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 February 25, 2008.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Leg. Kate M. Browning, Chairperson
Leg. Ricardo Montano, Vice-Chairman
Leg. Daniel Losquadro
Leg. Jay H. Schneiderman
Leg. Brian Beedenbender

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Ian Barry, Assistant Counsel to the Legislature
Barbara LoMoriello, Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
Jill Moss, Budget Review Office
Ben Zwirn, Deputy County Executive
Jill Rosen-Nikoloff, Director of Affordable Housing
Bob Martinez, Aide to Leg. Montano
Josh Slaughter, Aide to Leg. Browning
Linda Bay, Aide to Minority Leader
Paul Perillie, Aide to Majority Leader
Debra Alloncius, AME Legislative Director
Peter Sambaziots
Dr. Robert W. Burchell, Rutgers University
William Dolphin, Rutgers University
All other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:
Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

(THE MEETING COMMENCED AT 11:19 PM)

LEG. MONTANO:
We're going to start the meeting. Legislator Browning is going to be a couple of minutes late. She's stuck in traffic as a result of an accident so we're going to start the meeting and hopefully she'll be here next couple of minutes. I'll ask you to speak slowly so we can, you know, throw her some time to get here.

All rise, please, for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Beedenbender.

(SALUTATION)

Thank you very much. Before you're seated, please stand. We're going to take a moment of silence as we customarily do for those soldiers that are fighting in the wars and, you know, for those that have made the ultimate sacrifice. Thank you.

(MOMENT OF SILENCE)

PRESENTATION

Thank you very much. All right we're going to start with the agenda. We have on the agenda presentation by Dr. Robert W. Burchell and William Dolphin from Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy and Research. They're going to be conducting a power point presentation based on their Workforce Housing Needs Assessment Study for Suffolk County. This report was finalized in October of 2007 and contracted by Suffolk County Legislator Jay Schneiderman. You'll recall, Jay, I was also a co-sponsor on that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I didn't write that section.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. I'm not going to hold you responsible for it. But since you've been actually taking the lead on this, I'd like to ask you to explain, you know, how this was initiated, what was done, you know, with our resolution, where it went and where we're at today and hopefully we'll buy some time for Kate to get here.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'll try to stall for a moment.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah, speak slowly.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Several years ago now, I believe -- what was it? '90 -- that it started?

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah, I think it was our first year when we were both elected so it had to be four years ago.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Before so '94, '95 so --

LEG. MONTANO:

2004.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
As we were, you know, entertaining various ideas realizing we had a crisis upon us in housing, we felt that it was important to bring in experts to develop a county-wide housing needs assessment so we would know exactly where and how to focus our attention. We did an RFP type of process. And then we selected the Rutgers group. They're from the Center for Urban Policy Research; a very well respected group that did Westchester County's affordable housing needs assessment. We, of course, changed the name now. We use the term workforce housing needs assessment.

And we developed a fairly detailed scope for them to work with to determine the number of people who are already here, who are living in cost burdened situations, the demand for housing throughout Suffolk County, overcrowded housing. We asked them to look at delipidated housing. We also asked them to project into the future up until I think a 15-year period so I think 'til 2020 at that point to tell us what our needs would be and to give us some potential ideas to talk about in terms of how we might be able to meet that demand.

And we are now at a point where they have submitted a report and they are here to present and to answer questions. And I guess unless you want me to stall further, I'll turn things over and we'll get the presentation started. I'm not sure. Maybe they have copies of their power points so Kate if she misses the beginning she'll be able to catch up.

LEG. MONTANO:
I think the power point presentation -- were we given -- do we have a copy of those for the Legislators to follow along or --

MR. SLAUGHTER:
It was e-mailed to them.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. So we'll get to that later. Dr. Robert Burchell and Mr. William Dolphin from Rutgers, please proceed. You can do the presentation from where you're at unless you prefer to stand. That's up to you.

DR. BURCHELL:
This is actually better. When you're used to teaching you keep out of the line of tomatoes when you're this far away.

Let me just say we're pleased to be here and we have done these kinds of studies before. We do the housing numbers for New Jersey and New Jersey's Mount Laurel decisions. New Jersey's probably one of the most aggressive states of any in terms of requiring affordable housing. They have a new ratio which just was struck. They've gone from fair share housing to growth share housing. And essentially what is required in the state of New Jersey is one unit for every four market units and one unit for every 5,000 square feet of non-residential space. And, again, these are not terribly different ratios than have been recommended -- have been recommended here.

So, we're going to talk to you today very briefly about a study for Suffolk County on workforce housing need. Workforce generally is looked at essentially as taking affordable housing need up into the middle or lower middle income level typically up to 120 percent of median.

My name is Bob Burchell. I'm director of the Center for Urban Policy and Research. I've been at Rutgers for forty years. My students think it's longer. Bill Dolphin has been with me for that same forty year period. He's our Director of Computer Services and is actually scary in his ability to program; an old fortran programer who essentially literally can program the world. I mean he is very, very good in terms of his computer skills.

Okay. The methodology and the goals of the methodology essentially we have given you a 50-page report entitled Suffolk County Workforce Housing Needs Assessment. Again, we take that up to 120 percent of median family income. Median family income in Suffolk County is about 87,000 as of 2005. We try essentially to follow best practices in terms of giving you what is a reasonable study so that you can then go forward with it to develop housing policy. And a reasonable study is consistent with accepted housing practices up to date with the most recent US census 2005. Procedures support efficient and well planned growth. Procedures do not cause community significant fiscal strain. And procedures also allows sufficient time for planning.

Next slide. What is essentially workforce housing? And why essentially do we need it? We need it simply because the employment market does not function without people who work in an area being able essentially to live in that area or certainly close by. Elderly, believe it or not, is a component of workforce housing need simply because they typically fall within the income requirements that you're ultimately projecting.

In terms of the market that we see today, most housing and especially housing on this end of Long Island is built for those in excess of 120 percent of median. So if you were actually to project supply, large portions of that supply would be for those above 120 percent of median in terms of their ability to afford whereas demand typically and large portions of demand is for below 120 percent of median.

Why would we do and why would we consider workforce housing? Number one it's been successful. These are typically good properties that are able to be held onto by those who occupy them. There's limited fiscal impact in terms of over population of the schools. It provides balance and very, very formative communities.

In addition it's good for the economy. It produces jobs, promotes a steadying effect on the local labor force. And, again, if you went to the voters most citizens would vote for it. And it also cannot be produced by the private market.

Next slide. Who is workforce housing for and how long should it last? For current and future workers and residents of Suffolk County, for both family and elderly household, elderly demand is a component of total demand. It should contain both ownership typically in townhouse or condominium form and rental units that need to be provided. Rental units should also be a significant percentage of the units provided.

Units should be deed restricted kind of a mid-length of time, at least 15 to 30 years. Some of the new types of programs are actually deed restricting affordable units because units are being lost from the stock of existing affordable units. They deed those affordable units for 99 years or in perpetuity.

And procedures essentially in terms of affordable or workforce housing study should be a comprehensive approach, should deal with all aspects of housing need. If we take a look at preliminary definitions, preliminary definitions essentially say who do we deal with here in terms of the components of affordable housing? Those who are within the range of middle income, 80 to 120 percent of County median family income. Again, the median family income for Suffolk County is 87,000 so that would be just over 100,000, somewhere around 107, 110,000.

Moderate 50 to 80 percent of county median family income, low below 50 percent of county median family income. Now these are terms that are typically used in workforce housing. If we used the HUD terms, the below 50 would be called very low. Moderate would be called low. And middle would be called moderate income. The housing area that we use are communities and essentially towns of Suffolk County. The median family income in 2005 is just under 87,000.

Next slide. What are the types of overall need? There's actually four types of overall need: Existing, existing housing, essentially relating to those who live in deteriorated housing or those who live in overcrowded housing. Existing need in terms of those who pay too much for their housing and that's called cost burdened demand. And then finally future need. And those who are income eligible who will grow into the future for whom the market will not provide.

So the first is current or rehabilitation need. And those who live in housing that needs to be repaired who meet the income requirements, again, below 120 percent of median. And we define a unit as being deteriorated by three indices plus the age of the unit. And so if you do not have exclusive use of kitchen or bath or there's a component of the kitchen or bath that's missing, it's a deteriorated unit. If you do not have a standard source of heat such as gas or oil, it's a deteriorated unit. And also if you have an older unit, again it's a potentially deteriorated unit.

Now, you need two of those catagories, two of those indices to have your unit classified as deteriorated. So it's age and any one or any two of the others other than age. And again if you take a look and the reason that they use this methodology is that they send people out into the field and usually a unit that is old plus one of the others or has two of the individual characteristics, people in the field would report that unit as a need of significant repair bordering on needing replacement.

If we take a look at total housing units in Suffolk County just over 500,000 in the year 2005, income eligible about 61 percent of those who occupy those units. And those that are deteriorated a point three percent. Now that's a very, very low percentage and that's because housing is so expensive in this portion of Long Island. So that when housing is expensive, people will repair their housing rather than buy new housing. So there's a significant effect on the quality of the housing stock that essentially is made by having an expensive housing stock.

The second category of workforce housing need, the first one was rehabilitation need, those who live in deteriorated housing and are income eligible. The second category is those who are income eligible and live in overcrowded housing. Overcrowding housing is currently defined as those who have more than 1 person per room. So seven people in a six room house, four people in a three room apartment would qualify as housing. That's a definition of housing that has essentially been with us since the 1970's. It may change as we move past 2010. Before the 1970's the definition of housing was more than 1.5 persons per room. So it changes as household size gets smaller. It moves with the trends in household size.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Bob, what's counted as a room, living rooms, bedrooms, kitchen?

DR. BURCHELL:
Living room, bedroom, some combination of dining and kitchen facilities all add up to rooms, yes. And, again, the rule of thumb is that typically if you have a three-bedroom house, you have a six room facility, four bedroom house seven room, five eight room facility.

Suffolk County's overcrowded housing need as you take a look at this compared to deterioration is very significant. Essentially what we have here is about 1.69 percent even though it says 16.9, 1.69 percent which is a reasonably significant level of overcrowding. And, again, we take a look, there's a certain amount of overcrowding that is culturally based almost always associated with the Oriental population. We see that in urbanized areas. Fort Lee is an example in New Jersey where people tend to elect actually to overcrowd to be close to employment situations. That's not that they would not choose that if they had other more spacious accommodations available, but mostly this again is non-cultural. And this a reasonably significant amount of overcrowding.

Next slide. Another category is cost burden. And we define cost burden in two different ways; in rental housing those who pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing and ownership housing those who pay more than 50 percent of their ownership -- or of their income for housing. Now the reality of cost burden housing is that it's cost burdened for a variety of reasons, most of which or many of -- a reasonable share of which may not relate to the specific availability of other units in other places that would not essentially be cost burden.

So school systems relate to cost burden. The ability to be in a owned home rather than a rental situation relates to cost burden. And there are a variety of other kinds of factors that relate essentially to cost burden. The view of housing as an investment also relates to cost burden. So the reality of it is, is that there's a great deal of cost burden within American society and people essentially are living with it. There's a large share of renters. There's a large share of owners who are cost burdened but because of the nature of school systems, because of the nature of the desire to be an owner, because of the nature of housing as an investment, people accept a certain amount of cost burden as part of the normal routine.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Bob, can I ask a question on this?

DR. BURCHELL:
Sure.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
In determining the housing expenses that you have at 50 percent, you're using mortgage, you're using property taxes, home insurance?

DR. BURCHELL:
Yeah, PI, principal, interest, taxes and insurances. PITI.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Home maintenance, is that included?

DR. BURCHELL:
Depending on -- it's included in ownership. It's not included in rental.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
And utilities are not included in this the cost of heating the home?

DR. BURCHELL:
We use contract -- we use contract rent rather than gross rent.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So that means they are included, no?

DR. BURCHELL:
In contract rent, they may or may not be. They may or may not be.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
The homeowner you have a 50 percent as a cost burden, would that include the utilities for heating the home?

DR. BURCHELL:
Yes, it does.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. And that figure is 50 percent of -- it's gross wages, right?

DR. BURCHELL:
50 percent of their total --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Pretax wages?

DR. BURCHELL:
-- of their total income, yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So if somebody is making $100,000 family income, paying more than $50,000 for their housing related costs would put them in this category?

DR. BURCHELL:
That's right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Because the government's going to take close to 50% away in taxes?

DR. BURCHELL:
Well, the government is going to take 30 to 40 percent away at least, yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. So that leaves very little after housing.

DR. BURCHELL:
Yeah, it leaves very little after housing.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
For food, et cetera.

DR. BURCHELL:
Yes, it does. Yes, it does. And, again, the thing about cost burden is that it's very prevalent. It is very, very difficult to deal with and often it dominates all sorts of housing needs. So if you take a look at cost burden and you looked at the total cost burden easily can be 70 to 80 percent believe it or not of total housing need.

And so what we typically do is look at achievable cost burden in a short period of time and essentially attempt to look at how much can be typically dealt with in a reasonable means of assignment to communities as a goal to deal with. And typically that number is around 5 percent. So cost burden is significant. We don't deal with it well. It has a number of components. People in some cases elect to be cost burdened for the reasons that I've told you before. And, again, when we -- when we attempt to deal with it, we cannot come near dealing with the totality of cost burden so we deal what we call achievable cost burden which is around 5 percent of the total. Next slide.

LEG. MONTANO:
Before you move on, doctor, quick question.

DR. BURCHELL:
Yeah.

LEG. MONTANO:
Going back to the last slide, the 50 percent figure, at what income would you say more or less that's based on because it seems to me that the higher you go up in income, the less proportion you're going to pay for housing. So what was your guideline to get at the 50 percent? Was it the median income, was it 120 percent above median or was it lower?

DR. BURCHELL:
Again, we actually use the public used micro data sample so --

LEG. MONTANO:
Which means what?

DR. BURCHELL:
Well, it means that you can go in for areas over 100,000 in population. And with a 5 percent sample actually calculate the income of everyone below 120 percent. And then take a look at the housing cost associated with that household. And if it's owner and it's greater than 50, it's counted. And if it's rental and greater than 30 it's also counted.

LEG. MONTANO:
So about 120 percent of the median income is where you got that 50 percent figure?

DR. BURCHELL:
And below.

LEG. MONTANO:
And below.

DR. BURCHELL:
And it's -- in each case it's pulled out.

LEG. MONTANO:
Got you. Thank you.

DR. BURCHELL:
In each case it's pulled out.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Just to be clear because we had this conversation early on in terms of who we were going to look at. The study that was done by Dr. Phil Kramer, the economist who did it for Long Island Housing partnership, they had also looked at cost burden. But in their sample -- that sample included everybody. So let's say you made a $200,000 income and you bought a million dollar house, you would still be cost burdened. But that wasn't our target. So in this study we took out anyone who made over 120 percent of median income.

LEG. MONTANO:
Got you. Okay. That's the question I was asking. Thank you.

DR. BURCHELL:
Yes. Next slide, Bill. Future housing is those households that will be formed in the future less than 120 percent of median for whom the market will not provide. The market actually provides for some households. There is housing that is built for those below, not a lot of it, 120 percent of median. And in addition to that, there is filtering within the market. And so we can go to another data source which is the American Housing Survey and look at filtering in this market and take a look at those units relative to median and who occupied those units and the income of those who occupied those units. So we can actually track whether a unit went down and filtered down to someone who could use that unit who is below 120 percent of median or it went up and up is gentrification obviously. And the net of down minus up is your filtering. And there is filtering in the market.

So if we take a look at total future households, income eligible are about 40,000 of 70,000. And then when we take of that 40,000 and we take a look at what is being produced, new is in the market that's available. And this is both rental and ownership. And then also filtering you get down to essentially about 16,5 from your original 40,000 figure. So there is some activity in the market both through new construction and through filtering that meets some of the needs of those below 120 percent. Now when you --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Just a clarification. So filtering is an older house; as a house ages it becomes more affordable. So it falls within a target range.

DR. BURCHELL:
Yeah. Or a rental unit. Or a rental unit. And then when you really take a look at filtering the real question is that filtering is uneven. Filtering often gets you into the range between 100 and 120 percent; but those below that do not experience as much filtering. So as you go up in terms of your definition higher and higher, you get more filtering beginning to enter into the -- beginning to enter into the market.

Next slide. So if we take a look at our various components of need and we take a look at the households and deficient units, overcrowding, cost burdened, and again if we concentrate on the right-hand column which is our achievable column and which is the column for projected need, that includes filtering and new contributions, we see that over a period of -- a 15 year period 2005 to 2020, counting both existing and future need, there's about 30,000 units over a fifteen year period. 30,000 units over a 15 year period. Now essentially how do we begin to address that need? And again this study is concentrating on the need but also took a look essentially at how you might deal with that need.

Next slide. One of the ways of dealing with rehabilitation need and overcrowding need is to take a look at an income source that might provide subsidies in terms of a matching grant to landlords or to individuals to repair units. And again if you were able essentially to take an increase, your non-new construction residential building permit so this is not on new construction but this is alterations and repairs, people who are putting granite countertops on -- within their units and a variety of other kinds of expansions or repairs. And you just said we'll increase that fee by 10 percent, you could cover essentially some type of matching grant, 75 to 25 percent where the individual locality would be providing 75 percent and 25 percent by the individual. So if you wanted to elect for something like that, a 10 percent increase on non-new construction, residential building permits, it would meet the requirement in terms of the number of units that were projected.

And we also take a look at average cost to cure certain types of deficiencies; more for kitchens than bathrooms, more for both of those than for repairs to heating systems, etcetera. And again what is the linkage because linkage is important. A small increase in residential permit building fees for a market rate population could be used to subsidize those who can't afford to make repairs for their individual units. Next slide.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Can I just ask a question on that, too?

DR. BURCHELL:
Sure.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Because typically building permit fees are done at the town level. So do you see this as a town by town approach, do you see some kind of county building permit fee that the towns would collect and they would go into a centralized fund?

DR. BURCHELL:
Either could be done. They do it differently. We finished -- just finished a study for Coral Gables where it's -- it's being done at the city level. It's a reasonably sophisticated city. And they can handle that. We're just doing one for Halendale Beach also in Florida. And it's being done at the County level. So either jurisdiction can effectuate that kind of change.

Next slide. Oh, i'm sorry. Workforce housing as it relates to cost burden. Again, now this may be more difficult to do because it may take state legislation essentially to increase the mortgage transfer tax, but this is a reasonably -- it has strong linkage related to cost burden that property transfers essentially heat up local housing markets. And if you essentially were able to increase or recommend an increase at the state level to the mortgage transfer tax or look for another type of funding mechanism at the local level, such as a development fee, a development fee for market properties, again, you could provide these monies in a pool that would become available. And again we just use this essentially because this is the most frequent approach nationally to look at cost burden housing. And again it comes two ways, either being able to do -- to do it directly at the local level or to go to the state for an inclusion on the statewide real estate transfer tax.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
Can I ask a question on that?

DR. BURCHELL:
Sure.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
I know you said in the past that's been a common method of providing funding. But I think that was done prior to the downturn in the housing market that we've seen. And I'm just afraid that an increase in the mortgage tax at this point would further impact a softening housing market, putting an additional thousand, $2000 whatever it may onto an already high closing cost for the average home buyer let alone those who are having trouble breaking into the housing market. You know, we'll leave that aside for a moment. Those that we're trying to help but even the average home buyer who could afford a home in the past is having difficulty doing so now. So I don't really think that the mortgage tax given this economy and this housing market right now is really a very viable option. Do you have any thoughts on that?

DR. BURCHELL:
Yeah. The answer is you're right. And the overall response is that you have to figure out if you do not want to attack it this way, how do you want to attack it? And there are not a lot of options. As I said when we initially got to this slide, you can use a development fee but it's exactly the same -- it's exactly the same kind of thing. So, you know, I think that this is something that is really to be thought through by your own people at the county level in terms of what might make more sense here. And I know that Jay has some feelings about what kinds of sources could be tapped for this, but, yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
Doctor, this study was -- just for comments on this, my impression that this study was done during a time that we had a robust housing market. And as of late particularly my district I see number one housing prices are dropping. There are a number of short sales throughout the community in terms of short sale being the purchase of a home for less than the outstanding mortgage where banks are looking to -- rather than foreclose, you know, basically cash out, eat their loss and move on. Recently one of the companies in my district put out a notice that they were closing down their plant which would effect approximately 400 homeowners in the district. If they don't find replacement jobs those houses are possibly going into a foreclosure. So with the market that we're seeing today and the subprime crisis, does that skew in anyway the findings of your report? Because if the prices are going down, then obviously the homes could be more affordable. And, you know, so how does that play -- how does your report play into today's market?

DR. BURCHELL:
Well, obviously the question is what is a normal market? Now was the market before this particular downturn normal? Everybody would say no. So, there is some period of time before that when there was a normal market. Then there was a huge spike up. And now this is either viewed as a recession or a corrective factor to housing and to other aspects of the economy. I think this works in an average market. It's better in a spike up. It's less than desirable in a situation where you have difficulty within the market. But again my wife's a real estate broker. And the reality of it is, is that it is just now getting back to some level of reasonableness; not yet to some level of

reasonableness because people still have expectations that 30 years ago they could have bought a house for 60,000 and now they want a million two. So is that a realistic expectation? The answer is probably not.

So it's probably a very workable kind of solutions and very workable kinds of strategies. And the demand is the demand. So that side of it. Then we're talking about solutions. I think solutions work in an average type of situation which we were not at before, which we're getting to now, I would believe. And I think that the kinds of markets that we saw before, at least for the next three or four or five years are unrealistic. And people should be more realistic in terms of their expectations as they relate to housing.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Doctor.

DR. BURCHELL:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Since the big number seems to fall on this cost burden section, this 93,000 housing units in that category, and as you know I'm not a big fan of the mortgage tax method, you know, I've been looking at all kinds of other ways to restructure loans or to provide lower interest rates to try to get some of these people to not end up foreclosing or not leaving the area; but for a moment on the mortgage tax idea, I wanted to know since -- I think it was Dan who -- Legislator Losquadro who brought up this idea that that might actually hurt a lot of the people who are, you know able to buy homes now by increasing the cost of buying the home by that additional fee, is it possible to structure such a program that it only kicked in over a certain level like that million dollar home level?

DR. BURCHELL:
Sure. You can -- you know, it depends on -- it depends on where you have to go to get cured of action and what you would propose to that source. If you have to go to the state to get cured of action to adjust that mortgage transfer tax, then that would be --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Then it becomes more of a luxury tax at that point.

DR. BURCHELL:
Yeah. That would part of the proposal that would be brought to that individual level. But the other thing is, is that often as part of closing costs you can fold that in. You may be able to fold that into your mortgage. So often they tell you at the time of closing this is the kinds of things that essentially can be done in terms of folding it into mortgages.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Thank you.

DR. BURCHELL:
Next slide. Future cost burden, again, you're in a situation where there is some housing provided on a regular basis. However, one of the best ways of handling future cost burden or rather future cost burdened because the housing is not available to those who would seek it, again, the market is not supplying as much of it as it should is to use some type of inclusionary approach. And the inclusionary approach relative to your amount of housing that would be built over a 15-year period essentially breaks out for one affordable for every four market units one in five, about a 20 percent inclusionary; and one affordable for every 15 jobs or every 5,000 square feet of non-residential. And this would essentially saying that your future affordable housing supply is essentially begun to be paid for by both the residential and the non-residential development sectors.

Now this does not come without concessions at the municipal level. And the concession at the municipal level would be a one for one pass through as it relates to a density bonus. So, again, anything that you're asking for here 20 percent affordable on the residential side would come with a necessary extension to the individual developer of a 20 percent density bonus relating to the provision of that housing. And, again, linkage is important and new market housing and new non-residential gross creates the demand for workforce housing. So we can and should probably tap a share of growth that could be used for workforce housing from both the residential and non-residential sectors.

These are exactly the ratios that currently exist in New Jersey statewide. And every single municipality unless they have a reason for a more intensive supply of affordable housing has to abide by these ratios. As a matter of fact, in New Jersey as a result of the round three numbers, affordable housing numbers are actually assigned to individual communities over a ten-year period. Next slide.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Doctor, quick question. I just want to understand the density bonus. So if a developer is putting in five houses, one has to be affordable. I understand that's your 20 percent. And now the density bonus, does that give the developer the ability to build a sixth house?

DR. BURCHELL:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
On that same piece of property?

DR. BURCHELL:
Yes. Yes. And again Palm Beach uses one and a half or a one and a half -- close to a 30 percent ratio, one and a half or twice that number. So these are not numbers that are kind of pulled out of the hat. You almost need that kind of a number at least a one for one ratio to make the developer remain as whole in terms of you don't want the developer necessarily to lose money as he's providing this. And this way everybody bears a share of the provision.

And, again, it's important to do it both residentially and non-residentially. And by the way, one of the things that I should say is that these are our recommendations that we're vetting. And again these are not necessarily your recommendations. Your study was the numbers and these are approaches in terms of being able to deal with those numbers. And again all of these approaches if you deal with them as we have recommended, you can do it in terms of the revenue streams that would be necessary to support the level of housing that we have projected.

Next slide.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Doctor?

DR. BURCHELL:
Yeah.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Just real quick. Those comparable areas that you're talking about, Coral Gables, I think, you used in Florida, when you talk about the density bonus, do you happen to know if those areas are sewered significantly? Because that's a problem that -- that's a problem we're going to run into here because there's a significant portion of our County that is not especially towards the eastern end. And, you know, the density bonus I agree with you, it's a viable way to go about it but the problem that we'll run into is -- that's one of the things. So I was just wondering if the areas that you've looked at have a similar challenge that we do?

DR. BURCHELL:
They are sewered and probably they don't have the challenge that you look at. But also, again, if you are granting -- some local jurisdiction is granting permission for five units, I would be hard pressed to see the rationale for not granting six. So, again, it's certainty achievable. If you said we don't have the sewer to do the five, then you don't create necessarily the affordable housing need.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
One thing I could add to that because a lot of these areas don't have sewers but we do have a program in place in Suffolk County that allows the transfer of sanitary credits for affordable housing. So as we preserve land in these areas, which I think throughout the County we're doing, we may be able to use those credits to effectuate that extra unit.

DR. BURCHELL:
And, again, we just finished doing a housing study in Albuquerque, New Mexico. And if you want to talk about scale, it's a $5 billion housing investment consisting of 15,000 dwelling units and fifteen million square feet of non-residential development all to be built over the next 15 years. So we want to know where the growth is going that we don't necessarily see in the northeast. It's going to the southwest and to areas in the southwest that have less expensive housing which again New Mexico is noted for.

Next slide. And we're going to be finishing up here. And I usually say in conclusion and my class gets up and actually -- it's like guns going off with the books closing.

Okay. There are your categories of need. Again, need brought down to what is achievable under cost burdened. Under future what can be required net of filtering in actual new construction that would be within the income limits. And it's about 30 thousand units over a period of 15 years, around 2000 units a year.

Next slide. And if you take a look at -- those are the total numbers for the various communities. In Babylon, Brookhaven, east end, Huntington, east end broken out, Islip, Smithtown, the County total and then the annual -- the annual total.

And then the next slide. And these are the numbers broken out by category for each of the individual locations. And these obviously could be goals that these communities would attempt to achieve annually over a 15 year period; not insignificant numbers. Again, a lot dealing with when you take -- when you net out achievable and under the new construction you net out filtering and what construction is available within income limits, a reasonable amount of the overall total is contained again somewhere in the order of -- 25, 30 percent is contained within either rehabs or dealing with the crowding situation. So cost burden and then new construction are still -- represent somewhere on the order of three quarters of the total need.

Final slide. So what are our conclusions? Our conclusions are, you know, this is your need now. It's going to become more of an issue as baby-boomers retire and as they work part-time in terms, and that part-time -- 70 percent of the people in the United States retire in place so there'll be large amounts of people who will attempt to retire in the location where they raise their children. So they will attempt to retire. If they can't retire or can't afford, they will look elsewhere.

I honestly believe that workforce housing should routinely accompany market level residential and non-residential development. It's easy to do. If you give a density bonus, there's not much change in your land use patterns. With good landscaping, you can't tell the difference between four and five units to the acre, the increment of one. So with housing placement, it's non-discernable by the naked eye. And clearly it's necessary to be done.

It's a a difficult issue in many cases to do. Because in some cases everybody says yes, housing is expensive but they don't want to go forward as it relates to providing the solution. So consensus building may be difficult. And also your County policy has to look at this study, your own feedback from other sources, your own individual housing task forces, etcetera in terms of coming up with an overall strategy to answer your housing needs.

And thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Thank you. And if you would hold on a minute, we have Jill Rosen-Nikoloff here. And I'd actually like her to come up, maybe if you'd like to make a couple of comments and what maybe we're currently doing or working towards. And Legislator Beedenbender has a couple of questions again.

DR. BURCHELL:
Sure.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Do you want me to let Jill go first?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
No, go ahead.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. Just a couple of definitions and one bigger question. The 87,000 median income for a family, that's a family of four number; right?

DR. BURCHELL:
Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. And I guess this is a bigger question. You recommended deeding these for 15 to 30 years. Why is that the number? I know you touched on it a little bit. And you mentioned, you know, they can be done in perpetuity, they can be done for really any length, but why is the 15 to 30 years what you would recommend?

DR. BURCHELL:
Well, there's always an argument as it relates to affordable housing. What are we doing with the unit? Are we allowing the people who occupy that unit to mainstream themselves by buying out that housing? Or are we keeping that housing for future successor users? And so that 15 to 30 year period is a midway position between those extreme positions. In other words, you could say it's affordable today; five or ten years you buy it, it's yours. Now with the money you've made, you've mainstreamed yourself, you can sell it off. That will help you buy housing elsewhere but you've lost it from the stock.

On the other hand you keep it for a hundred years and you essentially say this is affordable housing. And the only people that are going to live in this particular unit and they're not going to mainstream themselves from that capital accumulation are the people who occupy it for that time.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. And the other question I had there's a proposal to do a development similar to this in our community. And rental was one of the first things that they suggested. And the difficulty that we had in at least my community, I can't speak for others, is that even with the affordable, the rental rates were just so high that it was not even achievable. And I'm sure Jill will have a response to that, too. But I mean we were talking about rental rates that are near some mortgages, people that have been in the house for a while so I guess -- I know you mentioned that the rental units should be a certain percentage but, you know, that becomes a real difficulty in some of the communities. Is there kind of a treatment for that? Is there an answer to that?

DR. BURCHELL:
Well, I mean these are all tough questions.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Right.

DR. BURCHELL:
And forget the question to me being tough. The solutions to these problems are not easy problems. And in addition to that, you have recreational opportunities that in this neck of the woods that also impact on your housing supply and costs; essentially your housing prices to go up. But, again, if you're doing a market rental unit, okay, a market rental unit, what I'm saying is take 20 percent of those units and then set them aside for affordable. And then you can do it within that range. If you give the developer a density bonus of at least a one to one in terms of being -- him being able to produce those units.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
I thought you were suggesting that out of -- there should be some sort of proportion or percentage of for every owner occupied workforce housing unit that you build, you should build what "X" percentage of rental workforce housing. That's not what you were saying?

DR. BURCHELL:
Ideally you should, but you can't do it that way because it's whatever the market is developing, you're trying to capture 20 percent. If you're doing no rental units, it becomes much more difficult to do that unless you give the developer a bonus. Now one of the ways in New Jersey that we give a developer a bonus is that for that community if they develop any rental units we count them as 1.5 to one in terms of that community meeting its responsibility. So if you develop two rental units, you've gotten a credit for three.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
I have a question.

DR. BURCHELL:
Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Zoning. When you talked about the -- your examples in Florida, you know, we have our ten towns, the ten town zones. We don't have, you know, county zoning. That's kind of where I'm going at, you know, you have your individual towns. And, again, there's a fear when people hear affordable or workforce housing, they automatically think it's low income Housing. And I know that I hear often about certain times the way they zone it's to keep out the affordable housing. So in the examples that you're giving, how do they do their zoning?

DR. BURCHELL:
Well, again, the examples that I'm giving essentially is saying that you don't have to change your zoning at all. Just every time that you essentially have a market level development in that particular area, you reserve essentially 20 percent of that. And then you essentially increase the total number of units allowed on that land.

Now, I think that you could use, and again you'd have to look at the law and what the law allows you to do, but almost something like a conditional use or I even hate to say the term floating, floating zone, that once certain conditions apply, that that developer is doing affordable housing that the zoning which allowed five units to the acre now allows six units to the acre.

But, you know, I think that the best way to get this done and the best way to get buy-in is not to change zoning; to essentially say to communities that, you know, your zoning is what it is at least right now and as a result of that we're attempting to try to get 20 percent of the units that are constructed, which would be a huge -- I mean the question is and we've been in this now for 35 years ever since 1974 in New Jersey, the question is do you get more bang for your buck on being tougher or do you get more bang for your buck on being easier and having more people participate? And we found at least in that 35 years that you get more bang for your buck by being easier and having more participate.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. Thank you. And, Jill? Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Can I just ask a question?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I think Legislator Browning's question really gets to what should the County's role be when the zoning is at the town level. All zoning comes through the state. And in New Jersey which you've cited several times after Mount Laurel the state adopted restrictions so that the towns had to have inclusionary type of zoning. We don't have that in New York State so we're left at the mercy of the towns to adopt zoning codes that will keep some of its workforce within the community.

And I'm not sure what role the County plays. Now we've talked about various ideas of how we can create incentives for the towns who do work toward meeting certain benchmarks. And as we talk about benchmarks, and you need to go back one slide if you would, because this is really, I think, the key slide where it's -- your group is making its recommendations on a community by community basis in terms of what should be done each year. I want to make sure I'm reading it. So let's say if we took Babylon which is the first entry, and you have the various columns, the total 313, so with the various methods you would like to see the Babylon area producing 313 units of affordable priced housing per year.

DR. BURCHELL:
That's right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So if I multiplied that by 15, it would reach the demand over a 15 year period?

DR. BURCHELL:
Bill, go one slide more. See, it would bring that -- multiplying that 313 by 15 would bring it to the 45 or the first number there which for some reason is broken. I can't read it from here. It's 4792 or whatever that is. 4702, right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I thought that number was the actual demand and the next slide was what --

DR. BURCHELL:
The annual.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- the achievable. No, they both say annual.

DR. BURCHELL:

No, no, no. It's annual, right. It's annual housing supply for the bottom -- for the bottom line. These are -- go back to the other one, Bill. Right. This one is the -- see county annual and county total? The total is the total amount. The 30 thousand over the 20 year -- over the 15 years. And the annual is the annual amount. And then if if you go to the next slide, the annual is the bottom of what each of the communities are supposed to be doing.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. So East Hampton, let's see, 44 units a year basically.

DR. BURCHELL:
That's right. And those are unique to their own need. In other words it's not saying what is their housing market and how much can they supply because then it would be all over --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. And these are averages. So if one year they did 80 and the next year they did none --

DR. BURCHELL:
We've gone into East Hampton and they had one deficient housing unit. They had 15 over crowed units. Not in total but that's what they have to respond to on an annual base. Their growth would make them respond in terms of new construction with 22 units a year. So they're unique to the individual locations.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. And these are yearly figures.

DR. BURCHELL:
Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. I thank you for coming. And, Jill, again, I kind of would like you to maybe comment and see if there's anything else that we're, you know, currently doing or working towards that might be in this?

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
Just so that I'm clear, we're talking about new construction of a 1099 units per year?

DR. BURCHELL:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
County wide.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
Okay. And that's county wide, right.

DR. BURCHELL:
County wide.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
Now does that break out into villages? Does that include the villages within each of the townships?

DR. BURCHELL:
Yes.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
It does. Is there a way for us to --

DR. BURCHELL:
No.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
He said precipitously. The reason it's of paramount importance to us is the County Executive has introduced a legislative initiative of New York State that will incentivize local governments to create housing opportunity areas and build additional workforce housing. Part of that process is to set up -- and it's a seven county initiative. We've actually gotten seven counties on board with this, which itself in my opinion merits its passage through the state but that's another issue. But part of that is planning. We will tell each municipality, each town, each village, each hamlet what their goal is for housing. And we would like to use this study for that. We don't want to have to recreate the wheel. And this doesn't seem to get us for purposes of our program where we need to go.

DR. BURCHELL:
We're talking about how many villages?

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
What are there, like, 62 villages; something like that. I'm not sure.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
There's a bunch.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
There's a whole bunch. And I'm talking, you know, Nassau-Suffolk.

DR. BURCHELLL
So -- Well, this is for Suffolk.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
Yeah.

DR. BURCHELLL:
Okay. And you're talking 60 for Nassau-Suffolk?

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
I think it's 60 something for Nassau-Suffolk. It's significant for Suffolk alone.

LEG. MONTANO:
Speak into the mike so we hear you better.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
Sure. Yes.

DR. BURCHELL:
I don't even want to volunteer this but I will. Bill? We can -- we could probably break Suffolk into the villages.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
That would be extraordinarily helpful.

DR. BURCHELL:
Okay. We can do that.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
Okay. Good.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
On that, because I've had this conversation somewhat, too, in terms of the methodolgy that Rutgers is using which is based on the census data. It's really difficult to get precise numbers on small sections of population. So it's basically -- it's a mathematical number crunch that's going to, you know, be reflective based on population; isn't that right, using the micro data?

DR. BURCHELL:
In other words when you start looking at the individual numbers that would enable you to get crowding or enable you to get rehab, you often cannot get that below 100,000 population. So you have to use some type of ratio system to enable you to get it down. To say if we can find some way or some ability to express that particular individual village as a share of total, we may be able to divide up the overall town into its respective parts.

But again the point that Jay is making is that that may be inaccurate for some that have more deteriorated housing versus others that have less. But if -- we can do as good a job as anybody can do with that so we could put forth something and see how comfortable Jay and the rest of the committee was with those numbers.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
Yeah, because, you know, I think the general concern is if you do it just by township, there are organizations and housing advocates who feel that, well, then the housing ends up getting built in certain areas instead of putting the pressure on, say, Bay Shore, you need this, Smithtown, you need this. Smithtown hamlet, not Smithtown township.

DR. BURCHELL:
Right.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
To avoid clustering which happens in a lot of cases.

DR. BURCHELL:
And, again, we will try something like that. We had difficulty doing the east end. So I mean that level -- I mean the original report was without the east end broken out. So, again, we'll do what we can to accommodate that. But, again, in each case you sacrifice accuracy when you attempt to break it down to that level.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay, in the interest of time, like I say, Jill, basically I was wanting to know if there was anything here that we're working towards currently in, you know, what the presentation is showing. Have we actually adopted any of their recommendations, anything like that? Otherwise we could continue this at another time.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
No. No. No. We're reviewing it. We hope to use it as part of the legislative initiative which hopefully will pass through the state. But, no, not currently.

I just want to make one other point in the assessment of it very quickly. In terms of, you know, focus on rehab and existing housing, to keep that affordable, you're going to have to, you know, place covenants and restrictions on those various houses. And that means getting government dollars in there so that you can have the consideration to sort of burden those houses and keep them affordable. That's a big undertaking.

DR. BURCHELL:
It is a huge undertaking simply because that's the -- those are the people who would be least

amenable --

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
Correct.

DR. BURCHELL:
-- to do something like that. So you're absolutely right. But if you did do that, the period of affordability that you're maintaining them into the future should be as short as possible.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much for the work you've done and the presentation. And I know we'll be talking to you some more.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I just raise one quick issue because if you are going to break it down into hamlets like Patchogue or, you know, villages or -- Patchogue is a village but Yaphank is, I guess, a hamlet, some of those places, if there's additional work that's not part of the original contract, as you know the Legislature has paid for this thus far. And I have no objection to having them do further work but if there's additional costs associated had with it, I think it would be only fair if it came out of planning or some other fund rather than coming back to the Legislature for that.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
As long as it doesn't come out of affordable housing, I'm fine.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
That's fine.

DR. BURCHELL:
Well, Jay, let me also respond to that. Rutgers can find a way to misspend your money more than any other institution probably. So what we're going to try to do is try to do it within the confines of the existing budget first.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay.

DR. BURCHELL:
And then if we run into any additional, we'll certainly let you --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, if it's a population based number crunch it should be fairly easy.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Last but not least, Legislator Montano, I believe, has a question.

LEG. MONTANO:
Well, no. I just want to thank you, also. As I said earlier I did co-sponsor the initial resolution and I want to thank you for the report and the presentation. And I'm sure we'll take it up further. With respect to -- Jill, I was going to ask you your comments initially about the proposal, this regional concept that was announced, I would like to ask you to come before the committee with the permission of the chairperson to discuss this and to outline exactly what it is that you're working on so that we could see what role we can play. You talk about legislation. I presume that's at the state level.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
That's correct.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. But would you be willing to come in at maybe the next meeting? Would that be appropriate?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
I think we can schedule it for the next meeting.

MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:
I'd be delighted, yeah.

LEG. MONTANO:
And this way we can put all the pieces together. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Thank you. And I know we do have one card, I guess, Mr. Peter Sambaziotis. I didn't do too much damage. You take the podium.

MR. SAMBAZIOTIS:
Hello. Good morning ladies and gentlemen. My name is Peter Sambaziotis. I am here today to request your permission to build affordable housing for low income families. As you are aware, there is a great need to provide affordable housing for all types of families. I would like to utilize the land I own near the Port Jefferson Station to build apartment complexes that will meet the need for low income families. I have owned properties throughout New York for over 20 years and currently operate several buildings that provide affordable housing for a variety of families. If given permission, I will develop the property immediately.

I'm associated with a company which we rent properties. We buy properties. We have land. We buy land and we have develop it. And usually with lot of properties, lot of factories, a lot of (inaudible) we turn into apartments. And by providing that apartment that's means the rentals will go down. We tried before one time in Babylon to get a building to turn it from offices to 27 apartments. And at this moment I'm trying to plan because I have lot of associates who like to build around the Long Island. We are between New York, Connecticut and New Jersey and close to 30,000 apartments, the whole company. Now this is a small project. In order for me to start it to see how easy it is to work with the government and the area.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Have you been to the Town of Brookhaven on this?

MR. SAMBAZIOTIS:
Not exactly. The only time we went to Brookhaven was the time where we tried to purchase the building in Babylon and it was rejected.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. You know, I would like to give you my card. We can speak later because I think it's more Town of Brookhaven Planning Department. And that's really more where you need to go than to come to the county level at this time.

MR. SAMBAZIOTS:
Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. Thank you.

HOME RULE MESSAGES

We need George. Okay, we're going to hold off. We're waiting for our Counsel. Okay, so now we can go to the agenda. We have **Home Rule Message one. Home rule message requesting New York State Legislature to extend time and benefits to County employee Leonard Wayne Bourne. (Presiding Officer Lindsay)** Can we have a motion?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
I'll second it. And explanation.

LEG. MONTANO:
Explanation.

MR. NOLAN:
This is a fairly standard home rule message we do from time to time that allows employees who are eligible to join the retirement system at a past date to relate back to that time and go into a lower tier, in this case a Tier II for this particular employee. We actually did pass this home rule resolution last year. The state has asked us to enact it again to allow this employee to go into Tier II.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Question.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah. With respect to the resolution, it says that -- as I read this, it's a County annual contribution of approximately $1700 plus an estimated one time payment for past services of 92,800. I'm reading this as 92,800 is paid for by the state.

MR. NOLAN:
Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:
Now this 1700, is that a one time payment or is that a continuous payment?

MR. NOLAN:
The way I read the state legislation it will be an annual payment -- additional payment of what we're paying now for this particular employee.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. And it says here in the resolution as long as Wayne Bourne follows a written request to the effect, you know, asking for the extension on or before December 31st, 2007, I presume that was done or is that --

MR. NOLAN:
I'm presuming it was done. As I mentioned, this was a bill that was introduced last year in the state senate and assembly. That was the language in the bill at that time. I checked the website this morning. It has not been updated to change it to December 31st, 2008. That may have to happen if Mr. Bourne did not file it by December 31st, 2007. It's probably something someone wants to check on between now and Tuesday.

LEG. MONTANO:
So if he didn't file it, there's no point in passing the resolution; am I correct?

MR. NOLAN:
Well, I don't know if the state assembly and senate were to accept a home rule message if we do

not have the correct date in the resolution. That I don't know.

LEG. MONTANO:
And last question, with respect to the payment do you know how much -- is it estimated how much this will cost the County over, I guess -- how do you do it? You do it over an accrual basis or something?

MR. NOLAN:
Well, it looks the increased cost to the County will be going forward $1700 per year.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Good to go? I believe we had a motion. I second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, **Home Rule Message is passed. (Vote: 5-0)**

I guess I'll make a motion -- you have a question.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, before we adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
Okay. Jay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Maybe it's for Counsel. The Rutgers group that just presented, I believe there's still -- we haven't finished the contract in terms of paying them. And I just want to see procedurally what has to happen next. Do we formally adopt their presentation? What's the procedure now? Adopt their report, rather? And then they can receive their final payment or how does that work?

MR. NOLAN:
You're just asking what they have to do to get final payment?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah.

MR. NOLAN:
I don't believe -- off the top of my head and knowing we spoke about this in the past, I don't think we have to formally adopt a resolution adopting the report in order for them to get final payment.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
No, I don't think so to be honest with you.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So we just have to informally accept it as a final report?

MR. NOLAN:
Right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
And let's adjourn while we're at it. So I made a motion to adjourn, second by Legislator

Beedenbender. I'm sorry.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
It's all right, Kate. Don't worry about it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
We're adjourned.

(THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 12:36 PM)
{ }   DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY