LABOR, WORKFORCE & AFFORDABLE HOUSING COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Labor, Workforce and Affordable Housing Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on March 10, 2008.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Leg. Kate M. Browning, Chairperson
Leg. Ricardo Montano, Vice-Chairman
Leg. Daniel Losquadro (not present)
Leg. Jay H. Schneiderman
Leg. Brian Beedenbender

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Alicia Howard, Clerk's Office
Joe Muncey, Budget Review Office
Jill Moss, Budget Review Office
Ben Zwirn, Deputy County Executive
Jim Morgo, Chief Deputy County Executive
Joe Sanseverino, Community Development Director
Michael White, Executive Director of the Long Island Regional Planning Board
Bob Martinez, Aide to Leg. Montano
Linda Bay, Aide to Minority Leader
Paul Perillie, Aide to Majority Leader
Debra Alloncius, AME Legislative Director
Brendan Chamberlain, County Executive Aide
Rick Brand, Newsday
Catherine Stark, Aide to Leg. Schneiderman
All other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:
Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:
Denise Weaver, Legislative Aide

(THE MEETING COMMENCED AT 11:17 AM)

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Can we have all the Legislators here at the horseshoe for Labor, Workforce and Affordable Housing? Okay. We'll start with the Pledge of Allegiance, Legislator Beedenbender.

(SALUTATION)

Good morning. We have a presentation. We have Jim Morgo. Oh, there you are. And Michael White will do a presentation. I asked them to come on the -- say this, "Downstate Suburban Workforce Housing for Economic Sustainability Act."

MR. MORGO:
Nicely done.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Thank you, Jim.

MR. MORGO:
Good morning everybody. And I thank you for this opportunity. Actually you have to settle because this presentation was supposed to be done by Jill Rosen-Nikoloff, who is the Director of Affordable Housing, but she's out today. And so you get sloppy seconds with me. However, you do have the Executive Director of the Long Island Regional Planning Board, Michael White, and you have the Community Development Director, Joe Sanseverino, here to answer questions.

I'd like to give you a quick summary of the bill. And I think it's important to start with context and how this bill came about. It really began last October -- October, in fact, of 2006. And the County Executive and I had been talking about the lack of planning when it comes to creating workforce homes. The way workforce homes have been created in this County and in most of the suburbs has been that every jurisdiction that controls land use, and that is every village, every town, would act pretty much on their own. Some would do a great deal. Some towns and villages would do a great deal and some would do absolutely nothing.

And in some of the research we were doing we found that in other parts of the country, in the northeast and also in places like Nebraska and Arizona, the need for homes that workers could afford would be part of those places' regional plans. There would be regional planning documents. There would be state planning documents. And the need for homes workers could afford would also always be part of those plans.

So in October of '06 I went to the Regional Planning Board and talked about some comprehensive look at the need for housing on a regional level, not just on every local village or towns level. And it was well received. This -- in fact it was before Michael was even hired by the Regional Planning Board.

Shortly thereafter, in January of '07, I was invited to go to a meeting of the RPA, the Regional Planning Association. The RPA called it a -- the point of fact is -- continue this chronology -- we went to the RPA and the RPA asked planners and housing people from the city to get with housing and planning people from the suburbs to see if we could work together in creating affordable homes in our respective regions.

And the thing after one meeting we learned is that we couldn't. The -- creating workforce homes, affordable housing in the five boroughs is completely different from creating it on Long Island. As you know, Mayor Bloomberg has set ambitious goals. There's been a great deal of workforce homes created in the five boroughs both for rent and for sale. We have not had similar successes in the suburbs. Not just this suburb, as a matter of fact. The downstate suburbs surrounding the five boroughs. They are all facing the problem that we are facing, the loss of our young, the need to get people into jobs, the jobs are there. The young people to work in these jobs have not been created.

So in a second meeting of this group in February of '07, we decided for the suburbs to work together as a region. And fortuitously we discovered that Connecticut, like as much of the northeast, facing the same kind of problem, has come up -- came up with legislation, which was a Housing Opportunities Act for the State of Connecticut. And we looked at that bill. And the main point of the bill was a point that we have here on Long Island; is that you can't create workforce homes without density. With the cost of land being what it is, if you could only put one or two homes on an acre, you're never going to create workforce homes.

And the motive behind the Connecticut bill was to get density to get zoning off the table. So seven Counties came together working in the city. And those Counties were Dutchess, Nassau, Orange, Putnam, Rockland, Suffolk and Westchester. And although those Counties have many similarities, they are also different.

And we looked at the bill as a regional approach to the loss of our young. The bill links, and this a key point, economic development, the need for workers, the need for good planning and the creation of workforce homes. And the principal that's used behind the bill to get zoning off the table is that municipalities that give the density necessary to create the workforce homes will receive incentives. The bill has been simplistically characterized as the incentive bill. It's far more complex than that. It requires -- it requires each municipality to have a goal based on many different factors for the number of workforce homes it either needs to create or preserve.

One quick thing, the County of Westchester where land costs are higher than they are in Suffolk County, has been facing this problem. And Westchester actually several years ago put together goals for every single town and village within Westchester. Gave it a number. This was about 11 years ago. And every year there is a report card. And there's a report by a not-for-profit how each town and village is doing.

There was recently a -- an article in the Times Real Estate section about a affluent village in New Castle up in Westchester. And it mentioned that this goal is something that the people who are trying to create workforce homes in this village are using. Many developers use these goals when they bring suit against the municipality by saying that they have not reached this particular number. You know, this is something that we've talked about. And, in fact, Westchester asked could their -- the goals that they've already created be used as part of this legislation. And the answer is yes. And I know that you commissioned a study that was recently released by Rutgers and I'm told has done exactly the same thing. We would not have to create a new one. That could be part of this legislation.

So every village or town gets a goal. And then the towns that agree to create the density required -- let me quickly tell about this. We worked on this bill with these folks from the different Counties for over a year. And it went through many iterations. We set originally standard numbers of units per acre. For example, with attached homes we wanted to see 16 units per acre, which happens to be the number of units per acre for this development right here, which is Copper Beach Village, as a matter of fact. We went back and forth with the different people from the different Counties.

Finally what the bill, as you have it before you says, that in order to get the incentives, a town or village has to come up with zoning that is 25% more than what you otherwise would have had that would have been as of right. And it breaks it down that way.

We -- those of us from Suffolk and Nassau compromised with these folks. We wanted a higher density. Some of them in Putnam and Dutchess sought 16 units an acre, which by the way if the design is a good design, it looks not particularly dense, it looks as a very liveable, walkable kind of community when you see that. All you got to do is look at Copper Beach Village to see that, but we compromised.

The -- we also compromised on affordability standards. What we used as the portion that's considered affordable has to be affordable. Half of it for folks under 80% of median, half for folks under 120% of median. We wanted for any incentives to be given at least 50% of the development to be affordable under those standards that I just mentioned, which is exactly what Copper Beach Village is. However, the -- we compromised and said at least 20% has to be affordable. The more -- the higher percentage that's affordable, the greater the extent of the incentives.

One thing we did not compromise on, and folks in Planning and Housing were very happy we did not compromise on this, the percentage that is affordable can't be designated as age restricted. If you've had anything to do with housing you know why that's a very important thing that we would not compromise on.

So this is the way the bill would work. And the incentives are -- there would be a one time payment for each workforce housing unit building permit. So when the municipality grants a building permit just for the affordable, there'd be a one time cash payment. Have we decided on how much that would be?

MR. WHITE:
We'd post 5,000.

MR. MORGO:
$5,000 incentive to the municipality. There would also be zero interest infrastructure loans to the municipality. There would be a school reimbursement for the net increase in cost that the school district can prove is due to the affordable housing. There would be planning grants to the municipalities and to not-for-profits to work on the needed planning.

The bill is comprehensive. It's -- if any of you are familiar with the -- I know you should be, Jay, from the Workforce Housing Commission, Massachusetts has chapter 40R, that right now is very similar to this. It's planning based, it's Smart Growth based and right now there are 12 different workforce housing developments going on in Massachusetts.

The bill has been filed. It has an Assembly sponsor and it has a Senate sponsor and it has numbers in both. We've had a lot of good press on this. Unfortunately, with Jill being out we put what you have in front of you, we put it together quickly. There was an editorial in support in the New York Times, a very strong editorial. I'll get that to you. And many other articles as well.

What we're looking for is a home rule message in support of this bill. I should mention without our asking for it -- oh, no, in Southold, Michael went out to Southhold and Southold passed a resolution in support. Huntington passed a resolution in support without our asking for it. And we're just beginning now and I don't know, Legislator Browning, if you asked Jill or Jill asked you for the opportunity, but we welcome the opportunity and we'd like to answer any questions that you have as well. Oh look, we do have the editorial.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. One of the questions I do have because I know that Copper Beach, they have a sewerage treatment plant. One of the concerns is I know you're talking about Yaphank development, there's a sewage treatment plant. When you move further out east, like Jay's district and mine, how do we provide this affordable housing when we don't have sewage treatment plants?

MR. MORGO:
You can't. However, what this bill addresses are the loans, zero interest infrastructure loans for -- certainly it's a sewage treatment plant is infrastructure. It address that issue. You know, both Supervisor Bellone and Mayor Pontieri -- Supervisor Bellone of Babylon and Mayor Pontieri of

Patchogue have weighed in on this bill and they both made the same point. Whenever there is community resistance to a workforce housing project development, the community will often say, you know, increased traffic or a burden to our infrastructure. This bill says, well, that may be, there may be that kind of impact, but we will provide the way to mitigate that.

So on the question of sewers, you're not going to create the density in Suffolk County particularly when we get all our drinking water from our ground, from our aquifers, without sewage treatment plants. This will provide the low cost or no cost loans to create that infrastructure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. And, oh, I believe you had a question.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. I'll let Rick ask you a question.

LEG. MONTANO:
Good morning, Jim.

MR. MORGO:
Good morning.

LEG. MONTANO:
Morning. Yeah, sorry I got here late. I had a little minor emergency. I didn't hear the first part of your presentation. I don't know how long you've been speaking before I got here. I was going to ask you the question about the incentives. And I think you answered that. But I just want to be clear that the incentives for this type of rezoning -- first let me back track. Does Suffolk County have a similar plan or report in terms of the goals that each municipality and village should reach in terms of its housing or is that something you're going to be working on?

MR. MORGO:
No, I'm hoping that we can use the plan that the Legislature came up with.

LEG. MONTANO:
The study that Jay and I sponsored?

MR. MORGO:
Yeah.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
No, that has been updated with village data.

MR. MORGO:
That's what Jill told me.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'm just looking at it for the first time so we'll have to figure out whether --

MR. MORGO:
Michael, do you want to go on with that because Michael is going to be -- has been handling the

planning aspect of this.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
No, I know, I know. I'm just saying that it has been updated with the village data.

LEG. MONTANO:
Right. Okay.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah, I got an e-mail from Jill telling me that, Jay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah.

MR. WHITE:
Just to add it does -- it would require the --

LEG. MONTANO:
Speak louder. Put the mike on, the bottom in front of you at the top.

MR. WHITE:
Got it. Yes, the bill does require effectively establishment of a council to direct these sorts of plans. But with municipalities within the five Counties that would be participating, if there already is existing plans, this question came up in Westchester and now we're looking at it in Suffolk where there is a plan coming forward that establishes those goals, we may be able to sort of short circuit part of that process because we can work with that information already.

LEG. MONTANO:
Just so I'm clear, the plan coming forward, is that a plan that's being initiated by the County or is that an adoption of the plan or rather the report that was included in the study from Rutgers that Legislator Schneiderman and myself sponsored?

MR. WHITE:
It would really be a plan that was effectively approved by this council, but it would come forward in most cases -- we've seen an example in Westchester -- come forward from the Counties.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay. Go ahead, Jim.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah, let me give you a for instance. And, I guess, our second or third meeting with the Regional Planning Association with the folks from Westchester, I mentioned that how we in Suffolk County and in Nassau County were impressed by the work that they had done in Westchester based on a similar plan as the one that you had done; and that how it was effective every year in looking what the different municipalities one by one had done. Now there's no mandate that they have to meet it, but it really is pressure.

LEG. MONTANO:
Right, I understand. These are goals. These are not --

MR. MORGO:
Yeah, but they're very effective goals when you have something like the legislation in place that we're proposing because planners, business people, housing advocates --

LEG. MONTANO:
Will respond to that.

MR. MORGO:
-- can say, look, and if you meet these goals, you come close to meeting them, you will be able to get these incentives. Let me finish because I'm getting to a point.

LEG. MONTANO:
Go ahead.

MR. MORGO:
Unlike most of my comments, there is a point to this.

LEG. MONTANO:
Go ahead, Jim, I know you many years. Go ahead.

MR. MORGO:
So a couple of folks from Westchester after we spoke said, you know, don't over estimate how much has been achieved in Westchester. Don't give us too much credit because it's been only marginally successful.

LEG. MONTANO:
Right.

MR. MORGO:
Since we've had this plans in place we've only created 5,000 workforce units. And those of us from Long Island said, we'll take it. Because if you think of Westchester, small area, smaller population and since they've had this plan in place they've come up with and they've counted them, 5,000 units. I've been doing this for a longtime. And I can tell you we're not close to 5,000 units, so --

LEG. MONTANO:
I know.

MR. MORGO:
-- we are left in the -- one of Deputies from -- Pat Dugan, from Nassau was there. And both of us had a pretty good laugh, said, you know, we'll take this. And they attribute it to -- they also have a County subsidy in place that speaks exactly to the goals for each municipality.

LEG. MONTANO:
Just so I'm clear, though, the entity that will adopt these goals is whom or what?

MR. MORGO:
Michael.

MR. WHITE:
It's basically a council formed by the legislation that would be headed by Pat Foye, ESDC. But would be people included from each one of the counties involved.

LEG. MONTANO:
So the members of this group is -- and I have the bill in front of me, I just haven't had a chance to read it. And if I had read it, maybe I wouldn't ask the question, but what I'm understanding is that the members of this entity are identified in the resolution or in the proposed legislation. That accurate?

MR. WHITE:
As to where they have come from, which is basically appointed from the counties that are involved.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. Does it say how they will be appointed from the counties? Is it an appointment from the County Executive? Is it a number of appointments? Is it an appointment from the Legislature? Are there designated people? That's the question I'm asking.

MR. WHITE:
It's appointments by the County Executive, which would be confirmed by the County Legislature. And there are three from each one of the Counties that would be involved.

LEG. MONTANO:
And that's enunciated in the legislation?

MR. WHITE:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay.

MR. WHITE:
And the chair of the council, as I said, would be, Pat Foye, Commissioner of --

LEG. MONTANO:
By virtue of his title as Commissioner of Economic Development or --

MR. MORGO:
Downstate.

MR. WHITE:
Yeah, correct.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right, I gotcha.

MR. WHITE:
And that creates, as Jim was pointing out, the link between when we're looking at the planning efforts for this and establishing those goals and looking even at the work that's been done. Linking it to the economic sustainability was really the prime element of that.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay. I see the bill in front of me from the Assembly. Who is the Senate cosponsor or cosponsors on this bill?

MR. MORGO:
Dean Skelos.

MR. WHITE:
Dean Skelos.

LEG. MONTANO:
Dean -- okay, from Nassau, all right. Go ahead, Jim.

MR. MORGO:
And there's a lot of efforts to get some of the five upstate counties as part. On your question on the --

LEG. MONTANO:
You mean as sponsors?

MR. MORGO:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
They're not on the bill yet.

MR. MORGO:
Not yet.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay.

MR. MORGO:
This was just entered into the Senate at the end of last week; just filed. Westchester asked the question, I may have mentioned this, could they be grandfathered since they did the study already. And I would assume that the same thing would happen with Suffolk. And Nassau has a similar study going on right now.

LEG. MONTANO:
When you say grandfathered, you mean?

MR. MORGO:
They don't have to do a new one.

LEG. MONTANO:
A new study?

MR. MORGO:
Right.

LEG. MONTANO:
Because we have the Rutgers Study.

MR. MORGO:
Right.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay. And the -- Legislator Browning asked a question about the sewage treatment plants and the incentive with respect to that under this bill is that you would provide an interest free loan for infrastructure or sewer development. Is that what I understood?

MR. MORGO:
Right, the state would.

LEG. MONTANO:
And who's providing that loan?

MR. MORGO:
The state.

MR. WHITE:
The state.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay. And the state is providing that loan to whom; to the developer, to the municipality, to the

county? Who is that loan going to?

MR. MORGO:
It goes to the municipality.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay.

MR. MORGO:
That's one of the things that's different about this bill. Most subsidies incentives go to the developer.

LEG. MONTANO:
Exactly.

MR. MORGO:
This one speaks to the municipality.

LEG. MONTANO:
This is going -- this is for the municipality to do the work, to develop the sewers. And it's going to be at an interest free rate.

MR. MORGO:
Or low interest. That's really up to the State.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. So it's either low interest or no interest.

MR. MORGO:
Right.

MR. WHITE:
It's also --

LEG. MONTANO:
Go ahead.

MR. WHITE:
Part of this is also with the planning grants. And the planning grants go to not only assisting municipalities to identify the areas for the housing opportunity area, such as connections to Smart Growth, Transit Oriented Development, looking at existing infrastructure. But part of those planning grants could also be utilized to take a closer look at the infrastructure with respect to wastewater treatment.

LEG. MONTANO:
So there's money provided under this bill for both sewer improvement, infrastructure improvement, or sewer development, and also money for planning for future, you know, infrastructure development. Is that accurate?

MR. WHITE:
That's correct.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah, but Michael mentioned something that I kind of glossed over. There's a very strong Smart Growth component here. What happens --

LEG. MONTANO:
What is Smart Growth as you define it?

MR. MORGO:
Well, there are about eight principles.

LEG. MONTANO:
Because I've said earlier -- I can't imagine dumb growth, but what is it?

MR. MORGO:
Well, dumb growth is sprawl.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah, sprawl versus -- yeah, smart growth versus the urban sprawl that we have at the moment.

MR. MORGO:
Yes. In building in green fields. Smart Growth is redevelopment, close to transportation --

LEG. MONTANO:
Got you.

MR. MORGO:
-- walkable communities. The -- what happens is when the municipality agrees to the rezoning to create the increased density, we call it a housing opportunities area. And those housing opportunity areas have to be in places of redevelopment. You know, you're not going to take open fields and call it one of these housing opportunities areas.

LEG. MONTANO:
Right, right.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Done?

LEG. MONTANO:
No, I'm not done.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
We tried.

LEG. MONTANO:
You tried, but it didn't work.

The onetime cash payment is, you said, $5,000?

MR. WHITE:
$5,000 per building permit --

LEG. MONTANO:
Per unit.

MR. WHITE:

-- for every housing unit.

LEG. MONTANO:
Who is that going to; the developer?

MR. WHITE:
The municipality.

LEG. MONTANO:
The municipality also.

MR. WHITE:
Correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Per unit.

LEG. MONTANO:
Excuse me?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Per unit.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Per unit.

LEG. MONTANO:
Per unit, right, I got that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Good?

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. Thank you very much.

MR. MORGO:
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. Jay, it's your turn.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'm not sure which questions to start with, I have a number. But, let me start with the state interest free, I guess, loans that are being made. Is that similar to that Environmental Trust Fund that we used to -- superfund money that they used to make available? Because the State ought to have something like that, a revolving loan fund.

MR. MORGO:
Well, they have the Environmental Facility Corporation --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right.

MR. MORGO:
-- loans that a municipality can apply for.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
But we can't use it for this, right?

MR. MORGO:
Well, it could be part of this. That's one of the things that Foye, said, Jay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay.

MR. MORGO:
The problem with the EFC loans, though, is the interest is not much better than tax exempt bonds.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay.

MR. MORGO:
It's not better. I mean I said it's not much better; it isn't better.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. But I'm glad this money is from somewhere --

MR. MORGO:
Yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- that's going to be low or no interest.

Let me speak a second about the Rutgers Study and in general the village data component. Because the way Rutgers got the numbers for the villages is basically based on a population crunch. And what happens when you start to -- you know, the villages tend to have very small populations compared to the towns. So you can get a very distorted picture, I think, using that methodology. The villages tend to have the highest property values, the most exclusive zoning. And so I think other factors really need to be included in determining what that village component is, otherwise you're going to get villages that show up as needing absolutely no affordable --

MR. MORGO:
Yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- housing only because they have very small populations.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
And it may not be truly reflective. So I'm just putting that out as a cautionary note.

The school tax, you mentioned, if the schools are able to show an impact from the development -- but I didn't hear whether you said that was going to be a one-shot or it's going to be a recurring revenue stream.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah, that was discussed. How did we finally come down on that?

MR. WHITE:
That it's reoccurring. It's reoccurring and I think --

MR. MORGO:
Fifteen years.

MR. WHITE:
15 years was the goal that we were looking at with respect to that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Now, will the project each year have to document how many kids are in the school?

MR. WHITE:
Yes.

MR. MORGO:
They'll have to be a methodology. Yet, under Chapter 40R it's in there in Massachusetts and there's been very few payments to school districts; very few payments.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'm not surprised I think that's largely a myth that affordable housing increases school taxes.

MR. MORGO:
But, you know, this is -- so that you know, we've met the Governor's people on this. And they see this as the toughest hurdle to get over on this bill.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. I think it's important that the program has that component because it makes it more sellable for those who are fearing that it's going to have a tax impact.

MR. MORGO:
Yes, I couldn't agree more. Just for a frame of reference, when they passed the Connecticut legislation right at the end when it was imminent, they took the school reimbursement out because they could not agree on a formula that worked although there is one in Massachusetts.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I want to talk a little bit about the idea of --

MR. MORGO:
Do you want to say -- Michael just wanted to --

MR. WHITE:
I just want to add --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, Michael.

MR. WHITE:
-- Jay, that we, Long Island Regional Planning Board, have been working with both Counties and the Long Island Housing Partnership taking a close look at this exact issue, looking at the multifamily developments in both Counties with respect to being tax positive, tax negative with respect to the school districts. And we're hoping to get that done certainly soon enough to advance or close -- provide some information or closure on that issue as the legislation advances through the state. So, shortly.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Let me switch over to the incentives. Well, that really was an incentive, that school tax

payment. But you also talked about a $5,000 per unit incentive. My concern in some of these areas that have adopted very restrictive zoning, they, you know, they've done that to be exclusive types of communities. It's hard for me to think that they, you know, a $5,000 carrot is going to do anything to make them increase the zoning density. We may have problems there.

MR. MORGO:
We have no illusion.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right.

MR. MORGO:
We don't think we're going to get -- I was going to say, to relate to you, but I was going to say, we don't think we'll get many workforce homes in Sagaponack.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right.

MR. MORGO:
But you do have a --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So the areas that really want to do affordable housing or workforce housing or next generation, whatever the, you know, the current politically correct term is, will continue to do that and they'll have that bonus. But the areas that have tried to fight against it will continue to and this really won't do anything to address that.

MR. MORGO:
It's elective.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
This is the carrot, not the stick approach. And you had mentioned Massachusetts as an example. And Massachusetts does have a --

MR. MORGO:
40B.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- they have some thresholds there --

MR. MORGO:
Yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- that are more of the stick approach.

MR. MORGO:
Right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
That if you drop below that moral threshold in terms of -- I think, in Massachusetts if you have less than 10% of your housing stock available to median income, then developers of affordable housing are able to circumvent certain zoning restrictions.

MR. MORGO:
In Massachusetts you have 40B and 40R. 40B is the stick that you're referring to.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right.

MR. MORGO:
But many of the people I talk to in Massachusetts -- in fact, we engage the folks from Massachusetts and from Connecticut on this -- I'll mention that 40D is really creating more heat than light. And they like the 40R, but that's -- you could make the argument it's only because they had the stick for a longtime and they see they'd rather do it voluntarily. But you're quite right, this is voluntary.

But in Westchester, again as a model, many of the housing advocates were able to go to some of the wealthier municipalities and say, look, you're giving up these incentives and we need it. But the exclusionary villages that have exclusionary zoning, this probably will not have an effect there.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. And understand, I'm not saying this is a bad thing because it -- anything that's going to lead to more housing for, you know, the young people who keep our communities running is a good thing. And I hate to see these young families leaving the area. But I think it would be naive to think that this won't further kind of filter in a sense where people are going. That the communities that have chosen to be elite will continue to be elite. And the areas that are doing workforce housing will continue to do workforce housing but maybe at a higher rate.

MR. MORGO:
And it will focus it on the downtowns where you create the higher densities.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
And I just think we shouldn't rule out, you know -- maybe, you know, we ought to be fighting for some kind of bottom line threshold so that everybody has to do something that they can't simply create job demand and expect other school districts to absorb that, you know, other communities to absorb the traffic, you know, and the impacts of that. There ought to be a bottom line; with zoning comes a responsibility to not use it in a discriminatory fashion and --

MR. MORGO:
You know, I agree of course, but I think that will probably come down --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
In the courts.

MR. MORGO:
-- as a judicial.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, you're probably right. And then -- and this is really along the same lines, the 25% density bonus, I know you said that you wished it were higher. And some of these areas where private developers are struggling to try to do housing that is affordable to the workforce, that 25% isn't going to make the numbers work. Things are so far out --

MR. MORGO:
Yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- you know, you'd almost have to double the density. And even there, in some cases, it won't do it either so.

MR. MORGO:
Yes, we know.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
You know, it doesn't hurt, a 25% bonus, but --

MR. MORGO:
But -- well, you -- obviously all of you know about this, when you're trying to get agreement, sometimes you have to give on a couple things.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right.

MR. MORGO:
And we fought that for what, three months or something?

MR. WHITE:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah.

MR. WHITE:
And it is created as a floor. So we were --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Were you looking for 50% or what was the number that you were shooting for?

MR. MORGO:
We were -- we had it for different kinds of housing. We had a minimum of 16 to an acre for attached. We had what, ten for detached. And we had it -- but again as Michael said --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right.

MR. MORGO:
-- that 25% is a floor, is a is a minimum.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right.

MR. WHITE:
And to add on that, we're hoping that through the planning grants and the kind of incentive system that the bill contemplates, the municipalities on their own will see some areas that can withstand and actually handle the greater density. Because anyone of the messages that comes across very clear and Jim said this a number of times in the talks that we've been given, it's not now demanding the percent affordability in today's world on Long Island particularly in Suffolk County and Nassau County, it's getting the density, getting the people --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right.

MR. WHITE:
-- and municipalities past the idea that there's a need for and places to put more density so that --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. Well, you have to have the density typically to make the numbers start to work.

MR. WHITE:
Correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
You know, with the cost of the raw land, you just can't make anything affordable happen on it, you know -- when you, you know, when you pick up an acre for a million dollars and you can only divide it into two, let's say, housing units, you're at half a million dollars a lot, you just -- you're already starting on affordable before you've done any construction.

MR. MORGO:
Exactly.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So you got to be able to divide it up enough to make the numbers work. And particularly in these downtown areas where the land is very expensive.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah. It's one of the things that all of us from the seven suburbs agree to exactly that. And as I said, maybe not on the east end, but Westchester prices, land costs are higher than our land costs.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right.

MR. WHITE:
One more issue of respecting the lands, another feature of the bill is a creation of a commission on state owned lands to take a close look at what state owned lands might be in these Counties that might become or be made available for workforce housing given as Legislator Schneiderman has pointed out land costs.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Can I ask because I --

MR. WHITE:
And that seems to not have been done on a comprehensive basis and we'd really like to see that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I think that's worth looking at. We did that with County properties --

MR. WHITE:
Correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- and town properties. And I think it makes sense to do that with state properties.

MR. MORGO:
Excluding parklands.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Does the bill do anything -- you know, I obviously just got the bill for the first time, I haven't had a chance to look at it; but in terms of affordability, how does it define what is affordable?

MR. MORGO:
Yeah, it -- again, to get the percentage minimum, the floor is is 20%. It uses the same --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Of the project --

MR. MORGO:
Of the project.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- 20% has to be affordable.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah. We wanted 50.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. And what is affordable?

MR. MORGO:
Same standard that you folks have adopted --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Up to 120%.

MR. MORGO:
Half under 80, half under 120. However, if it's a rental housing, affordability is under 80%.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. So that's -- your qualified -- let's say half the units have to be qualified for 80% -- under 80% and half of it for under 120%.

MR. MORGO:
For those designated affordable.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
But the actual prices are they based on -- and for a rental unit 30% --

MR. MORGO:
Well, they're all different.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- of income?

MR. MORGO:
Say it again.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Or are they based on 30% of that gross income?

MR. MORGO:
Well, for rentals, yes. For homeownership it's two-and-a-half times the income.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
For the ownership unit.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. All right.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Good?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, we're using the same definition.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. Presiding Officer Lindsay.

MR. WHITE:
And again, those are floors.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah, you want to -- do you want to?

MR. WHITE:
Just again, those are -- again, to get the compromised, to have the buy in on the regional approach, those were floors. It doesn't prevent a municipality from designating a housing opportunity area with different or --

MR. MORGO:
A 100% affordable.

MR. WHITE:
Correct.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah. Oh, you get a -- the more affordable the larger your incentives.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. And are we using the County median income or are we using regional median incomes?

MR. MORGO:
Regional median incomes. Area median incomes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
By town or census track or what?

MR. MORGO:
No, by -- for example it's the Nassau/Suffolk AME.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Oh, so we're using Long Island basically --

MR. MORGO:
Yeah, yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- median income.

MR. MORGO::
Westchester is using theirs.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Because Nassau County's median income is higher than Suffolk's.

MR. MORGO:
Correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
But that shouldn't hurt us. That could help us because more people will qualify, yeah.

MR. MORGO:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Presiding Officer.

P.O. LINDSAY:
This is a very interesting discussion. I think it was about five years ago myself and Legislator Guldi introduced a bill called the Government Facilities Agency that would set up -- an agency to do this with mandates and goals for every community. And it was rejected twice by this Legislature, not once, overwhelmingly.

Having put that aside, I noticed that the -- there's a cap of $87 million on the fund that I assume includes the loans, the incentives, the pilot payments, everything. Sounds like a lot of money.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
It's not.

P.O. LINDSAY:
But when you start dividing it that many different ways, the 87 million won't go too far.

MR. MORGO:
Well, it's -- Presiding Officer, it's really a pilot program to see if it works for the seven Counties.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Okay.

MR. MORGO:
And one of the things that is not mentioned in the bill, but anybody who's ever developed affordable homes as I have, would know that you don't use one source of funding. There are other State programs available, other State subsidies available. The County has the Acquisition Program and the Infrastructure Program.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Yeah, going down the same road.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah.

P.O. LINDSAY:
I wanted to know if the Governor had, what, is it 400 million in this year's budget? This is in addition to that?

MR. MORGO:

No, no.

P.O. LINDSAY:
This is part of it.

MR. WHITE:
We're likely just looking for a specific carve out from that $400 million fund for this.

P.O. LINDSAY:
So there was no specifics how the Governor wanted to use the 400 million?

MR. MORGO:
Yeah, he has a 100 million for Upstate, 300 million Downstate.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Just geographically allocated, not for a specific program.

MR. MORGO:
Right, right.

P.O. LINDSAY:
But this would be the vehicle to capture some of that funding.

MR. MORGO:
Yeah. And when I was -- I was on the Governor's transition team for housing and he came to the meetings. And he said in the suburbs zoning is the biggest hurdle. And we said, yeah, we have to get it. So I talked about this idea with him a little bit. And subsequent to that we've met in Albany with his housing people. And as I answered, I think, Legislator Schneiderman, the school piece was the piece that bothered them the most because they didn't know how to define it, how it would controlled. But they're interested. They're extremely interested.

P.O. LINDSAY:
But the point that I was trying to make is it sounds like a lot of money, but it really isn't. And I agree with you wholeheartedly that I know we have a component to -- especially for infrastructure for affordable housing, I don't think we use it enough. I don't think we use it enough, you know. Thanks.

MR. MORGO:
I would agree.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Legislator Beedenbender.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Hey, Jim. My question's kind of follow up on what Bill was saying because I did the math. It does sound like a lot of money, but there's 150 unit development that's proposed in my district and that's three quarters of a million dollars right there. So, you know, when you start thinking of it in that terms -- I guess when you do the math, it comes out to about 3400 units, if there was no infrastructure if we're just talking incentive and then 17,000 units over five years. So, I guess, was that a number that was put out there by these seven Downstate Counties that that's the goal?

MR. MORGO:
Yeah, but again if was the -- this money would be going to the municipality. The other money to bring down the cost of the homes goes to the developer, often a non-for-profit developer. So this was really to get it off the ground, Legislator. We came up with the number less based on the number of homes, more based on the State Senate's 25 million that it gave to Long Island. We said

what if we could do it. And that is a very flexible program. So --

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Yeah. That's the Employee Program, right?

MR. MORGO:
Yeah, yeah. And so we did 12 and a half million a county, but it's not designated that a county -- for example, if Suffolk municipalities were more active, they would get more than --

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay.

MR. MORGO:
-- of the 12.5.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Well, that was my next question. And I guess is there a restriction on what a municipality could do with this money? Because like I said the example I just gave, Brookhaven could stand to see three quarters of a million dollars. Does the law -- does the bill say what they can spend it on or could they just throw in their general fund?

MR. MORGO:
Does it define infrastructure?

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Does it restrict what they spend it on?

MR. WHITE:
It really has to be specifically for workforce housing, development, purchase of lands, infrastructure improvements, specifically and expressly related.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay, so this would go to inflate whatever fund they have to do that -- to do more of this so it would be self-perpetuating.

MR. WHITE:
Correct.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay.

MR. WHITE:
And specifically to the developments of workforce housing in their housing opportunity areas.

MR. SANSEVERINO:
Part of the thought behind the process was that a lot of times municipalities when a proposal is made will complain about, traffic, different impacts. And the thought was that if you have this additional funding to address those issues. So it was that --

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Yeah, you could put a light in and things like that. And there's no restriction on a type of unit? They don't have to be stand-alone; they could be apartments. It's all type of units. Right?

MR. MORGO:
That's right.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
And I guess the last question is, kind of where you were talking about the infrastructure funds, how would these loans interrelate with the infrastructure programs that we're doing now? Because to use the example in my district again, they're going to have to build a sewage treatment plant. I know they've already come to you, Jim, and talked about that that they want money for that. So how would we interrelate our infrastructure program with the state? Because if the state has a big pot, I'd rather them get the zero percent interest loan from the state than the County bond out the loan, bond out the money for it.

MR. MORGO:
That would really depend on who would be building, if it's a Cromoglass treatment plant or a STP. If the developer were building it there, is a process where the Legislature and the County's money would go to bring down the cost of building it. Whereas this money would be expressly for the municipality for lines or for a pump station, for that kind of thing. So it would be that kind of division of the money.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. That's it.

MR. MORGO:
Okay. Because Legislator Browning asked me to mention one thing.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Yeah. And actually following up on the little bit of what Brian said was I know Joe and Jill came for a ride with me with a lot of depressed homes in my district, boarded up homes that, you know, we want to turn into affordable housing. So this money it's not necessarily for the Copper Beach type things. It's -- you know the boarded up homes that we went to look at, can we use that money for those types of homes if we're going to make affordable?

MR. SANSEVERINO:
It would be probably difficult to adapt this program for that, but we have other financing mechanisms that we can use for that purpose. As a matter of fact, one of the things just going on right now in Congress is that they're looking to generate $4 billion in additional stimulus money that would be used for acquisition and renovation money for foreclosed properties. And that's something that we're tracking. But there are some other funding sources. The Home Program, for instance, could be used to start to buy up some of those houses and renovate them. So this would be a little bit more difficult to do with this --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Which we can -- yeah. And we could go toward -- I talked to you about -- talking about -- did you have a follow-up question?

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah, I had a follow-up question, very quickly, I know you have to run, Jim. As I read the bill it says over the first five years state costs are capped at no more than 87,500,000. Is that per year or is that total over the five years?

MR. MORGO:
Total.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. So that comes out to about 17,500,000 per year.

MR. MORGO:
Right.

LEG. MONTANO:
If you spread it out over five years. Approximately how many municipalities do you estimate qualify? Or have you done a study as to how many because I would think that's an enormous number.

MR. WHITE:
I think it is an enormous number. I don't have the number right in front of me, but I think that the point of that is and understand exactly the point that you're making, it's not a lot of money.

LEG. MONTANO:
It's peanuts.

MR. WHITE:
What we were trying to do here is to show that there would be a level of funding that could start making it work. And to the extent that we would be able to show what these kinds of incentives, some municipalities really diving in and taking advantage of the incentives, we'd have enough feedback to sort of -- in terms of the pilot program to say, look, this is a really wise stream of funding, put some more in it. And as Jim pointed out, that number effectively was an arbitrary number. We're looking at, well, if the Senate found $25 million last year, we would think they'd at least be able to find the same amount this year and perhaps going forward. It may be three -- four times that ultimately available for the program, we would hope.

MR. MORGO:
You know, this won't surprise you, during the discussions we had people from the Governor's Office as part of the discussions, Affordable Housing Corporation people, Marian Zucker, as a matter of fact joined many of the meetings. And we got it back from the Governor's key housing person that they liked it, but they were afraid of the unknown cost. So we said, all right, we'll cap it. And so that's really what it was. It was a cap to say let's give it a try and we'll cap it at a figure you can live with. That's the truth. That's straight forth what happened.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. Thank you, appreciate it.

MR. MORGO:
Legislator Browning --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Go ahead.

MR. MORGO:
-- asked me to speak briefly about the Legislation, I think it was 1146 that you passed, where you set aside for the Multifaceted Fund monies for land acquisition for environmental purposes and affordable housing purposes. As was said many times during the discussion, you're not going to incur any debt service, there will be no bonds actually appropriated. It's just -- I mean, sorry, no bonds authorized, the bonding was appropriated.

When you get land for affordable housing the process for good or bad is exactly the same process it is when you acquire land for open space. And the reason I say for good or bad is because as most of you know when you acquire land, you agree and you negotiate and you make a bid and you close, you're finished when it's open space. When you do it for affordable housing, you're just beginning. And obviously the appraisal depends upon your yield. As we were just talking about, the higher the yield the more valuable the land because you can get more homes on it.

The fact is what you actually did was to say, some of the money should be used for workforce homes in this year. That's all you did. And again, even by saying that, you know, when you look -- you look at each acquisition on its own merits. You pass the planning steps that authorize you to do, in fact, what we call in development, the soft cost, you do the appraisals, the surveys. It goes to the Environmental Trust Review Board. They decide whether the appraisal is fair enough. But then it comes back to you directly and you have the decision to either vote up or vote down on the actual authorizing of the bonds necessary to make the acquisition.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Rick has a question.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah, I just want to be -- you said that there is no debt service associated with what we appropriated. But what you mean is there's no debt service at the moment because it hasn't come back to us for approval.

MR. MORGO:
You haven't authorized them yet.

LEG. MONTANO:
We haven't -- right. So -- but in reality at the last meeting we authorized $41 million in anticipated debt services when you add up all the bills. And this was just one part of it. But there will be debt service associated with it once the project comes back to us, once you identify the project. And it comes back to us. And if we approve it then we have the debt service. There's going to debt service at some point in time on this once the project is complete.

MR. MORGO:
Once you approve the acquisition, yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Bill, you have a question?

P.O. LINDSAY:
The only thing that I can say about your comment, so bring us back some projects that we could fund; that we could dig our teeth into, guys.

MR. MORGO:
I think you know that Joe and Jill have quite a few in the pipeline. Right?

LEG. MONTANO:
Jim, if I may --

MR. MORGO:
He wanted --

LEG. MONTANO:
I'm sorry, Bill. Are you --

MR. SANSEVERINO:
We do have several projects that are in the pipeline. It just takes a while to get them through.

P.O. LINDSAY:
I realize it.

MR. SANSEVERINO:
You know, the biggest problem is getting them through the towns.

P.O. LINDSAY:
I realize that, but my fear is that we'll spend all the money on land preservation and not build any

affordable housing, all right.

MR. MORGO:
That's our fear, too.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah, that's essentially the point. If you know -- if you recall I think I voted against this for the -- the point that we should not authorize it unless we know what it's going for. And there was no definition in terms of where it was going to go. Am I correct in that?

MR. MORGO:
I don't know what you mean.

LEG. MONTANO:
When we authorized the money, there were no projects identified for the use of that money. Am I correct in that?

MR. MORGO:
Well, there have been some --

LEG. MONTANO:
In other words, it was a blanket authorization for this particular purpose without specifying where the money was going.

MR. MORGO:
I think Legislator Alden made the point that in the past before the Legislature put the acquisition money for affordable housing and the acquisition money for open space together, that there was a part of money just for affordable housing acquisition. Under County Executive Gaffney there was a $5 million fund.

LEG. MONTANO:
Right. We took that $5 million out.

MR. MORGO:
And -- but that was -- but you do that every year, you would authorize that fund and you still -- you didn't know where it was going until it went through planning steps and until it came to the Legislature. So this was just defining how much goes to affordable housing so it wasn't anything new or different.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
We passed a bill, I believe, last year, Legislator Cooper had a planning steps resolution for Tower Street in Huntington. This is a property that would fall under this program?

MR. MORGO:
It is.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. Do you remember that one? Okay, because I know that that's something I've been working on. We have a lot of properties in my district so I'm looking forward to being able to utilize that money. However, any more questions? No? I think ---

MR. MORGO:
Okay. Our intent in coming here obviously was that we would have a home rule message on behalf of the Assembly and Senate bill there, same houses. Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. WHITE:
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Thanks very much for coming down today.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Who is submitting that? Do you want to have everybody's name on it?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Yeah, I guess we could. Yeah, yeah, if you want to bring it to us, the Committees would like to sponsor that home rule. Yeah, okay. Thank you.

Okay, George. Okay. So with that, I guess we don't have any cards and this is going to be quick.

Introductory Resolutions

1161, Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Town of Brookhaven for affordable housing purposes (SCTM Nos. 0200-853.00-02.00-036.000 and 0200-909.00-08.00-020.000). (Co. Exec. Levy) I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Second.

LEG. MONTANO:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Second, Legislator Montano. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, motion's carried. **(Approved VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Losquadro)**

1162, Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Town of Brookhaven for affordable housing purposes (SCTM Nos. 0200-959.00-05.00-029.000, 0200-959.00-06.00-017.000 and 0200-973.70-04.00-032.000). (Co. Exec. Levy) I'll make -- same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Losquadro)**

1163, Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Town of Brookhaven for affordable housing purposes (SCTM No. 0200-979.10-06.00-046.000). (Co. Exec. Levy) Do same motion, same second. Okay. I think they're all my district. Okay. Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Losquadro)**

1164, Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Town of Brookhaven for affordable housing purposes. (Co. Exec. Levy). Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Losquadro)**

And with that we have no more business and I'll make a motion to adjourn.

LEG. MONTANO:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Second, Legislator Montano. And we're adjourned.

(THE MEETING WAS CONCLUDED AT 12:16 PM)
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY