

**AD HOC COMMITTEE ON WORKFORCE HOUSING**  
**Of the**  
**Suffolk County Legislature**

**Minutes**

A meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Workforce Housing was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on **February 9, 2005**.

**Members Present:**

Legislator Jay Schneiderman • Chairman

Legislator Vivian Vioria•Fisher • Vice•Chair

**Members Not Present:**

Legislator Michael Caracciolo • Excused.

Legislator Elie Mystal

-

**Also In Attendance:**

Mea Knapp • Counsel to the Legislature

Amy Duryea • Aide to Legislator Schneiderman

Dan Hickey • Aide to Presiding Officer Caracappa

Alexandra Sullivan • Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature

Jim Spero • Director/Budget Review Office

Ginny Sohr • Aide to Legislator Vioria•Fisher

Paul Perillie • Aide to Minority Caucus

Adam Santiago • County Executive's Office/Intergovernmental Relations

Jimmy Dahroug • County Executive's Office/Intergovernmental Relations

Jim Morgo • Commissioner/SC Department of Economic Development

Marion Zucker • Director•Division of Affordable Housing/Planning Dept

Dr. Sean Digiovanna • Asst. Professor/Center for Urban Policy Research

State University of New York/Rutgers

Nancy Marr • Suffolk County League of Women Voters

All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney • Court Stenographer

***(\* The meeting was called to order at 2:04 P.M. \*)***

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay, I would like to call the meeting to order. If everyone will rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Alden.

***Salutation***

Thank you, Legislator, for sitting in on this committee. I also want to thank Legislator Viloría •Fisher who is fighting a fever, nobody get too close, for coming out today because I think our topic this afternoon is quite important, and I appreciate you coming despite your infirmity.

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

I am a trooper.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Well, certainly creating housing for our youth who seem to be leaving at alarming rates I think is a tremendous issue facing the County that requires action on the County's part and we have, I think, an opportunity to move the agenda forward.

We have a gentleman here, Dr. Sean DiGiovanna from Rutgers Center for Urban Policy Research who is here. He had conducted a Housing Needs Assessment for Westchester County and they looked throughout the County at the needs on an area by area basis and he has prepared a scope. If you remember, we passed a procedural resolution last year for such a study and I had sent out solicitation letters to about six different organizations, research organizations. We have Mr. DiGiovanna who did respond by the deadline and he is here and I've been quite pleased with our conversations and with the scope that he prepared. We all have had an opportunity to review that scope and I'd like Mr. DiGiovanna to step forward and introduce himself to go over basically what he proposes and it certainly is my hope that we could move this forward and begin to develop this assessment.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Thank you. I'm Sean DiGiovanna from the Rutgers Center for Urban Policy Research. I would like to say I'm very excited to be here to talk to you about this project and with the possibility of working with Suffolk County. I speak on behalf of my colleagues at the center, we enjoy doing this work and for me it has a particular important meaning in that I grew up in Kings Park; so even though I'm not here now, I have a strong tie to Suffolk County.

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

Another youth who left Suffolk County.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

There you go.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

He's a statistic.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

I'm a statistic, that's for sure. I have prepared comments to kind of talk through a little bit about the proposal, I know that many of you have read it, I know that some of you are here in not necessarily the strongest of conditions and so I want to be cognizant and try not to make this too tedious. If I'm at a part where you think I don't need to go over, please prompt me to go further, but I think I'll just talk in broad outline terms about the study and if you have particular questions you can ask me or save them for the end.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Dr. DiGiovanna, do you have copies of the scope or the draft?

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

I don't have any additional copies of the report. I believe they were •• I'm not sure if they were ••

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah, because there might be some people here who want to see it and look over it.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

I have an outline of the scope, I don't have the full proposal.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right, we can run some copies.

**MR. PERILLIE:**

I'll will do that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay, run like ten copies of it.

**MR. PERILLIE:**

I'll be right back.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay, thank you.

**MS. KNAPP:**

You don't want to use this machine?

**MR. PERILLIE:**

Yours goes faster?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Whatever is faster.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Okay, I'll start by saying that one of the first things we wanted to do was identify what we called some of the study priorities which were kind of guiding principals and whatever the details of the methodology that we'd work out that we wanted to come back to and make sure that the study provided, and this was basically through a series of back and forth phone calls, e-mails, etcetera. And the kind of three broad areas that we identified as priorities were first

that the report would have to identify the workforce housing need in Suffolk County and that would include the existing need as of the 2000 Census, some of which has already been done in some ways, but also projected through the years 2020. And so that's part of what we bring to the table is the ability to use our models to project out housing need.

The second goal was really to identify the existing and projected geography of workforce housing demand and there is certainly an interest in seeing within the County which is a rather large and populous County where demand might be greater for affordable housing than other places. The sense is that it will probably in need everywhere but are there particular places where there's a more or different type of need than in others. And so to the extent that we can answer that, we'll try as much as possible to get detailed sub County data. Whether it will correspond exactly with township boundaries or there will have to be some playing around with it, we'll have to see when we get the data and hopefully we'll be able to give you the most accurate data we can. And part of that will also be a commutation analysis where we'll show where people are commuting within Suffolk County in terms of where jobs are and where residences are and how much of a match there is between those locations.

And the third priority was really to •• and this was a particular interest to Legislator Schneiderman that we talked about, was to analyze the impact of the summer and second home conversion on workforce housing demand which appears to be a growing phenomena on Long Island where houses are taken out of the market for second homes or summer homes and also as a result of that creating job demand as well.

And so those are kind of the priorities that we set out as being the large questions we wanted to answer, and then I kind of set out a series of steps that CUPR would take to answer those questions based on the ability to get the data that we hope we're able to get. And the first was within the broad scope of identifying the workforce housing need, both present and future, was to define a target population and this is something that we are actively seeking input on from all of you which is at some point you have to identify the group that you think of as the target for being able to provide the housing for.

So for example, in the study we did for Westchester we just completed we had a reporting for households that made up to 50% of the median County income and then for groups up to 80% and then for up to 100%, so we kind of took different cuts at the target population, and so depending on how you define the population you're going to have a certain number of

households. And if you look at the graph that I prepared for you, which may be a little confusing but I'll try to explain it, it's basically a bar graph, a stacked bar graph which shows the total number of households in Suffolk County as of the 2000 Census, and you see that's about a little over 450,000 households, and it then breaks those households down by household income ranges which are the color-coded sections.

So what I've done is I've drawn kind of dashed lines to kind of approximate if we were to say we're going to be looking at households that are 100% of the median household income which in 2000 was 65,288, then we'd have a certain number of households that could potentially be in our study. So if we're saying that we use the median household income, we may have a little bit under 250,000 households that could potentially be considered in need of affordable housing if they meet the other criteria that we'd set forth in the study. If we set it at 50% we'd be saying that our maximum population would be about 100,000 households. So you see, depending on where you define that median income range for your target population, you've got a very broad range of potential households that could be in there and so that's going to effect, in a sense, the final need number because what you consider populations that you're concerned about being able to afford housing is going to, you know, determine what the maximum population might be that you'd look at.

So I urge you think about that carefully as we go •• as hopefully we go forward with this process and think what makes sense in terms of making sure that the households that are truly going to be in need of this housing are part of the study without necessarily really inflating the numbers by trying to look at everybody. I'm sure that we can find that for a lot of households in Suffolk County, regardless of income ranges that they might be considered cost burdened for housing; that doesn't necessarily mean that we want to design programs or policies to effect all income ranges. So that's something that I'd like to hopefully have a discussion about, if not today, obviously at some point in the future.

The demand for housing is really defined by three components. It's whether or not families are living in deficient or substandard housing which is based on certain characteristics that the Census details. It's also whether households are in crowded conditions, whether there are too many people for the amount of rooms in a particular unit. And the final, and by far usually the largest component, is the cost burden component; are people paying more than they should for housing. And so those •• when those three components are determined and added together you

get the base existing need in which case will be as of 2000.

You might recall there was a study that was done by Pearl Kemer on looking census tract by census tract at the affordability for renters and owners in both Nassau and Suffolk County and that would include all •• she looked at all owners and renters, not just those in income •constraint categories as we might be looking at. But what she found was that 35% of total renters in Suffolk County and 25% of total owners were considered cost burden in that they paid more than 35% of their household income in rent or costs. So again, depending on how we would define for this study what our targets would be, what would be considered cost burden, those numbers might differ, but it shows you somewhat the gravity of the situation at least as it existed in 2000.

The projected demand CUPR determines through a series of quantitative exercises which basically identifies the propensity for certain age groups to produce household heads and the creation of new households and then forecasts that going forward, and that's through a very complex process that we have. And then we look at the growth rate among those age groups and so we rely a lot on population projections for that group, and so that information will come from those projections.

One of the issues we're looking at is that the projections don't always match each other. There's a County projection, there's a State projection or there's a third party projection and we may have to end up doing some kind of averaging among those projections if they don't really agree, especially the further out we go the more propensity there might be for those projections to differ over time.

The next step •• once we've identified that total need population, the existing and the projected need through the year 2020 •• would be then to kind of break apart some of the characteristics of those households that would be considered a need, so we'd look at socioeconomic characteristics, we'd look at some of the housing trends that have been going on in Suffolk County and we've talked a lot about those in the lead up to this discussion. And we'd also then look at what the projected future housing supply might be, and the way we look at that is we look at what has been done previously and we say if the kind of current building trends were to continue over the period, here's what we might see at the end in terms of the percentage of new units that would be created that would be within the affordable range for our target population or not, and that would give us some idea about what's going to happen in the future.

And then we do a matching exercise. We'd say in our projected new need population, the projected demand for affordable housing or for workforce housing and we have a projected supply of workforce housing availability, we'd say how are those going to match up? And that's a very complicated process because it's not a one-for-one match, there's a lot of things that happen in terms of the matching exercise. It depends on family size, it depends on •• it could depend on location depending on the data we have, it also could depend on whether there's filtering which means that as one unit is vacated that might go to someone else, and so the potential to create more than one affordable unit with the creation of one new unit exists. There's also conversion and rehabilitation of other structures which might produce more units than actually are built. And so once we kind of take account for all those potentials, we then have a kind of projected need number and that would be kind of the global target for Suffolk County and say, "Okay, X number of units by 2020 will not be met through the market or through existing programs." And so that's kind of •• would be the target number that might inform policy decisions.

So the next section of what we'd look at would then be to say, okay, of that number, how is that broken down in terms of the geography of the County? Is it •• where is it concentrated, how does it relate to job growth in certain areas; is overcrowding concentrated in more places than other places? And so we do kind of the sub-County analysis of the concentration of housing demand. That would include the commutation study, as I said, it would also include a section on the discussion of the summer home/second home conversion and that would be I guess a lot more of a qualitative exercise which would require a lot of interview I guess with practitioners and people who know about that process in Suffolk, although also kind of comparing it with what's been written and studied elsewhere; that's a growing phenomenon in a lot of places. And then kind of come up with what I call this geographically informed analysis of workforce housing need.

So on a sub-County level, where do we see •• by 2020, how is this going to impact the need in those particular •• the unmet need in those particular areas? And at the end of the day, bringing you a report with those two major sections and hopefully answering some of the questions that you need answered. And I think that's kind of my talking through it. I hope •• it's a lot of kind of stuff to digest, I'm happy to talk about any particular part in more detail or to answer any questions you might have.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay, thank you, Dr. DiGiovanna. We'll start with Legislator Vioria•Fisher.

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

We have to strike while we can. Thank you for submitting this, I did have a chance to read it before coming here today and I do have a few questions. One of them being that you're not from the area and I'm wondering if some of the literature study that you would do is actually •• would actually turn out to be based on the many studies that have been recently demonstrating the needs for affordable housing, the need for affordable housing.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Uh•huh.

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

Most recently the second Long Island Index that was recently unveiled last week and I believe that it did give us some, if not all, of the information with regard to need, not the projections that you're speaking of regarding stock versus need and where the projections are, where those would intersect geographically where they would occur, but I haven't studied the index fully.

If you are using as part of your review of literature on the material, and I'm going to ask this very bluntly, you referred to Pearl Kamer, the Rausch Foundation has been doing studies at the Stony Brook University, the Center for Survey Research partnered with the Rausch Foundation, and actually on their nickel they did this study; why would we go to Rutgers which is, you know, of course very well reputed, why would we go Rutgers, why would we go outside of Suffolk to do this?

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Okay, I'll try to answer that question. I mean, having not seen all the things that you're referring to, I've seen a number of them, I would say that what we offer differently than what's been done is, like you said, first of all the projections which I think will be important for future planning exercises. Also, the detail on some of the characteristics of existing need, I haven't really seen out there in any of the reports that I've looked at. And of course, you know, going forward with this process, I'm eager to look at anything that's been done on Suffolk County to inform what we're doing because, you know, we have this very detailed and complex, quantitative exercise that we do but I always believe that those things are better when they're

informed by qualitative research and also looking at what's been done in other areas. So for the needs of our approach, we have a particular methodology that we go by and so in a sense we'll have to kind of re do some of those exercises to make the data work for what we need to do for our projections. That doesn't mean we would discount what other people have done or other conclusions that have been •• that people have come to based on the work that they've done, we'd incorporate them into our final report and we'd say, "Here's what the consensus is among the various stuff that's been done." Again, I don't know if there's anything that's projected to 2020, what those needs might be and how precise they are in terms of the sub•County locations for the need or the characteristics of the need, but that's what we're endeavoring to do.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can I add to that?

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I think first we have to understand that there's only so much Suffolk County can do, we have limited resources and we don't have zoning control. So we can, you know, give grants out which are going to be limited in the amount of money that we have to give grants out. We want to, just like with our open space programs, prioritize those grant programs to go where they're needed the most, not necessarily the first town that jumps up and says, "We'll take the grant," we kind of want to have a rational basis for how we allocate those grants.

Two is since most of this resides in the powers of the towns to zone, the end game here I think would be to be able to sit down with all of the town leaders and be able to go over the situation that the County is in because if the towns don't respond to the need then the County is impacted with traffic, it's impacted in so many different social economic ways. And I think it's important to bring the towns in to the table •• bring the towns to the table and sit down and say, "Okay, how can we work together to meet these needs?" And those other studies, we don't have that right now where we can bring everybody in and say •• so each town could see where they are in the regional context, and I think that's particularly important.

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

That's exactly where I was going because I don't see here that particular aspect addressed. And Legislator Alden and I went to New Jersey to look at how golf courses are run there and we saw, you know, the devil is in the details.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Uh•huh.

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

And just looking at something as •• would seem to be as simple as the running of the golf courses, we saw that because of the governmental structure there and the way the parks are structured there and how the budgeting works in the parks department and how •• they're not called trustees, what are •• the town government, what are they called; are they freeholders?

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Freeholders; County freeholders, yeah.

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

Just the governmental structure, the way the municipalities are divided, made a difference on how they were able to address that problem. And I don't see here how we would be able to address the problem that Legislator Schneiderman very correctly and aptly pointed out was the lack of zoning power that the County has. There was just a symposium •• Tom, was it only •• Jim, was it only yesterday or was it two days ago?

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

No, Monday.

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

That was held by the Long Island Housing Partnership hosted by Senator Clinton and Congressman King, and it seemed that the cry seemed to be the County doesn't hold the zoning power. And I think right now we're already trying to work with the towns and I don't know how much further this will move us in that and I'm concerned that we're going to throw more money and another study and how do we get •• the answer will remain •• the question will remain how do we get the towns to the table? Will you be addressing that here or can you address that here? I'm not certain if you have the wherewithal to really give us that kind of direction in this.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Well, I don't profess to have the answers for you right now, but I think part of what I would commit to doing as part of the study would really be to get to know how things work in Suffolk County in terms of what could be promising strategies for making that come about and putting those in the report. Things have been done elsewhere, we have the example of what's been done in Westchester, whether or not that has been as successful as they would have liked it, there was a process there that I could speak to in the report, you know, there are things that happened in other jurisdictions. And yeah, you're right, you are certainly correct to point out that the localness of •• the local specifics of how things are structured really does make a difference in terms of what's possible or what's plausible. But I also think that if you're able to go to the towns and say look •• and we were also talking about bringing the towns into it earlier in the process to get them on board with the methodology and say if we follow this methodology you'll be able to, you know, buy in and say perhaps this isn't an unrealistic number, this is not just out of the air or some very aggregate level exercise, that this really does represent an obstacle that we're facing in our future planning and our future development. And so therefore, you know, you may have more leverage to sit down with the towns and say, "How are we going to address this issue? Here's a number, you know, that to our best estimates, based on the study that we all agreed on, you'll be facing in 15 years, how are you going to get there from here and what do we need to do to make that happen? Given that we don't have these zoning powers, given that you don't have a court decision like we do in New Jersey or an executive order from the Governor like we had in New Jersey, given that you don't have these same things, what's possible and what's plausible?" So I'm happy to speak in the report and also in the work that we do up to that to what's been done elsewhere and what possibly can be done here.

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

Just one more question, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can I just speak •• just add one more thing to it? Because, one, the study does give us that geography, it does tell us on a town by town basis what the projected needs are, and let me just speak as a former Supervisor. We didn't have the resources to know what our piece or our part of the larger puzzle was. I mean, we knew that a tremendous number of the people who

were growing up in the community would have to leave, that they would never be able to purchase a house, but there was always a sense, "Well, you know, we'll be able to get workers from another community or they'll come from Southampton or Hampton Bays and if Southampton is doing the same thing, you know, the workers will come from Flanders." I think everybody has to see the picture as a whole, the whole picture, and the smaller Planning Departments really don't have the ability to do that. I think the County has a fundamental responsibility to get a grip on this problem, to get a sense of the scale of it, not just currently but into the future, and to assist the towns not necessarily in the actual policy decisions but with the data so that they can craft the policy decisions to try to respond to those needs. So I think as a former Supervisor this data will be extremely helpful.

I would like to know what East Hampton's projected needs are for housing as well as Southampton's. And I certainly would not want to see one town responding to the need and nobody else, so I think that all the supervisors kind of have to come together in their town boards and say, "We'll do our share or we'll do a percentage of our share," and figure out how they're going to do it. I certainly don't want to tell anyone how they should meet those demands, but I think it's important that they know what those demands are.

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

I truly admire your optimism that data will help drive the process rather than just politics. Because we've seen towns who still refuse to acknowledge that there's any need with all of the data that has been presented, and there's been quite a bit of data presented in the last decade.

But my last question, one of the things that we are trying to get our arms around here in Suffolk County is the reconfiguration of the suburban landscape, smart growth is one way it's turned, the new urbanization of suburbia, density in appropriate places, land management. You know, we have seen this in Virginia, you know, there was an example of Arlington, Virginia working within this kind of paradigm, Montgomery, in Montgomery County in Maryland. How hard are you going to look at the geography in those terms, the hubs, the density, the centralized dense areas?

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Well, again, depending on the availability of the data, I can give you as much detail or not as you would like in the study. And certainly my goal through the study would be to be as familiar with the geography of Suffolk County, or I guess to refamiliarize myself with the geography of

Suffolk County as much as possible. And you know, I think very few states are probably doing as much as New Jersey is doing in terms of smart growth and that kind of policy and program, so I think there's a definite advantage to the experience that we've had in doing work for New Jersey and we have been the center of that service, the State Plan Association. So I think there's a lot that we can bring to the table in terms of bringing that perspective on to it.

I also want to comment just briefly on what else we bring new. And I think in the studies that I've seen that you mentioned, I haven't seen the second index yet but I've seen the first one and I really didn't see in there •• what I saw in there were very, very good detailed analysis of census tracked data for the affordability based on ownership costs or rental costs. Now, it doesn't take into account any of the other characteristics that we talked about and I think the danger in that is the number becomes so large when you're just looking at it with that very broad stroke, that that really turns people off and they say, "Wow, 90,000 units, how can we do that?" You know, it's just impossible or it's just •• and that's just to start, that's not even projected.

So I think the approach that we bring is a lot more detailed and a lot more balanced in terms of saying yes, we can expect that there will be supply created, even by the market. You know, there is going to be this filtering, there are going to be other things that will happen that will hopefully alleviate some of this problem so it doesn't become such an unworkable problem. And I think that encourages buying a little bit more than just, you know, throwing out a large number which I think is important to call attention to the crisis, but when you're getting down to the nitty gritty of policy decisions, to be able to have a figure and say you know what, it's not as out of reach as we thought it was going to be. It still will be a problem, you know, I'm not trying to minimize that at all.

**LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Alden?

**LEG. ALDEN:**

I think it might be helpful, and maybe Jim would have a different idea on this or maybe the

same idea, but as we go through the process of trying to select a company or individual to do this survey for us or this study, that we somehow reach out to the towns and see what they might need included or excluded from the survey to get them to maybe come on board with a Countywide process. Otherwise, you know, we might be doing something that would turn up a whole bunch of data and the towns might say, "Well, we need something a little bit differently done," and I think to coordinate it, we have an opportunity right now. And Jay, you served on that Board of Supervisors, right, or the Supervisor's Association?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Both, yes.

**LEG. ALDEN:**

So maybe we could reach out through them and just see if they might •• but you're going to find, you know, like some towns like Islip, Islip is always first, always leading the way and they absolutely did that in affordable housing and workfare housing; they might want to see certain things included in data and other things might be irrelevant to them. So we might be able to, while we're looking to pick a company to do this, you know, put together some of the different needs from the towns. And I realize there could be a political aspect to it, too, but certainly Jim's got a lot of experience, too, working with different towns and maybe if we just, you know, felt them out a little bit more prior to our making an award of the contract, then I think we might have a better product in the end.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Well, yeah, I was going to say, I don't know that you need to do it in that area order. You know, I mentioned this actually to Dr. Digiovanna earlier that, you know, should he be hired, I would like him to meet with the Suffolk County Supervisor's Association early on in the process. Because if they're going at the end, the towns, when they hear their numbers, are going to start questioning the methodology, we're going to have a problem on our hands. And I'd rather have them write in right from the start as partners in this study rather than adversaries.

**DR. DIGIOVANNA:**

And if I can respond to that. Also, you know, the scope of the study that we outlined is not meant to be cast in stone. I mean, the way we always work at Center for Urban Policy

Research is we, you know, we can add or subtract to the study as we progress, as we find that the needs might change or what's demanded of us might change. So I'm certainly open to working, you know, to adding into that or to take whatever concerns the towns might have and try to address them as best we can, whether it's through us or whether it's through working in partnership with some of the researchers in Suffolk County who have done some of the work. So I'm completely open to that.

I will say, though, that one thing you said was important in that you mentioned, for example, Islip being successful at providing affordable housing; we want to make sure in the study that that shows through.

**LEG. ALDEN:**

But that was a little self-serving because Mea Knapp actually served on the Town of Islip Community Development Agency as the General Counsel and I was her gofer for a number of years.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Right, okay. But it is an important point because, you know, one of the things that often gets frustrating when you just do an aggregated County assessment is, you know, you say, "Okay, we've got this much affordable housing need or workforce housing need and we're going to just divvy it up among the townships," and you know, a place like Islip might say, "Hey, wait, we've been doing a good job all along, why should we get more of this or more than maybe what •• it's not taking into account what we've done already." And so that's an important part of what we're able to do, too, is look at what's happened in the past and say okay. And for example, when we did the study for Westchester, one of the things they said was, "You need to acknowledge those that were successful in meeting some of their targets" and, you know, therefore that counts against maybe the future needs. So that might be something a place like Islip might be particularly interested in seeing in the study and we're certainly open to that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I have a question regarding the Pearl Kamer Report which you mentioned before which looked at cost burden, cost burden houses and you came up with a number of •• it was a pretty high number, 90,000; that probably startled a lot of people. I guess my question is, one, how will the study differ and if you could comment on that number and what some of the assumptions

may have been and how we can improve upon them.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Okay. Well, I have read the report and I looked over the report, there were •• there was not a lot of methodology that was in the report that I read that was detailed. But it appears to be a very good analysis, a census track by census track data on the affordability of housing based on ownership costs or rental costs, and so that gives you the very large potential population of cost burdened households.

So the way that we define housing need or the way that, you know, a lot of people who have done this or have to find housing need, that's one component of it is cost burden, but that is of the total population. So for example, if someone making twice the median income, you know, chooses to buy a house which may have mortgage payments in excess of 35% of their take home pay that they admit on the census form, they might be considered cost burdened, but in our system they wouldn't necessarily be there because we have a lower cutoff in terms of the median income. So it's not •• you know, if you take the whole population you could get a lot of household units that have particular situations.

The other thing to consider is that there are many reasons why owners of various income levels might consider taking on a higher household cost burden because interest payments are lower, because real estate investment has provided a bigger return than the markets recently. So there's a whole number of behavioral and decision making things that go into that where if you just take the total figure of just cost burden without regard to income, without regard to anything else, we might get a bit of a skewed number. So I'm not saying any of those things are true or they're significant, but our methodology will filter out •• will focus only on the targeted income groups who really are not making so much money and having trouble meeting those mortgage payments or those rental payments.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you. Cameron.

**LEG. ALDEN:**

I'm just going to point out to the Chairman, I'm not actually an official member of this and I'm not sure you have a quorum to vote on the assignment of it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Well, we can't vote but we conduct this interview.

**LEG. ALDEN:**

No, but I'm just saying if, you know ••

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'd like to •• no, I'm sorry. Thank you, I appreciate it and you have to go, I'll sit here by myself with Mea. I'd like to give Jim Morgo and Marion Zucker and anyone else, Todd, if you have any questions for

Mr. DiGiovanna while he's here.

**LEG. ALDEN:**

And Jim and Marion, I apologize for leaving, your comments are probably very important but ••

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

They'll be on the record so you can read them.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

Thank you for staying as long as you did.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Does Mr. Caracciolo have an excused absence, is he ill?

**MS. KENNEDY:**

Yes, he's excused.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Just for the record, we'll give Legislator Caracciolo an excused absence for today's meeting.

Okay, Commissioner Morgo.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

Good afternoon, Legislator Schneiderman, Counsel to the Legislature, Ms. Knapp and everyone else.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It's a small committee to begin with.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

I know. I do want to say some things because I read the report and I listened to Dr. DiGiovanna just now intently.

I, too, as you know, Legislator, when the proposal for the study was first made, questioned the need. And I cited the other studies; in fact, I cited the Long Island Housing Partnership Study that was performed by Pearl Kamer, Dr. Kamer, as being very comprehensive. However, after I read the proposal and thought about the same kind of things that Legislator Fisher spoke about, also in context of the Suburban Evolution Conference that occurred on Monday, I came to some conclusions and there are things in the study, of the proposal at least •• and if they come to fruition I will be very happy about •• that I particularly like, and the main thing is the geographically informed analysis.

I've never been known as being overly optimistic, but I do think it would be worth while if we know what each municipality has done in regard to homes that its workers can afford and what it needs to do. Now, I don't mean to imply that we will impose some mandates on each town because that would be a formula for disaster. But I think through getting this information out and showing what really needs to be done to keep the young people of any particular municipality •• and I mean every village, every township in Suffolk County •• to keep those young people close to home and close to jobs and close to their parents, I think that would be very worth while.

I would argue with one implication that was made earlier. I believe you said that you would be able to see how much would be a fair share for each particular municipality, how much each village, if some has done more •• if some town has done more than other towns then we can say, well, that town would have to do more; that's kind of the New Jersey experience. I would quarrel with that because implicit in that is that there's something not favorable about workforce homes; it almost says there's something bad about keeping our young people close

to us, getting our kids out of our basements and our attics. I think in many of the towns that have done quite a bit, those workforce homes have been a real boost to their populations and their economies; one only has to look at downtown Bay Shore for that. So I do like it, I very much like the idea that we'll know which townships have done a lot, which have done a little and what needs to be done. And I think that through the power of influence that information could be very valuable, and I don't know of any other study in Suffolk County where we can find that information.

I also like the commutation idea of it because when we are faced with the kind of sprawling traffic that we are, having people have the ability to live close to where they work, that would be very valuable as well. So those are things that I thought were particularly favorable.

One of the things that I spoke to you about previously, and I don't know what you can do about this, but the data that you're going to use to get where we are now, not the projections, to get where we are now is going to be the 2000 Census. Well, as I said, the study that was referred to as the Pearl Kamen Study which should be referred to as the Long Island Housing Partnership Study, was done in 2002 and it used 2000 data and it was already out of date. And the other thing when you talk about analyzing housing stock, one of the things that we were not able to do with The Housing Partnership is analyze those units that were being used as apartments but were not to code or, in fact, illegal. If we could do something to try to find out how many folks are getting homes or places to live they can afford but are doing so in illegal apartments, I think that would be very valuable as well and if we can break that down town by town, I think that would also be valuable.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's a challenging one.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

Yeah, I know it is, but I really think it would give us the full picture.

The other thing I think that everybody in Suffolk County knows is that as far as producing these homes, that people that under 80% of median can afford or people even at under 120% of the median can afford, there's an unequal playing field that's not anyone's fault and the reason •• as you well know, Jay •• is because 70% of Suffolk County doesn't have sewers. And if you're

going to build homes that are affordable and you factor in the cost of land, you can only build them if you get a density that makes them affordable, but you can't get that density because of our single source aquifer without some waste water disposal system that doesn't imperil our drinking water.

We have, as you well know, the Transfer of Development Rights Program, but that's not a high density program, even if it's used to its optimum it won't be a high density program. If you are going to do a subdivision and you have to build a sewage treatment plant, immediately that increases the cost of each unit's rental cost or ownership cost. So I think that would be something to look at.

So as I said, to just recap, in our discussions, Legislator, when you made the point to me that what you're looking for is a town by town, village by village breakdown of where we are and where we should go and if we have that information, I do think that would be valuable and I don't think that's duplicative. I share Legislator Fisher's concern if then we'll get the townships to respond; I think some towns will certainly, some villages will, we see the response of the Village of Patchogue and others going on now. So that's where I am. And as I said to you earlier, I really do •• I know it's on the record, this is different subject •• well, it's not a different subject really •• the Community Development Block Grant proposal in President Bush's budget.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can we do that in a little bit; would you mind?

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

Yeah, yeah, but I just want to make sure we do get to that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah, I absolutely will give you as much time as you want on that. I guess I'm it, it's Mea and I, we'll listen as long as you want to talk; and if you want another opportunity at a future time I certainly will welcome that, too. Doctor, did you want to respond to any of that?

**DR. DIGIOVANNA:**

Just briefly in that I believe I mentioned fair share, when I used that language I was referring to what Westchester had done. You know, one of the things I really don't want to get into is

that kind of assigning to municipalities what they should or shouldn't do. My goal is to give you the best information I can about if nothing is done, this is going to be the unmet demand. And then, you know, you, through your process and whatever you're able to do, can work out what people should do or what are appropriate targets for those communities, or they can decide for themselves what those would be.

The other comment is, you know, where you see problems or obstacles which are •• which I certainly will take into consideration when looking at provision of future supply in terms of sewer infrastructure provision, I see leverage. I see an opportunity to say, well, if you want •• if we can institute a program whereby we can help offset the cost of sewer production, maybe a certain part of that new development has to be workforce housing. So again, there's lots of ways in which other communities, other jurisdictions have used those kinds of leverage and those kinds of innovative programs to use both between carrots and sticks to get people to build.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I would like to add to that, too, that in terms of meeting the unmet demand, it doesn't necessitate only the construction of new units. I mean, you certainly can do accessory apartments within houses, it would I would think meet a significant number of demand without creating necessarily the need for sewage treatment. You may be able to do grant programs and things that make some of the existing housing stock more affordable and loan programs, you know ••

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

I mean, in a facetious way ••

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's obviously going to be a certain number of new units being constructed, but not all of it's going to be new units, I think some of it could be existing units becoming affordable.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

Let me react because •• react to several things; if we can have a dialogue here, that would be good.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Oh, yeah, absolutely.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

You know we always react to things because of our past everything, is in context. So the fair share concept is one that frankly makes me nuts because I was a developer of workforce homes and every place that we developed the homes they improved the neighborhoods. And when I hear people saying, you know, referring •• and I understand why, I understand, because they're not talking about the same kind of homes that The Housing Partnership created.

On the point of the sewers I agree completely. In fact, the County Executive in his Capital Program for this year and two years going forward past this year, has exactly what you're talking about, a grant program that will give infrastructure improvements as long as at least 20% of the development is workforce. And for your point, Jay, absolutely. One of the things that also makes me crazy is when somebody comes up with a solution for the workforce housing program, you know, as if inclusionary zoning or transfer of development rights or infrastructure improvements are going to solve the problem. There is no one solution, there's no silver bullet and you really have to use all these tools. So, you know, I especially agree with the accessory apartments and the rehabs, you have to do all those things, and new construction.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I just one •• you said a town by town, village by village breakdown and I'm not sure that we're going to be able to get a village by village, but I think to zone in at least on a town basis as a regional subunit might be more practical. Maybe Dr. DiGiovanna can answer that.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Well, the scope that I prepared was based on, you know, the initial work we discussed and, you know, within budgetary constraints, right. We can do a lot more qualitative research to get better data for the town by town, village by village, I think that would be really interesting. I'm not sure how it would effect the budget and the time frame and all that kind of stuff.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

Well, there are 31 villages, maybe some selected villages at least.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Maybe, it's possible; that's something we can talk about in refining this.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

And I'm certainly open to expanding the scope to do that, I think that would be very interesting to do and, you know, I'll endeavor to include as much of that as possible.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

A contrast between, oh, I don't know, let's say Patchogue and the Village of Belle Terre, that might be interesting.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

As the moderator here, let me get Marion Zucker into this conversation here.

**MS. ZUCKER:**

I have one •• is this on?

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

I think they can hear you.

**MS. ZUCKER:**

Right, there's not that many people.

**MS. MAHONEY:**

No, no, no.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Marion, is the mike •• the switch should be towards you.

Marion Zucker is the Director of our Division of Housing within our Housing and Economic Development •• Department of Housing and Economic Development •• Workforce Housing & Economic Development; whatever.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

That's good.

**MS. ZUCKER:**

There's one wish list item I'd actually like to see in the report, if possible. Because it seems to me that you're taking a look at housing stock characteristics and housing and household characteristics, and one of the issues that's facing us here in Suffolk County is that employers can't attract and retain their employees. So there's this kind of unmet or uncounted demand for workforce housing units by the employers and we have •• you know, unless we were to go by employer by employer, have no way of getting our hands around what that need is and by just looking at households that are here and housing stock that's here, we're not going to get a picture of that.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

One of the things we actually discussed was being •• one of the things we can do is try and get data from New York State to get the fully disclosed data on employment figures through the Unemployment Insurance Program to get a handle on exactly where the number of jobs in each of the towns and villages in Suffolk County and how that's changed over time, and that could give us a really good idea of where the demand is being created or has been going. And maybe that's been curtailed a bit because of the housing shortage, but it certainly points to where the trend would go and it allows you to kind of say to those communities, you know, if you want more jobs, you know, here's the potential drag on having those jobs because you don't have the housing stock to support it or something. So that was kind of our wish list, too, was to be able to get •• and I think if the County would approve •• approves of that use of the data and makes the case to the State, then they can allow us to use that data in a confidential way so that we can have that kind of detailed data. My background is really in economic develop, so I'm really excited about being able to do that.

**MS. ZUCKER:**

Oh, there you go.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Yeah.

**MS. ZUCKER:**

That was it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

No other questions? Counsel has asked me a question and I don't know if I'll phrase it right, the question is how do you get at how many would come to Long Island to work but aren't now because of the high cost of housing?

**MS. ZUCKER:**

That's kind of the same •• yeah, it's a piece of the same question.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Did I state that correctly?

**MS. KNAPP:**

I have actually a very personal reason for asking this question, my oldest son is living in Syracuse and works for a very •• works for a large, you know, nationwide company and makes a very good salary, he makes about \$100,000 a year, and he was offered the Long Island region and rejected it because he can't afford to buy a house; very personal.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Right. I'm not sure that we could really ever get a handle on that because, you know, short of doing a nationwide survey and saying, "Would you like to live in Suffolk County and how's housing costs?"

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

What we see in my office, as recently as last week we had a company who was thinking of relocating here, 50 high paying jobs, but the cost of both rental and ownership is scaring them away. You know, a lot of that is anecdotal, but it's always •• well, the first question is usually real estate taxes, the second question is where are my employees going to live.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

I can certainly speak with chambers of commerce and business organizations to say, you know, how much •• you know, what have you been hearing from employees and potential hires about this stuff? But again, it would be qualitative, it wouldn't necessarily be authoritative but it certainly speaks to kind of addressing the concern that people have that, you know •• and you know, we've seen this in New Jersey as well, it's a similar phenomenon. You know, so I think it definitely can be highlighted in the report, I'm not sure to what extent we could do a really

thorough ••

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

We could give you •• Economic Development & Workforce Housing could give you many companies that call us and the County Executive's Yaphank proposal caused companies to call and say what are we doing and how can we get involved. So we could give you those companies and you can see what they're trying to do.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Well, I could tell you, Jim, when I was Supervisor of East Hampton and we were •• I was trying to fill positions, we hired some 700 people, particularly management level positions but even, you know, other Civil Service positions, we could not fill them. You know, a lot of those jobs paid \$20,000 and you just simply couldn't find housing. Even though we had a law on the books that town employees had to live in the town, virtually none of the new hires were living in the town because they simply couldn't. But I would find as time went on that we had to go further and further away to get people, you know, to various areas, whether they're from Mastic/Shirley or areas where there were still more affordable housing. And the schools were going through the same thing, they couldn't find teachers. You know, and we were losing that sense that teachers couldn't go to the plays at night because they didn't live in the community, you know, they had less involvement in those students lives and it impacted the community and that was sad as well, besides all the time on the roads and the traffic and the air quality that gets degraded by all those car trips. I mean, there were just so man •• you know, so many facets, you know, that grow out of the lack of housing.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

The commutation will get into some of that.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Some of that.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

But I'd certainly like to see what exists already in terms of studies that maybe the business

community in New York has done or, you know, New York State has done on ••

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

But I guess what I'm saying in terms of like getting the information that Jim is saying, besides the companies, you can talk to your towns, you can talk to your schools, you can talk to your bigger employers and I think they all will tell you very similar stories about how difficult it is.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

One option that people might be comfortable with in terms of answering some of these questions is to do •• in addition to the kind of quantitative work, is to do a series maybe of focus groups to get that informed feedback from key constituents in Suffolk County that would then influence the report. I mean, the numbers are one thing but the context that we put it in can be really informed by some of this focus group work or some of interviews. Again, I'm open to all those kinds of options for getting into it and, you know, I enjoy that stuff so I think that •

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I was going to say as an employer, too, I think you •• though a school is not going to close down, but some of these other businesses, they reach breaking points where they simply can't pay their workers more and continue to be competitive and, you know, they leave, they leave Long Island, those that can, others fold. And there's obviously a huge impact on our regional economy.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

We just had a company who •• its manufacturing arm is leaving, its executive office is staying on Long Island but they're relocating all their manufacturing off Island because of exactly that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right. You know, the Rausch Study points to this and it looks at between 18 and 34 years old, what percentage of that group is leaving. But if we did an economic analysis, I think you're going to find a lot of your middle and high wagers leaving, and potentially a big chunk of your future tax base to pay for the infrastructure and programming that we'll need for, you know, those who remain. It's going to be challenging. Any other questions?

All right, Jim, both of you, if you want to continue to refine the scope with Mister •• with Dr.

Digiovanna, that's fine and make some of these changes. What I'd like to do is move this forward; Obviously I can't do anything today. We did •• and I'll Counsel this question briefly •• because your proposal came in at \$65,000 and I understand because of the expanded scope of the program, our approved resolution was for \$50,000. So I will need to amend the resolution to adjust for the additional \$15,000 and bring it forth •• does it have to come back; it won't remain in committee, right, to the full Legislature. Can you talk procedurally about what would be involved with hiring Rutgers?

**MS. KNAPP:**

I think what I would envision would be a Procedural Motion for the Legislature that would outline the process and the fact that there was one respondent and the reaction to that respondent put in the money that would cover this scope of services, if that's what you want to do.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. And Jim, you would be willing to come back to the Legislature and advocate on behalf of the Rutgers group? I would appreciate that.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

Yeah, I would hope we would be •• we'll talk in between the times.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Could we have a different •• a refined version of the scope or would that ••

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**DR. DiGIOVANNA:**

Okay.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

But if the price changes, obviously I need to know. And what the scope is, I would like to attach it to the resolution at some point.

**MS. KNAPP:**

Uh•huh.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Now, that scope may change slightly after you meet with some of the stakeholders, you know, the Supervisors may want additional information and we'll have to I guess cross that bridge when we get there; if they're adding greatly to the study, we may need to revisit the compensation end of it.

Okay, anything else? Okay, I guess I'm stuck here forever. Do I need a second to adjourn? I don't have •• how does that work?

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

I wanted to talk about CDB, Jay, I think you should know that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Oh, okay. Well, we can have that conversation here. Dr. Digiovanna, if you want to leave at this point or if you want to stay, I think you may find this next bit of information quite interesting pertaining to the work that you do. Commissioner Morgo?

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

Legislator, as you probably know, President Bush's budget was released on Monday and his budget would eliminate the Community Development Block Grant Program.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

In entirety?

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

Yeah and he would replace it with a new program that is intended to carry out the activities of 18 existing economic and community development programs. The new program is funded at \$40 million, that's less than the amount spent on CDBG alone last year.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's 40 million New York State or 40 million national?

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

National. In sum he took 18 programs, slashed more than 5.6 million a year in the administration budget, slashes the investment by 33%. You •• I know, Mea, you are familiar with CDBG in your days, it's one of the most successful programs run by HUD. It's a program with a mission designated to provide decent housing, a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for low and moderate income people, principally for people under 80% of median income.

Replacing CDBG and 17 other Federal economic development programs, would be a targeted 3.71 billion, the whole program would be \$3.71 billion and it's called Strengthening America's Communities Initiative and it would be administered by the State. So CDBG would go away, there would be •• it would be \$40 million less than what was spent just by CDBG last year nationally and in this new Strengthening America's Community Initiatives. And you've got to give the President credit for being creative with the way he names things. If you remember his environmental program and his No Child Left Behind, the grand •• what really is troubling about the new program is that it's criteria on who would get the money would completely eliminate the suburbs, our most suburbs. It would be based on three criteria; loss of jobs, families below the poverty level and unemployment levels. And while there would be some census tracts on Long Island that would qualify, they're not part of a jurisdiction. For example, if you took a low income area like Wyandanch in the Town of Babylon, that would probably qualify on unemployment levels, poverty and loss of jobs, but you can't go by Wyandanch because Wyandanch is not a designated Community Development Block Grant area; actually it's an unincorporated hamlet. So that you would have to judge by the entire Town of Babylon.

One of the things that Senator Clinton was talking about on Monday was the score communities, revitalizing the suburbs; this would totally kill that. The only areas that would get money would be inner cities and it's an incredibly destructive program. Joe Sanseverino who is the Community Development Director was going to be with me today, with Me and Marion, but he was unable to come and he prepared something that I gave you on what this slashing would do to Long Island, it's incredibly destructive and ••

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What can we do about it?

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

I was thinking of a Sense of the Legislature.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay, I'll have Mea prepare one and I'll introduce it. We missed this cycle, the late petitions.

**MS. KNAPP:**

No, Senses don't have a time line. We will do that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Oh, Sense doesn't have a time.

**MS. KNAPP:**

We will do that.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I will have one for the next Legislative meeting.

**MS. KNAPP:**

I'm sorry, I didn't see the material that you brought from Joe.

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

From Joe? I have it here.

**MS. KNAPP:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay, we'll make sure Mea gets a copy and we'll prepare that. Also, can we do a resolution to hire Rutgers? That has to go through the cycle? That's Procedural and that doesn't have a filing deadline either, right, so we'll have ••

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

You know, I want to mention that I have discussed this with Steve through e-mails and I'm sure he would join on a Sense of the Legislature on the sense of it. Because this is just the

Community Development Block Grant Programs, there are other economic development programs and everything that have also been slashed, but this one grabbed my attention.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay, thank you, Jim. I hope that people read our Sense Resolution. Is there anything else that we can do to help fight this one ••

**COMMISSIONER MORGO:**

It's our Congressional Delegation that we're going to really need, so however you can get to them.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Good, thank you. Anyone else? I'll make a motion and a second to adjourn. Thank you all.

***(\*The meeting was adjourned at 3:07 P.M.\*)***

***Legislator Jay Schneiderman, Chair.  
Ad Hoc Committee on Workforce Housing***