, and too expensive to move, so I just suck it up and stay there, but I'm constantly worried about when my next rent hike will be, with no protections.

(Speaking Spanish.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

We need to pass the good-cause bill.

I and many single mothers will continue -or, I and many single mothers will continue to be
taken advantage of if this does not happen, as a
first step to more dignity in housing.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you all for your testimony.

I'm going to keep it short.

I understand that at least one of you has to

leave for child-care duty this afternoon, so we 1 2 appreciate your spending so much time with us today, and your very important testimony today. 3 But I'll refrain from asking questions. 4 And does (inaudible)? 5 6 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: (Indiscernible) 7 also, gracias for your testimony. I wanted to make sure, though, Norberta, if 8 you want to just see my assistant Sergio, and give 9 me your information, so I can help to reach out to 10 11 your -- if you want, to reach out to your building 12 manager. 13 Okay? 14 NORBERTA GUERRERO: Okay. Thank you. 15 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Okay. 16 Okay. Gracias. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you all. 18 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Thank you. 19 And I'm glad, by the way, thank you for 20 actually saying you have a good landlord. 21 I'm almost wanting for you to tell me the 22 name of this person too, because, you know, we don't 23 hear a lot of that. 24 So, I'm sure the fact that there is somebody

who you're happy with, that's probably somebody who,

25

you know, should be acknowledged. 1 What's your landlord's name? 2 FIDELA VASQUEZ: Just know the first name? 3 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Okay. 4 FIDELA VASQUEZ: His name is Antonio. 5 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Antonio. 6 7 FIDELA VASQUEZ: Yes. 8 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Okay. 9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 10 Okay, next up we're going to have Evan Bell 11 and Carol Danziger and Kenneth Nilsen and 12 Silvio Solari (ph.). 13 CAROL DANZINGER: (Inaudible) public 14 speaking. 15 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: You signed up. 16 CAROL DANZINGER: I know, because needed to. 17 I felt I really needed to. 18 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: This is your 19 moment. 20 CAROL DANZINGER: So, yes. 21 Good afternoon. 22 My name is Carol Danziger. 23 For the past 29 years I've worked for a non-profit that is an advocate for affordable 24 25 housing, so I understand the magnitude of this

issue.

I can attest that there is a clear lack of affordable housing options for lower-income and working-class families in our communities.

However, ETPA, as it stands, is not the answer to this problem.

It has been 45 years since the various municipalities adopted this outdated and, apparently, ineffective regulation.

If ETPA was the answer, we would no longer have a housing issue.

Despite this regulation, affordable housing is still a problem that must be resolved.

This leads me to wonder, why, over the past 45 years, has New York State failed to pass legislation to include the use of all rental housing, not just a handful of buildings in select communities built before 1974?

If the housing issue is severe, why has New York State not created legislation that is statewide, benefiting all communities?

This is a statewide issue, and we need everyone in all communities to help solve this problem.

Before speaking more on why changes need to

be made to New York State's approach to solving the affordable-housing issue, I want to share my own connection to ETPA.

My three siblings and I inherited a building under ETPA when our father passed away in 2009.

My father, who worked as a barber, purchased the 18-unit building in Mamaroneck in 1970 in hopes of providing a better life for his family.

He con -- had he contemplated that same decision just five years later, after ETPA was adopted, he may have made a much different choice.

Whereas most people would see the opportunity to own real estate as a financially beneficial one, most owners of ETPA buildings know the truth can be far from that.

The reality of ETPA is that it is a narrow solution, placing the responsibility of providing affordable housing on a group, a small group, of business owners.

The owners impacted by ETPA are asked to accept rents far below market rent.

For example, my building in Mamaroneck is 100 percent stabilized, and my 18 units are renting for far less than HUD fair-market rents for the village.

The reason is due to ETPA.

The building was built before 1970, and nothing more.

I must stress that this burden is not one that is carried equally.

Over the years I have seen many apartment buildings built in Mamaroneck; the Avalon, for example, and none are asked to carry the weight of this regulation as we are, and, most certainly, never to the extent we are.

Those owners, also private individuals, are allowed to charge rents that the market will bear just like any other type of business.

Some may have a handful of units that are more affordable, but it's a small fraction compared to ETPA owners.

This influx of new construction does nothing to help alleviate the housing issue or share the responsibility.

Affordable housing in New York State is difficult, no one denies that.

There are a growing number of people seeking affordable housing.

It grows increasingly difficult to understand how ETPA can be a viable option at this time.

As a landlord, I have seen the shortcomings related to this regulation for both the owners and the tenants.

First, the design of the regulation does not allow for the expansion of the program within the existing municipalities. There will never be an increase of affordable units available supporting the growing population in need of them.

Second, tenants live in ETPA units -- the tenants that live in these units may not even need affordable housing.

Unlike housing subsidies, such as Section 8, New York State does not determine if the person who rents an ETPA unit actually needs, and would qualify for, affordable housing.

Additionally, the small business is not compensated in any way for the use of his or her property.

Finally, ETPA is helping to create a surplus of aging buildings that owners can no longer afford to repair.

ETPA dictates what rents and increases an owner can charge, even when that amount is not sufficient to cover needed repairs and basic expenses.

Hardest hit are smaller properties that cannot absorb the inadequacies in rents. It becomes increasingly difficult to properly maintain the buildings, and remember, these buildings are at least 45 years old.

The building my family owns is approaching 90.

If this continues, you will be forcing our most vulnerable populations to live in sub-quality housing conditions.

Our shared goal should be to find more comprehensive and evolving solutions to the affordable-housing issue.

We do not need New York State to renew EPA (sic) as it stands, which is outdated and ineffective, and we urge you not to do that.

It cannot add more affordable units in the communities where it exists, and it has not alleviated the affordable-housing issue in those communities.

I would argue that, proven solutions, like the housing subsidy, Section 8, should be expanded, considering the wait lists are years long.

We need the programs that get the assistance to those that truly need it.

Take the burden off this handful of small business owners who have a limited impact, and put it back with New York State where it belongs.

Create legislation that shares the responsibility equally and equitably throughout our communities, and help those who really need it.

I would want to say, just on a personal note, since a lot of people were talking personally about their experiences with ETPA, we, as owners of this 18-unit building, and as I said, it's 100 percent stabilized, so we have no way to absorb the rents that are at \$500 versus the rents that are closer to market rate that may be \$1300 or \$1400.

We -- we feel are good landlords, I think.

And that's proven by the fact that tenants really don't leave our building.

We've had most of our current tenants for more than twelve -- more than ten years, and we've had two that have been there for more than fifty.

We have a handful, probably three or four units, that have turned over in the last, you know, probably 10 or 15 years. And the legal regulated rents on those units are much higher. They're not quite near the deregulation rate, but they're higher.

So, basically, that 20 percent that we get when the building turns over, we don't actually get, because nobody in our area is going to rent a unit in a building that's 80 years old for 2,000 or 2500 dollars a month.

So we offer the rents as preferential, because that's what the market allows. We rent them for what people are willing to pay for them.

Now, after that, we don't raise them more than what the Rent Guideline Board stipulates.

I mean, I know we can, but we don't.

I mean, far be it from us to think that we would rather have a good tenant, than a bad tenant that pays you \$100 more.

And, as far as the bad landlords, yeah, there are bad landlords out there.

But, unfortunately, in order to try to alleviate what's happening with those bad landlords, you are taking down, completely, the good landlords that own smaller buildings like I do, because the income that comes in from this building can't even support a single-family household.

Now, my husband and I, we both work full-time. I also watch my granddaughter in afternoons and evenings so my daughter can work.

I am a landlord that is actually a tenant in 1 the building that they own. I live there with the 2 other families, the 17 other families, that are in 3 the building. I know them all personally, they all 4 5 know me. 6 You know, we try to keep the building upkeep 7 as much as we can. But, without any relief of being able to, you 8 know, build any equity, you know, we could be one 9 big repair away from going under, you know. 10 11 And I know you've talked about MCIs, and 12 I almost don't even want to get started on that, but 13 we -- you know, we had an MCI for a new boiler that 14 was rejected by HCR. 15 And I would be more than happy at another 16 time to discuss that. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going ask you to wrap up your testimony --18 19 CAROL DANZINGER: Yes. 20 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- and then perhaps we'll 21 have some questions, and you'll be able to continue. 22 CAROL DANZINGER: Absolutely. 23 MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: I think public

(Indiscernible cross-talking.)

speaking is not --

24

25

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yeah, you seem to be doing 1 2 okay. 3 CAROL DANZINGER: I've just now breathed 4 again. SILVIO SOLARI: First, I would like to thank 5 6 you for your attention, and listening to us, and 7 showing your concern, and sitting here for four hours. 8 9 I think you should be recognized, and you do 10 this many days. 11 I couldn't believe the calendar when I looked 12 at it. 13 My name is Silvio Solari, a former landlord 14 in Westchester County. 15 I will no longer own a rent-stabilized 16 building ever again. 17 For a small landlord of one or two buildings, 18 the rent regulations are just far too difficult and 19 cumbersome. 20 In Westchester County, the rent guidelines 21 are often unfair because the costs can be 22 dramatically different among various municipalities. 23 The big differences are property taxes. 24 How can you have the same increase when, in 25 one municipality you have a 2 percent increase in

property tax, and another one you have a 6 percent increase in property tax?

As you know, in Westchester, one of the

As you know, in Westchester, one of the biggest expenses a landlord faces are property taxes.

That's something I think you should address and consider.

And it hurts communities, like Mount Vernon, whose property taxes go up, sometimes, 10, 15 percent in a year. And landlords there are hurting. And the tenants also suffer as a consequence.

So I think that really needs to be looked at.

My immigrant father told me a long time ago to buy property. It's the only investment he knew.

I found out since, there are better ways of investing.

I am saddened that I had to sell because the meager increases didn't keep up with expenses.

I believe that I was a good landlord.

I followed my father's advice, I treated tenants as if they were my family.

I planted flowers in the front, and vegetables in the small backyard, and we all shared.

There were times some tenants fell behind in

rent. I worked with those tenants until they overcame temporary issues.

Many times I was ill, and those same tenants helped out by shoveling the snow and doing other chores.

However, I found better ways of making money.

I was driven out by rent-stabilization regulations.

There are many landlords who still hold on to their properties, and you may wonder, why?

I know many of them.

They hold on for a few reasons.

Many of them are first- or second-generation immigrants who only understand and know real estate. They're not aware and fear other investments.

You also have those landlords that I call "generation landlords." They have inherited the properties from parents or grandparents, and they want to hold on to that legacy. They just can't let go of a dream that their ancestors created.

Then there are the vulture landlords, who grow in numbers as more regulations are imposed. They find ways of making money.

By making it more difficult for the good landlord, you increase the number of vulture

landlords.

Please don't make it more difficult for landlords to make their fair return, or you may create a housing crisis.

I think I need to look at the -- I think you need to look at the rent guidelines boards that have become political and expensive.

Their rent guidelines are very often -- are unfair.

I think it would be better to go to an automatic rent guidelines based on inflation, and a rent increase based upon the increase in property taxes in those municipalities whose increases are above the average for the county.

Also, you must keep the MCI and vacancy allowance because, very often, this is the only way a landlord can maintain his buildings.

A few comments about other statements that were made today.

It seemed that many people came up here and stated that landlords can evict without cause.

According to my attorney, he says, in practice, no judge will evict without a justifiable cause.

The second thing is, as you make more

regulations, you drive out the good landlords. You don't drive out the bad landlords, they become bigger in number; they become more. They own the buildings.

Because now you can't -- you have to sell at a loss, or have you to sell at a lower price, and they come in and buy the buildings because they know, you know what? The laws are not being enforced.

The issue is, the current laws are not being enforced in housing.

And that's what has to be addressed.

If you make more regulations without enforcing the laws, you're going to have the same thing: pushing out the good landlords, and the vultures are going to be rushing in.

All right.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Mr. Nilsen.

KENNETH NILSEN: Okay.

My name is Ken Nilsen.

I'm a landlord in Yonkers, and I've been a landlord there for about 35 years. And, we're a family business, and we're in the business of providing affordable housing.

You know, we have a number of Section 8 tenants. We rent to other organizations, like Cluster, and some other organizations.

And I want to talk about, one, the purpose of the rent laws --

You all have a copy of my statement here.

-- is to prevent rent gouging.

It's in the language of the original law.

But based on the DHCR data, the average rent of regulated buildings in Westchester is \$1278, average rent. And this includes deregulated units as well as regulated units. This is the average rent.

If you compare that to the HUD fair-market rents, it's substantially below the HUD fair-market rents.

What that tells you is that -- is that the existing ETPA is keeping rents in regulated buildings affordable, in spite of what everybody is saying.

This is data statistics based on actual numbers.

So, I think you ought to consider that in -- in -- when you're going to kind of make wholesale changes to the law that may be destructive in the

long run.

Some legislative proposals would discourage investments in building systems and individual apartments in the long run. This will cause the housing stock to deteriorate.

Look what happened to the New York City Housing Authority.

There's been underinvestment in infrastructure.

And infrastructure is just -- is not -- not very sexy, and it doesn't -- it doesn't get votes. But the fact is, it's critically important.

I'm an engineer by training, and recognize what systems are needed to maintain the building.

If you underinvest, eventually, it's going to get you.

And it happened in New York City in the housing authority.

It happened, like, about 20 or 30 years ago, when -- in the '70s, when there was wholesale abandonment of buildings, like in the South Bronx, and the Koch Administration had to invest public monies, \$10 billion when \$10 billion was real money, in improving private buildings that the laws allowed to -- allowed to deteriorate, because they were

squeezing the landlords so much, they just walked away from them. It didn't work anymore.

You want to -- basically, the incentives the Legislature would want to do away with, such as MCIs, IAIs, vacancy allowances, low-rent minimums, et cetera, were put in place in the '80s and the '90s to correct the poor housing policies of the '70s.

The ETPA housing stock is in better shape now than it was years ago, so don't gut a program that is working.

So, be very careful, because you could do significant damage to the stock, and to tenants in the long run.

The individual apartment -- one of the com -- other comments is that -- is that this -- this -- it's like a competition between tenants and landlords.

We're really all in this together. We're not -- basically, most of the people, you know, operating a rental business in affordable housing in Westchester are small family businesses. Okay?

We're not the large retes that are coming in and building these developments in Yonkers and in New Rochelle and in White Plains. And I think you

have to recognize that, that there's -- there's -- there's a different dynamic here.

Individual apartment improvements, that's what they call the "IAIs," in most cases, my experience is that it's catch-up.

What happens is that, somebody's been in an apartment for a long time. Because the Rent Guidelines Boards provides low increases over a period of time, they're way behind the market.

In addition to that, they need a lot of work, and so you have to go in there and make significant improvements. A lot of it has to do with, it's everything; from electrical, to avoid electrical fire; plumbing, sheetrocking.

A lot of it, I've done a lot of work of lead-paint abatement, which is extremely expensive stuff, because you're sheetrocking the walls. And you're -- in many cases, we're -- we're changing all of the moldings because that's usually where the lead paint is. And it's extremely important to do it, and it's extremely costly.

And that kind of thing, in your plans, to look at individual apartment improvements, is, don't gut that program because that's very important.

In some cases, it's increased the rent to

higher what the market was, so the legal regulated rent may go up higher. But the actual preferential rent, what people are paying, may not -- you know, may not go up as much.

And I've had that situation.

But that's really -- sometimes it's done for people in place, but that's very rare. It's really on vacancy.

But, it's catch-up.

And -- and -- and the fact is, it can't go up too high because people won't rent it, and then you end up with a vacant apartment. You don't want to do that.

But there has to be some kind of return on it.

All the discussion I've heard here, about, you know, kind of giving back over a period of time is, if you make an investment, we're talking about twenty, thirty, forty thousand dollars to do some of these big improvements. That's money that's invested.

If you didn't want to put it in the thing, you'd put it in the stock market, or something like that, and make, you know, 5 or 8 percent, or something like that.

You've got to continue -- you've got to consider that in the whole calculation.

Many of the buildings that we have, I have at least two buildings that are over 100 years old, and some of them have 100-year-old bathrooms.

There has to be a vehicle on vacancy, when -- when there -- when you can, you know, gut a bathroom, put a whole new unit in, and bring it up.

And we've done that in many cases, and the present law has allowed that to happen.

And, please, don't gut that whole thing because it's not going to be good for the tenants.

If they make -- if the regulations change to make these investments unattractive, landlords will just not make them and the quality of the units will fall.

Water leaks and fires from all the electrical wiring will damage apartments, reduce the number of affordable apartments.

Major capital improvements:

The fact is, that a lot -- there's a lot of -- everybody talks about major capital improvements.

In my experience, I've had some of these buildings for 20, 30 years, and I may have had, you

know, like, three major capital improvements.

I mean, it's not like that happens all the time. It's not like, every year, somebody does major capital improvements.

It's, like -- like, it's a small amount.

I just did one in one building, that ended up changing the roof and the boilers. It's a 40-unit building. And the cost for an average apartment, the one-bedroom apartment, was like was \$35.

Nobody complained, because they saw what was happening, and it was, you know, something that needed to be done.

If you don't have it, then somebody's going to say, the roof is leaking. I'm gonna patch over here. You spend a couple thousand, you know, patching that. Wait a couple years, somebody is patching over there.

It's -- it's like -- as an engineer, it's like the wrong way of doing it.

But, if you change the law, then that's what's going to happen.

I remember taking over a building where we had a lot of water leaks. And we'd open up the wall and find out that, rather than changing the pipes, would have to be changed like every 60 years or so

because they wear out, there were just clamps all over the place. And it was a continuing problem because nobody had decided they needed to do the entire -- change all the pipes, because, eventually, it was all going to happen.

And so if you take away the impetus to do that, it's going to be a problem, especially for -- I can list the things: Roofs, boilers, waterproofing, elevators, electrical systems, and the like.

Otherwise, they're going to deteriorate.

The existing formula for MCIs is already bad, it's already unattractive.

It's -- it's for buildings over 35 units.

You take the cost, you divided it by 108, and that's only the direct cost.

Like, if you take a -- like, \$100,000 to do something like a boiler, and you're going to apply this -- this -- this formula, you can get an increase of around \$1,000, using round numbers.

Well, if you take that 1,000 -- that \$100,000 and put it into, like, Con Ed stock, or something like that, you get a 5 percent return.

Well, I mean -- or, you go out and borrow the money to do that.

1 That's -- that's 5 percent, which is like 5,000. 2 3 So, on one hand, you're getting an increase of \$1,000 a month/12,000 a year, but it's costing 4 you 5,000. 5 6 So the net is only \$7,000. 7 Well, to recover that \$100,000 thing is going to take 15 years, and that's a pretty lousy 8 investment if it takes that long to recover. 9 10 So if you make that any worse, people are 11 just not going -- landlords are just not going to 12 make the improvements, period. They're going to 13 just be patching. 14 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Kenneth, I'm going to ask 15 you to wrap it up. I think you will have questions, 16 and be able to continue that way --(Indiscernible cross-talking.) 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- (indiscernible) 18 19 witnesses. 20 KENNETH NILSEN: Okay, great. 21 Then -- okay, and I'll quickly go through: 22 The vacancy adjustments, you can't turn it 23 over very quickly. The existing law has 5, 10, 15, and 20 percent, depending on 1, 2, 3, 4. 24 25 So you can't just keep turning the thing over and bounce the rent by 20 percent.

And last, but not least, is high-rent deregulation, is -- is -- the present laws grew out of the emergency after World War II.

That emergency is over.

Any attempt to regulate the housing market results in a misallocation of resources, such as, one or two people in large apartments, and I've got a number of those; huge families living in small apartments because the large apartments are not available; and fear of building new affordable housing because of the threat of regulation.

Higher-income tenants living in rent-regulated apartments is a fact.

I don't understand why the existing law protects people who are making \$200,000 a year.

It's written into the existing law.

Why should that be the case?

The justification for doing what you're doing is, this is for poor people.

But the fact is, the law says, we're protecting people who earn \$200,000 a year.

How can you justify that?

If you have any questions, I'll be happy to try to answer them.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I think we will. 1 I'm going to begin by -- Senator Myrie first. 2 SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you for your testimony 3 4 today. You know, I welcome the conversation on 5 6 enforcement. I think that's very important. 7 In fact, we had a hearing on enforcement last week in Newburgh. 8 And, also, the conversation around taxes. 9 You know, those disparities aren't just 10 11 county to county. 12 I see those disparities in my own district in 13 Central Brooklyn, where there's certain 14 neighborhoods that pay a disproportionately higher 15 amount than other neighborhoods. 16 So I think that is a conversation that we 17 need to have, to address the totality of this 18 crisis. 19

But I wanted to focus on the last point you made, and I believe you made this as well, regarding protecting people that make a certain amount of money, and means testing as a way of deciding who gets rent regulation.

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the conversation around means testing has always focused on the tenants. And we should be

1 looking at how much they make, and why are we protecting those folks. 2 The Rent Guidelines Board just put out their 3 annual report that said that 95 percent of people 4 5 operating rent-stabilized buildings were operating 6 at a profit. 7 There are only 5 percent of those properties were distressed. 8 And so when we talk about means testing, are 9 you open to means-testing landlords as well? 10 11 Right? 12 If we are deciding who gets regulated based 13 on how much they make, is it your position that we 14 should do the same for property owners? 15 KENNETH NILSEN: Well, the fact is, we 16 submit -- every year, we submit income and expense 17 information to the DHCR as a requirement. 18 Are you saying, on a comparable basis, we 19 should have every tenant submit their income to make 20 it equal? SENATOR MYRIE: No, that's not what I'm 21 22 saying.

23

24

25

already --

2 | SENATOR MYRIE: What I'm saying is --

KENNETH NILSEN: -- we're already doing that.

SENATOR MYRIE: -- the conversation is, we should be doing our policy based on the means.

That -- that that's -- that -- that's what you're saying.

And what I'm saying in return, is that if we have the majority of the property owners, in fact, an overwhelming majority, who are making money, who are making a profit, right, the notion that we should be catering our entire policy to the 5 percent of building owners that are distressed, to me, is at odds with this notion that we should be means-testing tenants.

KENNETH NILSEN: I don't understand what your question is.

CAROL DANZINGER: Yeah, I think I understand what you're saying.

I think -- I think that I would ask, that if you're going to judge, or do a means test, to see if these buildings are making a profit, how would you judge what is an adequate profit?

How do you tell a private business owner what should be adequate for them to make?

1 I don't think anyone -- I don't think you 2 would want someone telling you what you should be 3 paid. SENATOR MYRIE: Right, so that -- it 4 becomes -- it becomes stickier. Right? 5 So then -- so --6 7 CAROL DANZINGER: So --SENATOR MYRIE: -- so then --8 9 CAROL DANZINGER: -- yeah. 10 SENATOR MYRIE: -- so -- so then who is 11 to make the determination on how much a tenant 12 should be making, and whether or not they should be 13 able to rent that affordable apartment? 14 CAROL DANZINGER: Well, housing-subsidy 15 programs already do that. 16 I'm not saying create new ones. 17 I'm saying, use your existing infrastructure to make sure that someone is not living in an 18 affordable unit that doesn't need it, and, 19 20 meanwhile, somebody is homeless because they need 21 that unit. 22 Do you see what I'm saying? 23 I'm not -- I'm not saying we should tell 24 people they can't live in these units.

But I -- I'm wondering if you are enabling

25

the people that need it the most, the people that we 1 hear talking today that have been homeless, that 2 could not find units, would they be able to find 3 units if people that didn't need affordable housing 4 were not in those units --5 6 SENATOR MYRIE: Do you know what the 7 median --CAROL DANZINGER: -- is what I was asking? 8 SENATOR MYRIE: Do you know what the median 9 income of a tenant that lives in a rent-stabilized 10 11 unit is? 12 CAROL DANZINGER: In Westchester County? 13 KENNETH NILSEN: In Westchester County, or Manhattan south of 96 Street? 14 15 SENATOR MYRIE: Do you know what the median 16 income for either of those are? 17 KENNETH NILSEN: No. ZELTZYN SANCHEZ GOMEZ: I think they're, 18 about, just a little bit below the average. I think 19 20 it's just -- I don't think it's way below the 21 average, I don't think. It's just a little bit 22 below the average. 23 SENATOR MYRIE: The average, what? 24 SILVIO SOLARI: Average income of

Westchester County, I'd say, is 70,000. So maybe

25

1 it's about -2 SENATO
3 median income

SENATOR MYRIE: Okay. So, statewide, the median income is somewhere around 45,000?

CAROL DANZINGER: Yeah, in Westchester it's 108,000, I believe, is the median income.

SENATOR MYRIE: The median income for a rent-stabilized tenant in Westchester?

CAROL DANZINGER: Oh, no, no, for a rent-stabilized tenant, no.

I'm talking the median income in general.
 (Indiscernible cross-talking.)

SENATOR MYRIE: Okay, that's -- that's the question I'm asking.

So, in fact, HCR testified earlier today, and said that that median income is significantly below what the median income is for non-regulated tenants.

And so this notion that rent regulation, at large, protects wealthy people, while preventing low-income to moderate people, taking advantage is just not in line with what the reality is.

KENNETH NILSEN: But's it's protecting some people making that kind of money.

SILVIO SOLARI: Yeah, I think a bigger problem than that is, where you have tenants in a three-bedroom apartment, there's only one person

living there, because, originally, they had a 1 2 family, and the wife passed away and the children moved. And they have -- it's -- it's ludicrous to 3 have that situation. 4 5 So they could be placed, if, hopefully, you 6 can think about that, whether you can have some sort 7 of regulation, where that person be placed, and be told, he has to move to a one-bedroom apartment. 8

This way, that three-bedroom could be available to a full family.

I think that's fair.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And we have a lot of apartments like that.

SENATOR MYRIE: Okay. I --

CAROL DANZINGER: I don't believe in asking someone to leave where they're living.

And I know that you said that there is,
I guess, data that supports that people are living
in these units all need affordable housing.

I don't know if I completely agree with that.

I think that there are a lot of people that do need it, that aren't getting it, and there's a reason they're not getting it.

It's because it's not out there because someone else is using it.

SENATOR MYRIE: Okay.

I will yield to my time to my colleagues. CAROL DANZINGER: I don't know. MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: I just think --you know, I think we're at this point here where everybody is coming and saying, you know, this is the case, but not always that. I think what we're trying to do is not spend a lot of time on extremes. I do believe that the problem is, that there's not enough affordable housing.

I do not believe that, you know, if we took everybody who, quote/unquote, couldn't (sic) afford housing and took them out so there would be enough affordable housing, because I don't think that's the vast majority of the people.

I think the vast majority of people living in affordable housing need affordable housing.

And I think you can always talk about, oh, there's some millionaire living in some -- well -- but we don't want to talk about that.

And by the same token, I think what -what -- what Senator Myrie was responding to was
this idea of the means testing, because most people,
again, don't have that.

And, you know, if I were to listen to the

landlords, you know, most landlords are great, so -- and nobody is gouging, and nobody's doing this or that.

So, we're having these hearings because we know the range of the problems. And we know that everyone would want us to legislate from this edge of the world or that edge of the world.

And what we are trying to do is correct the issue that is -- is why we have rent laws to begin with, which is, there's just not enough affordable housing.

So your testimony here is important for us as we deliberate, but I don't want anybody to really think that we think that everybody's in affordable housing who could actually afford market rate, or that every landlord is, necessarily, you know, raking in, you know, untold dollars without any regard to their tenants.

But we're trying to get to that sweet spot that makes sense.

CAROL DANZINGER: Well, I think the sweet spot that makes sense would not restrict it to units that were built before 1974.

MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: I heard what you said, yeah.

CAROL DANZINGER: You have a really, really unbalanced system that puts the burden on particular owners. And it's only 16 municipal -- of the municipalities, or 17, out of the 43 in Westchester County. I don't even know how that can be legal. sorry, I just -- I don't understand that. People are struggling; people are struggling

People are struggling; people are struggling on both sides.

MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: I appreciate that.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Leader Stewart-Cousins.

And just -- actually, to briefly respond,

I mean, the current system is such that the state

law permits localities to opt in at their choice.

So each of the localities that is part of this is part of it because the local governing body of that municipality has opted into the system, based on a formal determination that they have a tight housing market for the kind of housing that's regulated in that locality.

CAROL DANZINGER: And that they had a housing emergency.

I guess the question I would also ask HCR,

who's supposed to be, basically, impartial, and make 1 sure that everybody involved is doing their due 2 3 diligence: Do they make sure, is there any provision after the fact, to make sure that a 4 housing emergency still exists? 5 6 I know that there were housing surveys done 7 when these laws were adopted 45 years ago. Have they even bothered to ask the 8 municipalities --9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Again, this is -- this is 10 11 very much --CAROL DANZINGER: -- to do it again? 12 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- this is very much a function of home rule. 14 15 So you have -- you actually have an example 16 of one municipality that opted into rent regulation 17 recently, and then proceeded to opt out, based on, you know, a change in the political composition of 18 19 the governing body of that --20 CAROL DANZINGER: I mean, do we have the 21 right to know if emergencies still exists --22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I think that, again 23 each --24 CAROL DANZINGER: -- considering --25 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- I don't want to --

1 CAROL DANZINGER: -- they're seizing our 2 personal property? SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- and I don't want to 3 belabor this -- and -- and --4 5 CAROL DANZINGER: You know, I mean --6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Generally, we ask the 7 questions. 8 But --9 CAROL DANZINGER: -- I think that's 10 something -- I know. 11 I think that's something --SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- I appreciate the 12 13 dialogue. 14 CAROL DANZINGER: -- that the State should --15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: But just -- just to say, 16 I think the current law is such that, this has been 17 grant -- this is -- this is a function of home rule. And there are localities in the three 18 19 counties where people can opt in, where the 20 locally-elected governing body chooses to adopt this 21 and chooses to continue it. 22 They do have -- each locality has the option 23 to -- to -- to change that decision if they choose 24 to, and they don't need -- they don't need a formal

determination that the circumstances have changed.

25

1 They do have the opportunity. So this -- this -- these systems remain 2 3 supported by their local governments, and that's -that's the legal basis on which they can continue to 4 be in place. 5 I do want to shift gears and just focus a 6 7 little bit on your experiences with MCIs and 8 IAIs, because you have that experience. 9 First of all, I have to ask, on what basis 10 was your MCI application rejected? 11 GAIL WILLIAMS: Well, we had an 12 80-year-old -- I have to give you just a brief --13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: That's fine. 14 CAROL DANZINGER: We had an 80-year-old 15 boiler that cracked. 16 We went to our oil company at the time, and 17 they suggested a replacement, which we did. After the -- we did not immediately put in 18 19 for an MCI. And after the first season, it was not 20 adequate. 21 The tenants were complaining there was not 22 enough heat. 23 It just be couldn't handle. We have four stories for steam heat. 24 25 So looking at that, and looking at the

options, we decided to then, at that point, we were going to go with a gas alternative.

We were going to go green, so we worked with Con Ed. We put in gas-fired boilers.

We had an 80-year-old manifold which they had us replace.

When we submitted our application to HCR, we wanted to explain why we chose to convert to gas at that time to get the new boiler.

And ultimately, in the end, after we waited nine months, they come back. They give us a week to respond.

Then they come back again after a month.

And so this went on for probably more than a year.

They basically determined that we could not prove that the boiler that replaced the broken one was insufficient; and, therefore, they would not allow us to charge for a newer one.

Even though we had not charged an MCI for the boiler that did not serve its purpose, even though they had letters from tenants and such, they denied the entire application.

SENATOR MAYER: Can I (inaudible)?

So they did not -- the first one you didn't

1 apply for? CAROL DANZINGER: We never submitted for the 2 3 first one. SENATOR MAYER: And the second one they 4 denied when you applied for it? 5 GAIL WILLIAMS: When we supplied (sic) for 6 7 what we currently have, and what is sufficient for our building, and what is now "green." 8 SENATOR MAYER: Did you ever apply thereafter 9 for this boiler issue? 10 11 CAROL DANZINGER: For another MCI? No, because, after a year and a half of that, 12 13 I just did not have it in me to do it again. 14 SENATOR MAYER: I'm sorry to interrupt you. 15 CAROL DANZINGER: I just didn't. 16 KENNETH NILSEN: I have one experience with 17 that, and that is, the MCI that I talked about in this one building, we put in a boiler and a roof. 18 19 We also did substantial work, probably \$100,000, on 20 the parapets, repairing various parapets.

But, and I knew this beforehand, unless you replace the whole thing, or you do the whole building, it's not going to qualify for an MCI.

21

22

23

24

25

And -- but I felt it was the right thing to do before we put the new roof on, we had to fix so

of the -- repair some of the parapets, and we did.

And that's just part of the cost of operating.

So we only got an MCI on the two things that qualified under the regulations, which are very stringent.

So they -- the DHCR doesn't give away MCIs for nothing. You know, they have their stringent regulations, you have to follow the rules, you have to provide, you know, a whole bunch of documentation, for them to approve it.

And -- and some -- and many things are not approved. Many big projects are not approved.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm sure the commissioner, who was here earlier, would appreciate us hearing that testimony from you.

Just -- on the -- on the -- I want to talking about the math of IAIs for a minute.

So an IAI, as has been discussed, in a building with 35 units, or smaller, the amount of the IAI is recouped in 40 months. And then, you know, that continue -- that cash flow continues indefinitely into the future.

Here, you know, you've said that -- and that -- and that raises the legal rent, that amount,

1 irrespective of whether it --2 KENNETH NILSEN: Right. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- can actually be charged. 4 Is -- you know, I'm hearing -- and -- and --5 6 and I carry -- I -- I carry, and have carried, a 7 bill for a number of years, a bill that would repeal IAIs entirely. 8 9 So, I don't want my questions to suggest sort 10 of where I am on this issue. 11 But dealing with your testimony as you've presented it, is a 1/40th return -- a 1/40th 12 13 increase in the rent necessary to make the economics of IAIs work? 14 15 CAROL DANZINGER: In an 18-unit building, 16 absolutely. 17 In a fully, 100 percent subsidized, 18-unit 18 building, yes. 19 There was -- there is no way we could afford 20 to make those repairs to the plumbing, to the 21 kitchens, which need to be done when tenants are not 22 there, because then, otherwise, what are they going to do? 23

The older units, when people move out, it's, like, we need to make those repairs.

24

25

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I understand. 1 2 I'm not -- I'm sorry. 3 I'm not questioning the -- at this moment, I'm not questioning the need for the program at all 4 per se, so much as the mathematics. 5 6 Like, so if you spend \$40,000 on a unit, you 7 need \$1,000-a-month increase on --CAROL DANZINGER: If the unit was renting for 8 9 \$600, or \$700, yes. I mean, I don't think it's going to rent for 10 11 \$1,700. 12 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Well, that's -- I guess 13 that's the question. 14 CAROL DANZINGER: But --15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I mean, we -- we --16 CAROL DANZINGER: We need the option to have 17 it rent for what the market then will bear. 18 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- part of the chal --19 part of the challenge we have, is that we are trying 20 to make rent regulations for millions of -- a 21 million apartments, with thousands and thousands of 22 landlords --23 CAROL DANZINGER: Release the -- release the 24 little guys. SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- of all different 25

scales.

And I would note, that current laws have a lot of elements that we broadly consider loopholes, that the real estate industry, that people lobbying on behalf of the industry as a whole, have protected very aggressively.

And the result of that is that we have many, many instances where landlords, sometimes purchasing a building out of the blue, as we've heard a little bit about today, and sometimes just, you know, deciding to cash in on the value of the real estate, have used every mechanism available to them for the purpose of pushing up rents.

So we have a concern that, if you can put money into an apartment and get all of that money back in 3 1/3 years, and then continue to get that return indefinitely, that landlords have been using that.

And we have -- you know, in addition to sort of fraudulent use of it, we've had legal use of it that seems, to us, to be intended to raise the rent rapidly, as opposed to making the basic -- you know, the basic improvements necessary to make the apartment properly habitable, make it -- make it a reasonable place to live.

So we're just trying to understand, is there a -- to the extent that we were to consider reforming these, as the HCR commissioner suggested we might, is there any play on that math?

I mean, like, do you -- you -- you're telling us that if -- if -- if the return were less than -- you know, you're get 30 percent of the amount of the IAI investment each year, indefinitely.

Is it really -- is -- is -- are you suggesting that you wouldn't do the improvement if you only got 20 percent a year?

CAROL DANZINGER: I -- I don't know.

It depends how much the improvement costs, because, basically, the income that's generated by the building, without even taking anything from it, would not be enough to do major improvements to more than one apartment. And that's without even taking anything out of it, you know.

So, I mean -- yeah, I mean, it would have a direct effect on the small landlords.

I can't speak for anyone else. I can only speak for how it affects myself.

And, honestly, I don't know how you stop the people that are using it the wrong way without completely annihilating the people that are using it

the right way.

I mean, quite frankly, in a perfect world,

I would be happy not filling out the paperwork

required by this regulation, you know, at a minimum,

you know.

So I don't know what to tell you about that.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: But you understand, in a world where landlords -- I mean, we had testimony before, that 75,000 units were found by HCR to be --

CAROL DANZINGER: In New York City.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- illegally deregulated.

CAROL DANZINGER: In New York City.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Not only in New York City, but we've had that phenomenon in -- I mean, there are many more units in New York City than there are in Westchester. But we have had illegal deregulation across the entire region.

So when -- you know, in a situation where landlords are just deciding, at some point, to cease to treat a unit as regulated at all, that we would have some concern about a system where there's no documentation at all. And, landlord, like, an honor system around rent increases is challenging for us.

Okay. I guess that was a rhetorical point more than a question.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I appreciate --

CAROL DANZINGER: I mean, yes, because I'm never going to reach a deregulated rent rate in my building because I'm not going to have the turnover.

(Indiscernible cross-talking.)

CAROL DANZINGER: And, I mean, not having the turnover is not necessarily a bad thing.

> SENATOR KAVANAGH: Right.

CAROL DANZINGER: But when we do have it turned over, I need to bring those lower units that have been out of, you know, the system for me up to where it can help alleviate this -- this unbalance.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: But there may -- but even from -- just from your perspective as a small --I mean, we have landlords telling us, that we must be able to invest, at least, you know, if it's been occupied -- if it's been -- the last tenancy lasted 10 years, we might have to invest \$120,000 per apartment.

And that's -- I mean, that translates into a \$3,000-a-month rent increase.

And they're telling us, if we tinker with that, it's just going to be too hard for people to function.

And it sounds like that's not your

experience.

CAROL DANZINGER: Mine have been averaging about twenty if it's a much older unit, because you're going to have to replace all the plumbing and the electrical.

I mean, you need to take the opportunity to do it when you can do it --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. That's --

CAROL DANZINGER: -- and hope you have the funds to do it at that time.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: That's very helpful.

Mr. Nilsen, do you have a perspective on this?

KENNETH NILSEN: Yeah.

The reality -- my reality, is that it's most effective when -- really, when -- when the rents are -- are substantially below market, essentially, to try to bring it up.

And I don't know if you -- if you're going to look at that, if you look at a -- some kind of a bifurcated system, where there's one set of rules when it gets -- you know, when you're going up to market, and then another set of rules when you're going beyond that.

If you're talking about \$120,000, that's a

pretty fancy apartment.

You know, that's -- but -- but I know, if you're really gutting an apartment, and I've done that, you know, you're talking about, you know, \$40,000 in addition to that, or \$60,000.

When they had to renovate those apartments in -- in like the South Bronx during the Koch Administration, it was averaging \$60,000 an apartment to do that kind of work, and that was like 20 years ago.

So that -- you know, this stuff is real money.

And that's what people forget, how much it costs to do this stuff.

Like, you know, my guys, when they go to Home Depot, you can't get out of there without spending a thousand dollars for few pieces of lumber. It's just incredible.

But the reality is, is -- is -- especially for those rents where you're in catch-up mode.

And -- and you can't raise it outrageously anyway because people won't rent it.

And it -- it's -- it -- and it's not affecting, you know, people in place.

Sometimes there's a -- you know, a stove, or

a refrigerator, or that kind of stuff. I mean, that's small stuff, that's not really the big deal.

The big deal is the -- is the apartment renovations.

And, you know, as I say, you know, when you're doing the whole ball of wax, it can be very expensive, but especially when you have the low rent.

If you have somebody who's renting it for \$700, and have lived there for 35 years, (1) you need to change, pretty much, everything, and -- and (2) they've had a low rent, just because the way the Rent Guidelines Board sets things.

The existing system is so complicated that it's morphed the system. So you don't -- you don't have a gradual increase.

You have a few people who have a great deal, and then you have everybody else who's, basically, subsidizing them.

And -- but, anyway, it's for those really low rents on vacancy that -- that it -- that's my experience, is that it's most important for.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

KENNETH NILSEN: And I'd hope you would keep that in whatever you -- you come up with for the

1 rent regulations. 2 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 3 Again, my time is long up. Anybody else on the panel have any questions 4 on comments? 5 6 Okay. 7 Then we appreciate all of your testimony very much --8 (Indiscernible cross-talking.) 9 10 KENNETH NILSEN: Thank you very much. 11 Our only hope is that, you know, you do a 12 balanced, you know, changes to the law, to allow us 13 making improvements so you don't have deterioration. 14 These, you know, apartments, some disaster 15 happens, and then you have to replace it with a new 16 building that costs, you know, four or five hundred 17 thousand dollars a unit, and it can't be affordable unless it's subsidized. 18 So, maintaining these buildings is -- is --19 20 is the most important thing to maintain affordable 21 housing. Give us the ability to do that, please. 22 23 Thank you. 24 CAROL DANZINGER: And please don't forget the 25 small owner.

1 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you very much. 2 You have very eloquently represented the 3 small owner today, so we appreciate that. Next up we have Laura Case of Westchester 4 Disabled on the Move. 5 6 LAURA CASE: (Microphone off) Thank you for holding this --7 8 Okay. Thank you. (Microphone on.) Thank you for holding this 9 hearing. 10 11 My name is Laura Case. I am here today as the systems advocate at 12 13 Westchester Disabled on the Move. 14 We area Westchester-based independent-living 15 center that provides services and advocacy to people 16 with disabilities. 17 We proudly join the voices you have heard, urging you to pass all nine bills in the universal 18 19 rent-control platform. 20 We cannot let our rent regulation laws 21 expire, and just renewing them as they are would not 22 be enough to start addressing the housing crisis 23 facing Westchester and the rest of New York State. 24 The emergency is definitely not over.

The price of housing far outweighs what

25

people are able to pay, especially those working lower-wage jobs and those with fixed incomes.

This year, the fair-market rent for a one-bedroom apartment in our county is \$1,463.

In the meantime, the maximum amount that a single independent person in New York State receiving SSI can receive is \$858.

A person working 40 hours a week at minimum wage earns about \$1,900 before taxes.

There is clearly a gap.

People with disabilities are being hit especially hard by it.

At Westchester Disabled on the Move, we provide assistance searching for housing to hundreds of people a year.

We have to tell those seeing us for the first time not to come in with high expectations because accessible, affordable apartments in Westchester are becoming harder and harder to find.

When members of our community can't find one of them, they wind up in places that are not good for their well-being.

Westchester has one of the highest rates of homelessness in the state. It's grown over 37 percent since 2010.

According to a national report called "Priced Out," 24 percent of those homeless nationwide in 2016 had a disability, and had either been homeless for over a year or had been homeless multiple times.

I've also met homeless home health aides and a bus driver.

In Westchester County, anyone can become homeless, and more and more people are rapidly becoming so.

I myself am formerly homeless, and even while working now, I can only afford a room.

Other people with disabilities wind up in nursing homes and group homes where they don't have the independence and privacy that many of us take for granted.

Centers like ours are the product of the independent-living movement, which is a civil rights movement that has its origin in of the '60s and '70s, like many others.

One of its main goals is to help people with disabilities in institutional settings move back into the community.

This is something that state and federal governments are now legally obligated to do as well

under a Supreme Court decision called "Olmsted."

The "Priced Out" report goes on to share that one of the biggest barriers to doing this is the lack of affordable and accessible housing available in our country's cities and towns.

Rent stabilization and rent control have allowed people to stay in their homes.

In 2018, there were about 25,000 rent-stabilized apartments in our county.

Cities with rent stabilization can also pass SCRIE and DRIE, which allows seniors and people with disabilities in rent-stabilized units to have their rents frozen.

It's a win-win, with landlords receiving tax credits to make up the cost, but as you heard today, there are serious flaws in the system.

It doesn't make sense to get rid of rent stabilization; instead, we need to expand it and we need to strengthen it.

It doesn't make sense that landlords of rent-stabilized apartments can hike rent by up to 20 percent between tenants, and can further raise rents by making repairs.

There might be a needed conversation about tax credits or subsidies to do some of those things,

but the burden right now is on the tenants, and people are losing their housing because of it.

When the rent gets high enough, it becomes unaffordable to many of the people who need affordability.

When it gets higher still, the unit is deregulated.

It's also arbitrary that tenants of rent-controlled apartments face increases much higher than those in rent-stabilized ones.

It's, frankly, unjust that only New York City and municipalities in Westchester, Nassau, and Rockland can pass rent stabilization when we know that people are struggling throughout the state.

It's pretty clear from the folks who testified from Rochester today that there is a crisis throughout the state, and the upstate counties need rent stabilization as much as the counties downstate.

And, I actually do believe that it's not fair that tenants in buildings that were built after 1974 can have their rent raised or be evicted without oversight or cause.

But, again, the solution is not getting rid of the existing regulations. The solution is to

expand those regulations and to strengthen them.

The nine bills in the platform are all crucial and must all be passed.

I believe that the just-cause eviction bill and the statewide Tenant Protection Act may be the two most important bills in this package because they would extend protections to so many people who currently don't have them.

This isn't the only thing we need to do to solve the housing crisis, but it's a step we can't solve it without.

I heard people talking about adding Section 8 vouchers, adding subsidies, and, we need to do those things. But, it doesn't matter if we get those subsidies created if there aren't apartments that are in their price range.

I know people who actually lost their Section 8 vouchers because they couldn't find an apartment that they could afford with it.

We hear that landlords cannot afford these reforms, but I don't think our communities cannot afford to pass them.

Thank you.

Great. Thank you.

Questions?

1 SENATOR MAYER: Thank you, Laura. 2 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Mayer. SENATOR MAYER: Thank you. 3 When tenants come to Westchester Disabled on 4 5 the Move, or folks that are at risk of eviction or 6 need alternative housing, how do you identify the 7 best possible place; in other words, how do you find, for example, a potential rent-stabilized 8 9 apartment or subsidized apartment? LAURA CASE: I think that that's a really 10 11 good question. 12 I think that it could be challenging, because 13 I think that another issue is that, there's kind of a lack sometimes of centralized information about 14 stabilized lower-income units. 15 16 But I know that we use the County's 17 Homeseeker site. I know that we kind of use our connections in the agency community. 18 But I think that the amount of information 19 20 available about these units is another thing that 21 really needs to be addressed and improved. 22 SENATOR MAYER: Thank you. 23 LAURA CASE: Thank you. 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, next up,

25

Patricia Weems.

And I think, on behalf of Dennis Hanratty,
who we understand had some health issue today,
Karen Heim is going to read testimony. Is that
correct?
Okay.

If you can come on up, I'd appreciate it.

PATRICIA WEEMS: Always on the move.

Nice seeing you here.

My representative is Andrea Stewart-Cousins, and I'm keeping her busy.

Twice; right?

I'm from the town of Greenburgh, and I've been on the Affordable Housing Committee for around five years, and I really could not do it any longer.

It's heart-rendering, it really is.

And I'm not going to -- I started last night, and at 2:30, I stopped.

You all know all of the problems.

I wonder if you realize that, maybe, on one half, there's an answer on this side, and then on the other side there's a half.

Public housing in here, there is no such thing as affordable housing. I'm serious, there really isn't.

And when you have public housing, the problem

is, no one can get out of it.

What happens is, they move in, they pay their rent. The first raise they get, (indicating) their rent goes up.

If a child reaches 18, and starts working, the child has (hits microphone) (indiscernible).

So what happens is, it's a catch-22; you cannot get out of it.

Then I'm listening to the people who have homes, 18 units, 25 units, whatever. And the people who are living in them have been there for generations, and they're only paying \$700, \$800, under \$1,000, for a three-bedroom apartment.

So why can't we just flip this some kind of way, give them additional money for those people.

There's no place in Westchester that you should be able to live for \$700 a month, that's the bottom line.

So now how do we do that?

What kind of laws can we pass that state, if you live in public housing, and we want you to live there until you -- when you're paying \$2,800 a month in rent, in public housing, that's a mortgage.

So why can't we just say, okay, the landlord or the tenant, or whoever it is, because a lot of

these are privately owned, but they're getting money from our tax dollar, and what I want to see is, that the rent that they pay, basically, when they take an increase, a large percent of it has to go to an escrow account. And in this escrow account, that person can keep the interest on it. But after five to seven or ten years, whatever you allot, that cash comes back to that person, and they have to leave, and that's enough money for a down payment for a house.

You're talking, like, \$15,000, \$20,000.

I know we can come up with some innovative ideas.

And then, that way, you get these people out of those houses, buying houses. And if they don't buy a house, they cannot return to public housing.

With \$20,000, you've got something to start with.

But they cannot save that money. They get nothing in return for the extra -- the rent they're paying. The rooms aren't larger. They don't get air conditioning. They don't have new refrigerators.

Nothing.

That's pure profit for the individual who's

collecting the rent.

So now how do we change that around, so that whoever owns that little 14, 18 units, and they're only getting \$700, you see where I'm coming from?

MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: That's why we're

(inaudible).

PATRICIA WEEMS: I know.

So, now, I want to know, what is it that -- what is it that we can do to see to it we can help you implement some of these plans?

How can we --

MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: I'll tell you what you can do.

By being here, giving us information that allows us to make the wise decisions.

You're doing exactly what you should do.

PATRICIA WEEMS: Okay.

So, you know, we have the ideas.

And I'm president of the Civic Association here in Greenburgh.

Mine is on Hillside Avenue, down to 119.

And the person who was the president of the Fairground -- I'm Fairgrounds -- Fairview, that individual died. So I figured I'd come and try to do something for Manhattan Avenue and Oak, and

1 whatnot. I have on -- in my civic association, a 2 seniors building next to the Theodore D. Young 3 Community Center, and that's being changed. 4 So -- but we need the housing because, 5 50-by-100 lot here in Greenburgh, you're talking 6 \$300,000 just to buy the land. 7 So what's affordable? 8 9 How do you do? 10 When we're losing all our younger kids. 11 I try to lie and say I'm 29, but, you know, 12 all my Brownies and my Girl Scouts, you know, where 13 do they go to live? You know, they're moving. 14 And we're losing good resources, and it's not 15 fair. 16 You know, I don't want to live in an 17 all-elderly community. I'm 29. 18 19 [Laughter.] 20 AVA FARKAS: So, you know, what do we do to 21 help to keep our younger generation viable in a

community where they can't afford to live? There you go. Okay?

And I'm going to leave -- oh, no, I'll wait,

22

23

24

25

'cause I'll sit here had a little longer.

KAREN HEIM: Good afternoon, honorable members of the Westchester, New York State, Legislature.

I'm here, I'm Karen Heim, on behalf of Dennis Hanratty.

You probably know he had a little accident in the house, May 5th, and he's not as strong as he thinks he is.

Okay.

He is the executive director of Mount Vernon United Tenants.

He's been in this position 36 years, and has been coming to Albany all of this time, lobbying for stronger state tenant-protection laws.

He and the whole tenant movement are -- in New York State are very excited.

This is really the first time, in at least his 36 years, that there's a great likelihood of significant, long overdue improvements to laws.

We're counting on our legislators to do the right thing by tenants, and pass the nine -- all nine bills that we've been advocating for.

He called me this morning and asked me to make the point, that this is a function of the

legislative branch of government, not the executive.

While MVUT engages in a whole variety of tenant services, the great majority of our work falls on its free programmatic categories.

First is homelessness eviction -- I'm sorry,
Homelessness Prevention Program (the HPP).

We provide intensive case management for the tenants at risk of eviction through various legal and administrative interventions.

We effectively prevent over 150 evictions annually.

That's a conservative figure.

This provides enormous fiscal relief for Westchester County taxpayers who are spared the huge costs of the emergency shelter system.

The real beneficiaries are, of course, the families and individuals who are spared the horror and indigenities of becoming homeless.

The second function is the TAP (the Tenant Action Project).

MVUT organizes tenants within individual buildings, to better understand their rights and responsibilities, and to be better able to represent their own interests vis-a-vis their landlords, governmental agencies, and the courts.

So many people have become homeless because they didn't know they didn't have to.

They thought they had to get a lawyer.

And if they can't afford their rent, how can they afford a lawyer.

Public advocacy is the third.

MVUT works on all levels of government; municipal, county, state, and federal, to push for policies that benefit tenants and other low-income residents.

The New York State Tenant Protection laws enable us more effectively to engage in all of our program activities.

Our Homelessness Prevention Program (HPP) is the activity we spend the greatest amount of our time and energy.

Eviction prevention is very detail-oriented.

It requires incredibly dedicated staff, for example, the initial intake, the collection of documents, the analysis of problems, the contact and acquiring the resources.

I might add here, this is where I work, getting people who are embarrassed because of their situation, through no fault of their own, to divulge the problems that they have is part of the fight.

They're shy, they don't want to come forward.

And they have rights they don't know about.

Preparing orders to show cause, follow-up services of papers, core preparations, et cetera. We go with them to the court.

We're not lawyers. We just go as moral support.

Part of the analysis of problems is determining whether the tenant facing eviction is rent-regulated.

If so, the tenant is in a far stronger position challenging his eviction.

I very often feel inadequate when I receive calls or requests for assistance from unregulated tenants.

By asking them where they live, what is the address, and my long-term history with MVUT,

I know -- he knows exactly what building they're talking about, whether it's ETPA or not.

Their rights are much likely to be upheld if they're in an ETPA building.

People are -- all they do is buy time.

They eventually end up out of their apartments if it's not ETPA, and, that, it's unsustainable.

Where will the working people live?

Presumably, you want working people in the county to do the work.

Okay. Likewise, for tenants in unregulated buildings, my message is much less optimistic.

Extending the ETPA to smaller buildings.

Three units to five units would be a big help in our efforts to fight evictions.

The good-cause eviction legislation that we're supporting would do this, and perhaps more.

Providing protection for the thousands and thousands of tenants who live in areas of the state not covered by the rent laws is key.

It's tough to overstate the value of the rent laws as a tool in fighting evictions and keeping tenants in their permanent homes.

I don't have to explain to anybody the effect on a child who doesn't know, when they come home from school: Did we get the money, mom? Like, you know, is this going to happen, is this the day?

It's gut-wrenching.

While MVUT does provide the majority of our services to Mount Vernon tenants, as the only funded and staffed tenant association in Westchester, we do great -- we do get requests to help from throughout

the county.

In fact, MVUT was responsible for Croton-on-Hudson and Rye adopting the ETPA in the last number of years.

And we, likewise, played a major role in Ossining opting into the ETPA this past September, even though that was partially revoked and is currently subject to litigation.

MVUT has always been a firm believer in coalition work.

We have worked with the tenant movement in

New York City and individual organizations, such as

New York State Tenants and Neighbors, the

Metropolitan Council on Housing, over the years.

I've been a member -- and -- we -- and have been a member of the broader coalitions working in the renewal and strengthening of the state rent laws; for example, the Real Rent Reform (R3) Coalition, and the current Housing Justice for All (HJ4A).

Many look at the state's rent laws as being solely a New York City problem.

Actually, the numerous communities, and three suburban counties of Westchester, Rockland, Nassau, have adopted the Emergency Tenant Protection

Act.

The ETPA helps stabilize buildings and whole neighborhoods.

This is especially important, as Westchester and Nassau are two of the last affordable metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) as listed by the National Low-Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC) in their "Out of Reach" report.

Westchester is one of the least affordable MSAs in the country, requiring a housing wage of \$32.44 to afford the fair-market rent.

For a two-bedroom unit, Nassau's number -- numbers are comparable.

It is the eighth least-affordable MSA in the country, requiring a housing wage of \$36.12.

You begin to realize what we are up against.

We're lobbying the State Legislature to support and press all nine of the bills that are listed on the attached HG4A flyer.

Universal rent control for New York State,
the R3 campaign, that have been pushing three
separate pieces of legislation for years are (1) end
vacancy decontrol, (2) close the preferential
loophole, (3) eliminate the statutory 20 percent
vacancy increase.

1 Through the upstate/downstate effort, we added six legislative priorities, which will provide 2 3 much-needed benefits to renters, and begin to level the playing field with the vastly more-resourced 4 5 real estate industry. 6 Please do so. 7 Thank you. MAJ. LDR. STEWART-COUSINS: Thank you. 8 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you both. 9 10 Great. 11 Okay. So we now have heard from everyone who 12 had signed up in advance of this hearing. 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we're going to -- now, we're going to go to people who have -- who arrived and signed up today. We're going to try to accommodate everybody.

So first I have -- there are five people who have signed up from the Building and Realty Institute.

And I'm going to ask, basically, all five of you come up, and we'll hear your testimony as a group, as we have with other organizations, and then, you know, take any questions from the panel.

So, Lisa DeRosa, Alana Chufatelli (ph.), Mike Nukho, Gene DiResta, and Jason Shian (ph.)(sic), I think, if I'm saying

that properly.

Yeah, we're gonna -- let's -- we're going to run the clock at 8 minutes. But if you can summarize, you know, we do have to get out this building at some point.

But, yeah, if you could -- we'll run the clock at 8 minutes for each of you.

So I don't know -- so please just identify yourself individually, and any affiliation you'd like us for the record, and then proceed.

LISA DeROSA: Hi. My name is Lisa DeRosa.

I'm a landlord.

My father built these buildings that we currently manage. It was his life dream to build an apartment house, and growing up he referred to them as "his children."

So, technically, I'm here speaking about my siblings.

[Laughter.]

LISA DeROSA: My name is on every building, and I take pride in them because they're my father's legacy.

He's not with me anymore.

We provide quality housing, and we make all repairs in our buildings in one to two business

days.

Our repairs are not Band-Aided, they're repaired properly.

I have no violations on any of my properties, and I have not had any in over two decades.

I also provide jobs.

In addition to my building staff and office staff, I hire local contractors and use local suppliers.

It doesn't make sense to turn over an apartment for the sake of turning it over. Financially, it doesn't make sense.

In any business, the cost to get a new customer is 13 times more than it costs to keep your existing customers, and it is no different in real estate.

If you take the cost of the improvements, plus the time that your apartment is vacant, it makes no financial sense to do that.

If you have a good tenant who's paying rent and abiding by the laws, there's no reason to evict somebody.

I cannot pay my bills, I cannot pay my staff, with empty apartments.

There are some instances where you don't want

to renew a tenant.

I have had instances where I've had a drug dealer in the building.

I have families in that building, I have families with young children. I have single women in that building.

I don't want a drug dealer and his clientele coming onto my property, and it was very difficult to evict him.

I had to hire a private investigator. There was no other way to do it.

You have tenants that throw loud parties all night, who are a nuisance to the residents that do the right thing.

And as a business owner, I need to protect my business and my clients, and, in some circumstances, you need to not renew a tenant.

But other than that, it doesn't make sense to have -- to not renew someone to have a vacant apartment.

I didn't do my homework this weekend, so I'm kind of speaking from the cuff. I took the weekend off.

What do you know, I might be done.

As far as individual apartment improvements,

my buildings were built in the '70s.

Avocado and harvest-gold kitchens just don't work in today's market, and you need to get them updated.

I spend money on my apartments.

I don't think I've ever spent \$20,000, but,

I do need the ability to recoup my costs.

And, I wanted to address something that Senator Harckham had said, and I'm sorry he's not here right now to hear it.

But, when you talk about apartments going off -- becoming deregulated and going -- and not -- and disappearing, they're still there, they're not going anywhere, and they're still being rented at prices conducive to an apartment built in the '70s, and, in White Plains.

So because an apartment becomes deregulated, I can do anything you want to it, but I'll never get 2,000, 3,000, 4,000 dollars for those apartments in White Plains.

So, I think what needs to be made clear is that, they're still there, they're just not counted anymore.

MIKE NUKHO: Hello, everyone.

My name is Michael Nukho.

I am a landlord.

I'm with GEM Management Partners.

I'm also a real estate broker.

I hold a "certified property manager" designation.

And I just wanted to say that, about
2 1/2 weeks ago, our company was honored by the
Guidance Center as a preferred landlord servicing
Westchester County, because we open our doors to
subsidies, such as, like, Section 8, and agencies
that have participants that are in need of quality
and safe housing because they may suffer from some
mental illness, or, things of that nature.

So, we were very proud to be honored.

But when I think about some of these proposed reforms, it's almost that we would have to hand back that honor because we would not be able to sustain that designation.

These -- these -- these -- these laws that are out to roll back the ability to have landlords put money into a property affects these tenants.

If I ask any one of you to go home, whether you live in an apartment, a condo, or a home, and voluntarily put money into that place to fix something, that may be a struggle for you because

that place that you call "home" does not give you any money.

So it's the same thing with an apartment building.

If you take away the abilities to raise rents, to make it profitable, how can we voluntarily go into our pockets and just put money back into a building?

So, there's a lot of things here that I hear.

You know, I heard the unfortunate stories of some tenants being evicted, having poor housing conditions.

You know, it's sad for me to hear that, but, for those landlords that do the right thing, you know, we're -- we're -- we're getting stripped away from that ability to continue to do it day in and day out.

We need -- we need the ability to raise rents in order to put monies back into a building.

It's just -- it's -- it's
black-and-white math.

If you have an apartment building that has several units, 10, 20, whatever the number may be, and you have sporadic vacancies that may open up, because, it could happen.

And then you have, like the other woman mentioned, a cracked boiler that may happen out of nowhere, there's no -- there's no time clock, there's nothing that will -- that you will foresee, no crystal ball that will say, you're going to come to work today and then you have a boiler issue;

Nevertheless, potential vacancies;

Nevertheless some tenants complaining because you have a nuisance tenant that lives above you that happened to leave the water running, and walk away from it, and then, all of a sudden, you have a leak coming below.

These are -- this is the nature our business.

It's a constant, you know, go, go, go; there's always something going on.

And I think that something that needs to be made clear, that I don't think anyone really realizes, is that I believe that a lot of people have this misconception, that if you have so many apartments, that everyone pays your rent.

That does not happen.

I am -- I could open my books at any given day, I have 25 to 30 percent of uncollected rents sitting out on the street, that will never be collected, never mind the legal fees that we have to

engage to try and collect the rent.

It's just -- that's just the nature of the business.

So, it's very important that IAIs remain in effect.

You know, we talked about apartments becoming vacant after so many years of being occupied.

And, our business evolves.

So, if you have an apartment that was 20-, 30-years occupied, and then it becomes vacant, especially in buildings in New York which, predominantly, were built in the early 1900s, those electric wiring and panels, they're very old, very hazardous.

Think of the effect that you place on the burden of landlords, that if you take away the ability to put money back in, good money back into a building, to fix it the right way, that they're going to take shortcuts because they don't have the money.

So if they're going to take shortcuts and just do whatever is necessary just to kind of slide by, then, what happens when that family is -- is -- is a result of a fire -- or, a victim?

Another thing I want to mention is that,

landlords do the right thing.

We do things like surveillance cameras.

If you go through -- to a neighborhood and you look around, and the buildings are predominantly kept up to par, you have secured entrance doors, you have intercom systems, you have properties that have a flavor of being maintained, surveillance cameras is a big advocate for it.

I have many, many local police departments that come to our properties, with their own tablets, and they know how to access our buildings because we give them the smart codes to get in. And they get in and they access our surveillance cameras, without even us asking, because we already have developed that relationship, and they're out there trying to fight crime.

In Yonkers, some months ago, I don't know the victim's name, but, a poor man was walking across the street, got hit by a car, died.

The person that did the hit-and-run was captured by surveillance cameras.

That was from property owners.

Now, the effect is incredibly hard.

You know, we all know somebody, and if you don't know somebody directly, you may know somebody

who does know someone, that works at a Home Depot, a mom-and-pop-shop hardware, that's a clerk for an electrician, a plumber, that's a stock boy, something to that effect.

You take away IAIs, you take away the incentive for landlords to put money back into these properties to make them right for the people's safe and well-being. And then the trickle-down effect is that there's going to be a loss of jobs.

If landlords don't have the ability to put money back into their buildings, then those electricians and plumbers and the Home Depots of the world and the mom-and-pop shops, they're going to lose employees.

It goes round and round.

Taxes go up, water goes up; those bills have to be paid no matter what, whether you collect the rent or not.

If you -- I like to look at -- I was trying to think about a way to kind of streamline the analogy.

Imagine buying a car, but you can't buy a brand-new car. You have to buy a used car.

And you have to, you know, just like everybody else, you put a down payment and you

1 finance that note. Same thing when you buy a building. 2 Your buildings are used. So you put a down 3 payment, you finance it. 4 So now have a mortgage on the building; you 5 6 have to have a mortgage on a car. 7 When your brakes go bad on your car, do you just let it go? 8 When your tires go bad, do you just keep 9 fixing it, and hope that you're going to sustain a 10 bad rain or snow? 11 12 The same thing goes true with a building. 13 You have to do what you have to do, and you need the funds to be able to do it. 14 15 So, I mean, I'm very familiar with the IAIs 16 and, you know, the MCIs. 17 And I think Ken hit it on the nose earlier. Ken Nilsen, he said that, not all of them are 18 19 approved. 20 And that's very, very accurate. 21 And when they do happen, they happen 22 sporadically. It doesn't happen all the time. 23 So, MCIs, for whatever it's worth, I don't

believe in the calculation, I don't think it's

sufficient enough. But, it needs to stay.

24

25

But the IAIs, that's important, because now you're going to tamper with the quality of your housing stock.

And nobody ever spoke about succession rights here.

I have properties that I have -- I have a classic tenant who pays me \$505 a month, and he has a house in the Hamptons. And -- he has a house in the Hamptons, and he pays \$505 a month.

Is that fair for those people that could use that apartment?

I don't think so.

I -- or -- or the folks that strategically play games with the rules.

If you look at the ability to incur a unit through succession rights, you just have to set up residence for two consecutive years and be a bloodline relative.

So, where I have a property that has

56 units, and I have a three-bedroom, two-bathroom

apartment, and the tenant pays me \$305, and this is

real, that family's bloodline could, presumably, go

in there, set up residence, and -- and -- and -- and

have a couple of the Con Ed bills placed in her name

or his name, and set up residence, put it all on

their driver's license, for two consecutive years, and they would inherit that three-bedroom, two-bath apartment.

And that is -- when we talk about loopholes, that's a major loophole.

And I don't think that anybody quantified how many of those rent-controlled apartments that are out there, that could presumably be handed down to a bloodline relative, that may not even need it.

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

GENE DiRESTA: Good afternoon, Senators, colleagues, and audience members.

We're here to provide testimony, share our experiences related to the management of rental properties, and how the proposed changes to the ETPA law will affect both tenants and landlords.

You've heard testimony that denigrates landlords by tenants, and, conversely, tenant problems experienced by landlords.

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

GENE DiRESTA: My name is Gene DiResta.

An additional inference in every person is every person's desire to reduce their costs at the expense of the provider without regard to the financial needs of the provider.

The need of low-income people must be addressed by society, and not by small landlords who are running a business and not a social service.

It is my position that a viable strategy that accommodates both landlords and tenants is an analytic algorithmic approach to rent regulation.

An algorithmic approach would consider current economic conditions of both tenants and landlords.

Now, I've heard a rumor that an algorithmic strategy exists, and that it hasn't been used much.

I have not located this algorithm in any published resource.

Perhaps it needs to be upgraded, or, more likely, created, to make the rent guidelines more relevant and responsive.

As an engineer-mathematician, I have developed a financial real estate mathematical model that has been useful in the management of my family's 22-family real estate investment.

It allows me to decide on expenses, et cetera, needed to allow me earn the fair return on investment needed to continue our business and pass it on to my daughter.

I would also like to point out that no

published papers in any peer-reviewed journals by academic economists support the economic benefits to an entire community from rent guidelines.

An algorithmic strategy would also eliminate the need for a rent guidelines board.

Finally, I ask that our legislative representatives (indicating) incorporate new language, or mandate the use of algorithmic strategies, to determine fair rent guidelines rather than the current arbitrary process used to determine rent increases.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Last up.

JASON SCHICIANO: Good afternoon, Senators.

Thank you for your patience in hearing all of us out.

My name is Jason Schiciano.

I'm co-president of Levitt-Fuirst Insurance.

We're an insurance broker located in Tarrytown, New York.

We're also the insurance advisers to the Building and Realty Institute, and the Apartment Owners Advisory Council.

I am also the insurance broker for several of the landlords in this room.

So I think I have a somewhat unique perspective in terms of being a vendor to these landlords.

My first comment relates to the testimony that you've heard regarding expenses that these landlords face relative to the recent DHCR-allowed rent increases.

Last year when I testified at the rent-guidelines hearings, I mentioned that the previous five years, one-year allowable rent increase totaled, for the five years, 7.25 percent.

That's right from the DHCR reports.

And over the same period of time, the DHCR reports showed that the premium increases for insurance increased by 24 percent.

Now, I'm not the only expense on the operating statement of a landlord, but I'm certainly selling insurance, one of the top three or five.

So, that's an interesting disparity.

There have been some comments today about wage stagnation as well.

I would point out that, from 2016 to 2021, the minimum wage is going to increase by 50 percent.

I employ 65 people in Tarrytown. Many of them have wages that would be in the range of what a

tenant in the apartments that we're discussing would typically earn.

And I can tell you that, over the past five years, the same time period, those type of employees, critical to our operation, have earned wage increases, on average, of 20 percent. And I'm a local Westchester business.

Secondly, with respect to the correlation to collect adequate rents and IAIs and MCIs, relative to the ability to maintain a building or invest in necessary capital projects, I think it's pretty obvious that, with continued, or even more severe, rent-increase restrictions and elimination, or reduction in IAIs and MCIs, that there is going to be reduced maintenance, or, certainly, only maintenance of an emergency nature, and, certainly, fewer capital projects.

Ken Rotner (ph.) spoke of the need for electrical upgrades to apartments, to buildings, and individual units when they're vacated, which is costly, as well as the need to, for instance, remove lead paint.

I can give you a different perspective on that.

Not only is that necessary for the building

to continue to operate and function properly, and for the protection of the tenants, but, also, I can tell you that there is a bit of an insurance crisis in New York.

In New York, it's the hardest state in the country to obtain affordable insurance.

And, in New York, insurance on these apartment buildings costs far more than any other state in the United States of America.

As a result of that, there are very few insurance companies that have any interest whatsoever, at any cost, or any premium, to insure apartment buildings.

So my point is, the more that these apartment buildings defer maintenance or defer capital projects, the less attractive they will be from an underwriting perspective; the more non-renewals of insurance policies you'll see; and the result of that will be higher replacement insurance at less coverage.

That's bad for landlords, and it's bad for tenants as well.

Lastly, I'll mention that the -- the -- there's definitely, within the last 12 months, an umbrella liability crisis for these landlords.

Landlords have seen recently, or will be seeing shortly, that their umbrella liability insurance will cost them 30 to 70 percent more this year than last year.

Why is that?

Because two major insurance programs for umbrella liability have pulled out of the New York State marketplace.

And, Senator Stewart-Cousins, I'm going to be meeting with you on Friday to discuss this.

It's because of the scaffold law, which makes the insurance for the vendors that service these buildings extraordinarily high.

The contractors pass that expense on to the landlords, and the landlords have to pay for it somehow.

So, a number of different issues from an insurance perspective that maybe gives some light to why there needs to be some fair consideration with respect to the ability to obtain rent increases, in order to pay for various maintenance and capital projects, as well as the insurance.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

So I appreciate all of your testimony.

Given the late hour, I'm going forgo the 1 2 opportunity to ask questions. 3 But anyone else on the panel? SENATOR MAYER: I just have a brief question. 4 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Mayer. 5 SENATOR MAYER: Can each of you say how many 6 7 units you can -- are under your management? 8 LISA DeROSA: 400. 9 SENATOR MAYER: 400. 10 How many buildings? 11 LISA DeROSA: Three. 12 SENATOR MAYER: And your insurance? 13 JASON SCHICIANO: I mean, we insure 14 thousands. 15 SENATOR MAYER: I know, yes. 16 GENE DiRESTA: 22. 17 SENATOR MAYER: 22 in one building? 18 GENE DiRESTA: Yes, ma'am. 19 SENATOR MAYER: And you at GEM? 20 MIKE NUKHO: Yes. 21 Approximately 500 over 22 buildings. 22 SENATOR MAYER: Okay. Thank you. 23 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you very much. 24 Next up were going to have Alan Zaretsky, who 25 I understand has been waiting very patiently for

some time.

2 ALAN ZARETSKY: Good afternoon.

My name is Alan Zaretsky.

Before I read my prepared statement, one of the benefits of being towards the end is to listen to everybody say what's going on and hear all the different viewpoints.

I don't envy your, hopefully, solomonesque task before you.

I only hope that you don't throw out the baby with the bathwater when you do make a decision on this.

Good day, and thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

I have operated and rehabbed hundreds of units, both in New York City and Westchester, over the years.

I've seen the benefits of capital improvements enhance buildings, neighborhoods, and the quality of life for those families living in these properties.

It is important for all to remember that we are all in this together and should not be at odds with each other.

Landlords and tenants both have a vested

interest in maintaining and upgrading housing.

The tenants that reside in rental properties are entitled to safe and secure living conditions, and landlords are entitled to a reasonable return on their investments.

This can only be accomplished through cooperation and respect, not only for each other's rights, but the properties themselves.

Mechanical devices have an expected lifespan.

When maintained properly, that lifespan can be extended.

When neglected or abused, that lifespan can be severely shortened.

Accordingly, the need to replace or upgrade services within a building or individual apartments requires both landlord's and tenants' attention and care.

It is not equitable, nor economically feasible, for landlords alone to bear the cost to replace items such as stoves, refrigerators, et cetera, every few years due to misuse or neglect.

These types of items are primarily within the control of the individuals living in the apartments.

It is the landlord's responsibility to ensure that they're in working order, and the tenant's

responsibility to use them properly in a clean environment.

Likewise, building systems also have a lifespan.

If maintained properly, they can last well beyond their expected viable usage, but, ultimately, they will be need to be replaced.

The current method of allowing landlords to upgrade both individual aspects of apartments and buildings-wide systems works.

The landlords have to expend large sums of funds, which expense is then shared by the recipients of those services over an extended period of time.

During that time, the landlords' costs continue to go up as taxes, electricity, heating, maintenance, insurance, and other costs only increase.

Many changes to the law, although well-intended, often have resulted in unanticipated consequences which have dramatically affected the cost of maintaining rental housing.

Following the New York City law,
Westchester County has eliminated the use of
lower-costing Number 6 oil, and Number 4 oil to

follow in 2020.

This has resulted in the necessary move to higher-priced Number 2 oil, or converting to gas which is extremely difficult and an expensive procedure.

This has resulted in increases in heating costs, as well as capital outlays, to convert the equipment to accommodate this change in heat-source usage.

Of course, we are all aware of Con Ed's recent moratorium on gas conversions, which only add to the cost of Number 2 oil, and further inhibited the well-intentioned ban on 4 and 6 oil sources, as gas is not an option currently, despite the upcoming 2020 ban on Number 4 oil.

My point, in short, is not to be shortsighted in eliminating the capital-improvement aspects of the current rent law.

This will only exacerbate the decline of properties, and cause more harm to the residents living in these properties, than the short-term goals of a select few.

Cooperation is a key in moving forward in these difficult times.

We are all in this together whether we like

it or not.

Now, off my prepared statement, I rehabbed for the City of New York, under their vacant-building program, over 1,000 units in the South Bronx.

It worked.

The City gave low-interest rates, which made it viable.

The people that worked on at least my projects were people from the communities. And I would say 40 percent of them moved into these buildings that rehabbed, maintaining that neighborhood as to what it was.

And while it was a small section that we were on, on Sheridan and Sherman Avenue in The Bronx there, we worked somewhat of an oasis when we were done.

People knew who would come to our neighborhoods to make trouble.

The people that lived there helped enforce that.

And so the -- the capital improvements, whether it be individual apartments or the full building-wide, are a necessary expense that has to be done.

And there's no way that many of these smaller 1 landlords can afford this, unless it's allowed to be 2 shared. Not fully put on the burden of one side or 3 the other, but shared by all parties involved. 4 5 Thank you very much, and I trust in your good 6 judgment. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, appreciate it. Questions? 8 SENATOR MAYER: Thank you. 9 I just want to say, thank you for the tone of 10 11 your comments, which are constructive, in the sense 12 that we do have a challenge before us how to do 13 this. 14 And, how many employees -- do you have a 15 company? 16 ALAN ZARETSKY: I have several companies, 17 yes. 18 SENATOR MAYER: Oh, okay. 19 How many employees do you have, all together? 20 ALAN ZARETSKY: I probably employ over 21 85 people, between building superintendents, 22 maintenance people, and my office staff. 23 SENATOR MAYER: But on the repair side that you talked about in your testimony? 24

ALAN ZARETSKY: On the repair side I have

25

```
1
        15 people working for me.
               SENATOR MAYER: Okay. And is that primarily
 2
 3
        in The Bronx now, or Westchester --
               ALAN ZARETSKY: Right now it's all in
 4
        Westchester.
 5
 6
               SENATOR MAYER: -- okay.
 7
               Thank you.
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.
 8
 9
               ALAN ZARETSKY: Thank you very kindly.
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: And our last panel, I'm
10
11
        going to call up the last two.
12
               And if you are here, and you are expecting to
        testify, and you haven't been called, this would be
13
        a good time to speak up.
14
15
               But, the last two folks on my list
16
        are Edwin Martinez, and I think it's -- it's
        handwritten, but I think it's Maria Kwan.
17
               JULIE WEINER (ph.): I thought I signed up.
18
19
        Julie Weiner (ph.).
20
               SENATOR MAYER: Julie Weiner.
21
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, I do not have you on
        the list. But, why don't we -- we'll have you come
22
23
        up last after that.
24
               So are -- are -- Edwin Martinez, these are
```

folks from Immigration Defense Group.

25

```
1
               SENATOR MAYER: No, they did not want to
 2
        testify.
 3
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.
               Then, Ms. Weiner, you are up.
 4
 5
               JULIE WEINER (ph.): Okay. Thank you.
6
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.
7
               JULIE WEINER (ph.): Hi. Good -- good to
8
        meet --
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)
9
               JULIE WEINER (ph.): What?
10
11
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yeah, you don't need to --
12
               JULIE WEINER (ph.): Oh, I don't need to --
13
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- put it closer enough.
14
               JULIE WEINER (ph.): Okay.
15
               I'm Julie Weiner.
16
               I live at 1 Shonnard Terrace, Apartment 3-D.
               And I -- when I moved in in 1986, I moved
17
        into a rent-stabilized building.
18
               I don't believe I still live in a
19
20
        rent-stabilized building. Apparently, I'm one,
21
        or -- I'm one, or perhaps one of two, remaining
22
        rent-stabilized tenants.
23
               In the time I've been there, obviously, there
        have -- there's been a series of landlords.
24
25
               I -- really, I'm here today out of a sense of
```

obligation to myself, because I want to protect rent stabilization.

I wasn't able to attend the lobbying day of the tenant organizations because I was in Albany lobbying on election integrity.

So, my living in a rent-stabilized building has enabled me over the years, as a single woman, working as a mental-health counselor, whose per-session salary/per-session income has not gone up.

There isn't a single insurance company who has increased by income, per session, in the 25 years that I've been working in this field.

So having a rent-stabilized -- having my rent-stabilized, and not moving, despite, sometimes, not well-maintained building, has enabled me to -- has enabled me to make the contributions that I've made over the years, both as a counselor and in the community.

I've done volunteer work at the

Sharing Community, among other places, where I've

seen -- I've seen the dire effects of homelessness.

I think we're -- I think we're kind of in the position of the frogs in the water that's slowly boiling, where we don't see -- that anybody could

ask, could even ask, whether there's a homelessness crisis is -- is shocking to me.

But I guess we've just gotten used to seeing people with no resources wandering the streets.

It didn't used to be that way.

The -- the emergency that led to the -- the laws that exist now were in a situation where you -- it would have been shocking in those years to see people wandering the streets, homeless.

They just wanted to prevent it.

Anyway, I don't want to take your time long.

I just wanted to say, I think that the prob -- from what I've been hearing, we're dealing with a problem, that many people have invested in housing.

It is an extreme -- as you pointed out, it's an extremely reliable investment if 95 percent of landlords are making a profit.

I don't think there's anything else you can do with your savings that's a more reliable investment.

So -- and I don't think that there's a law that says you have to make a profit on your investments.

On the other hand -- and we are subsidizing

landlords in a lot of ways, with Section 8, where we've actually subsidized the rent increases by subsidizing the market rents.

So I want to make a little bit of a radical suggestion.

We've had -- I've -- there's been a huge turnover of landlords in my building, not just tenants, because property, real property, was a speculative investment.

So they invested, expecting to flip it, and they did, over and over, until the market peaked.

And I have the sense, from the way expenses aren't being taken care of, that probably the current landlord paid too much, I don't know.

But, I want to suggest a radical solution to the problem of market housing. It's not a new one.

Mayor Fiorello La Guardia invested New York
City funds in public housing. First houses still
exist in New York.

There is other funding of -- there's other -there are -- there's other housing in New York that
has been, while it houses a lot of people, less
successful, in terms of the amenities -- of how nice
it is a place to live.

But I would suggest, maybe you can't do it

this term, but I think the State of New York ought to be investing in housing.

We can't keep -- we can't -- with -- with housing as a speculative investment, there really isn't another way but competing with the landlords to set up housing that -- to set up housing for people who can't afford it, because working people's incomes do not go up at the rate of return that investors expect.

You know, the miracle of compound interest doesn't work in terms of how much working people are earning.

We just -- there's a limit to what we can keep giving, until we just are exploited to the -- beyond the point where people can survive.

So that's my long-term solution.

Meanwhile, I thank you for your -- thank you for your -- thank you for your support for sustaining -- for sustaining rent -- rent-stabilization and rent-control laws, as I hope you'll be doing, and modifying them so that they can have long-term viability.

Thanks.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And thank you for your testimony.

1 Any questions from the panel? Comments? 2 Okay. 3 We appreciate your patience and your testimony today. 4 5 JULIE WEINER (ph.): Well, I appreciate yours (inaudible). 6 7 I was not prepared. I just wanted you to know, here I am. 8 9 There's nobody left around me who's a 10 rent-stabilized tenant. 11 SENATOR KAVANAGH: We're very much glad that 12 you joined us. So that concludes this hearing. 13 14 Thank you all for -- everyone who testified, 15 and the senators who joined us today. And we will continue this conversation as we 16 17 move toward the deadline for the laws to be renewed on June 15th. 18 19 Thank you. 20 (Whereupon, the public hearing held before 21 the New York State Senate Standing Committee on 22 Housing, Construction, and Community Development 23 concluded, and adjourned.) 24 ---000---

25