

Village of Tannersville

Date

June 3, 2022

Time

2:30 PM

Location

Tannersville
Village Hall

Present:

Lee McGunnigle, Mayor
David Kashman, Trustee
John Gallagher, Trustee
Kimberly Thompson, Trustee

Type of meeting: Special Meeting/Informational
Session

Robin Dumont, Village Clerk-
Treasurer

Absent: Greg Landers, Trustee

Also Present:

Ed Kaplan, County Attorney
Warren Hart, Deputy County
Admin/Planning
Darryl Legg, Greene County
Legislator
Allyson Phillips, Young/Sommer
(RUPCO Counsel)
Douglas Senterman, RUPCO/Town
of Hunter
Kevin O'Connor, RUPCO
Chuck Snyder, RUPCO
Carl Giangrande, Building
Inspector/CEO
George Bain, Jr.

Minutes:

The Mayor opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Mayor gave some background as to how we got to this point, and explained that the Village applied for a DRI and that there seemed to be a clear housing crisis in our area. In the application for the DRI, one of the main initiatives was the DRI to address the affordable housing piece.

The Mayor turned the floor over to Emily Hamilton from RUPCO to give a brief presentation on their proposed project.

Ms. Hamilton (Sr. Project Manager for Real Estate Development) stated that the purpose of this presentation was to show you what RUPCO has done with real estate development. The idea was to show other buildings they have done in the Hudson Valley.

Ms. Hamilton stated that their mission was to create homes, support people and improve communities. Their vision is for strong, vibrant and inclusive communities with a home and opportunity for everyone.

Ms. Hamilton stated that they are more than real estate development, they are administrators of section 8 in Greene County and Ulster County. They have a property management department, program services department, help people become first time home buyers.

Ms. Hamilton showed slides of other projects that they were involved in: 15 town homes, Kirkland - 80 affordable housing units, rupco office and community space, 2013 Woodstock Commons, mixed housing, East End I and II in Newburgh, Lander Street, Mews in Prattsville (did not build it, but manage), Energy Square, Landmark Place, etc.

She continued to stated that in Tannersville, they would like to do between 60-65 units at the Cold Spring Site. Would include a community building, outdoor recreation, play area, 2 apartment buildings. She showed on the slides proposed renderings prepared by Ashley McGraw in Syracuse. She presented the draft site plan.

Trustee Kashman asked if they could be walked through the site plan.

Jeff Senterman indicated that Spruce Street was to the top of the drawing , the 4 buildings closest to the street proposed are probably going to be 2 story structures, with 3-4 units each, the 2 larger buildings in the back are about 30 units in each with typically studio and 1 bedroom apartments. The building in the center, is to be designed as a community center and have a superintendent on the second floor of the building. He indicated that they may scale the project back by 5 units, and blocked out sections to accommodate parking. They need to further study the site and account for grades and such.

Darryl Legg asked if anyone visited the property before they drew this up because the topography of the property and there were old quarries there and is a lot of stone, and drainage, steep grade in the back.

Mr. Senterman stated that its not likely there will be any basements, and he stated they were aware of the grades working gradually from Spruce Street and he said its not applicable at this point with the proposal footprints.

A gentleman asked if there was municipal infrastructure on Spruce Street.

Mr. Senterman stated that there was municipal water and Sewer on Spruce Street, there was an old water service that is feeding the old hotel.

A gentleman asked about the drive on the side of the site plan if it was private or public. Mr. Senterman stated that it is Quarry Lane/Street and is under the impression that it a public road.

Another gentleman asked if water was metered in this municipality.

The Mayor replied yes, and stated before we got this far, we had an engineering analysis done and have an application in to DEP on behalf of the Village for possible up to the capacity of the infrastructure that already exists on the property. There is a manhole on the property, and we asked the city to confirm the flow rates that are possible to sustain on that property. As far as water, we are obligated to provide water. The water is metered and would be charged per our water regs and there are 2 existing connections to the property.

A gentleman asked if the plan was for RUPCO to own and operate the facility. Ms. Hamilton replied yes.

Darryl Legg asked if this would remain on the tax rolls

Ms. Hamilton stated that they will work with the Village to apply for a PILOT (Payment in Lieu of Taxes).

Mr. Legg asked if they planned to take this off the tax rolls.

Ms. Hamilton stated that they would be paying payments in lieu of taxes. They will still be paying a form of taxes.

Mr. Legg stated that he noticed in a lot of the other housing, they have homeless, substance abuse. Ms. Hamilton interrupted and stated that they are not doing any of those types of housing.

Mr. Legg asked about section 8 and working families. Ms. Hamilton stated yes.

Kevin O'Connor, CEO of RUPCO stated that their approach is really simple, they work with communities and are here for one reason. They were invited here a year ago by the Hunter Foundation to create workforce housing. They are doing affordable housing tied to the incomes of the people who work here. This is workforce housing and hope to make it as green and sustainable as possible with geothermal and solar using a passive house design. He stated their projects are award winning and that is why they were here. There is a sheet passed around with some incomes, there are some government programs that have limits and they are working on the Greene County incomes. People felt their incomes were too high. They want to try to do what they can for people working for

the Village, in the restaurants, businesses, etc. He indicated they have several different housing types, they would love to do more homeownership. He stated he thinks the Cold Spring Site is the perfect site and is also walkable.

Mr. Kaplan stated there was a question on the table before Mr. O'Connor took the floor – whether or not this was going to be subsidized, section 8, and what the timeframe would be on that.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they have to be careful with their terms. This will receive some government grants. This is being built as workforce housing and you cannot discriminate based on income in the State of New York. If someone comes along with a section 8 voucher that desires to live here, they take it, they cannot discriminate it is against the law and cannot discriminate based on the form of income. They will have to honor that. There are no preferences.

Warren Hart stated that he knew that HCR sometimes changes their programs, and asked if there was a name of a program or discreet AMI program at HCR that they would be applying for.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they hope to be applying for the next round of the 9% tax credit round that HCR has in the fall, and thinks their RFP will be out in September and they want to be ready for that. Generally the tax credit is looking at 60% of the county's median and below and he wants to do mixed incomes so he wants to get up to 100% at least and have shown some incomes up to 120%. Nominally most of the units will be at 60% and below and depends on the number of peoples income.

Mr. Hart stated that on the chart he sees 50/60/80/100. What he didn't see was the percentage of the number of units in each of those AMI categories. Mr. O'Connor stated that they are still working that out, and will predominantly be 60 or below. They will have some 80/90/100.

Mr. Hart stated that his understanding, he is supportive of the project, and just asking questions. His understanding of the HCR programs for workforce, and workforce is typically 80% and above. Below that is categories of low, moderate low, ultra-low. So when we say workforce housing, what the community might need is really up to the community based on the incomes and the types of jobs that are here. If it is predominantly going to be 60% and below, that's low income or ultra-low income, so in terms of the acceptance of the community and the standing of the community of what's being built, it's important to really be specific on and transparent on is it a workforce and what does it mean, and the definition of workforce housing is changing all of the time. But if its going to be predominantly 60% and below, that is a low-income housing project.

Mr. O'Connor stated that these are the incomes. 60% for 1 person is \$33,000 and asked if there were a lot of jobs that paid \$33,000 on Main Street in Tannersville.

Mr. Hart stated that you could provide this income spectrum, but have it predominantly 80%.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the funding sources won't allow it and without the funding sources they will have to go home.

Mr. Hart asked what the funding source specified in terms of a percentage of AMI?

Mr. O'Connor stated 60% and below with the opportunity with mixed housing up to 80/90/100 %.

Mr. Legg asked if these apartments cant be filled does RUPCO actively seek out section 8.

Mr. O'Connor stated that was false and he has waiting lists and they get calls every day about people needing housing. He stated that 70-90 % of the people for this site will come to Tannersville or have a connection to Tannersville and they will have more applications then they have units. Their vacancy rate is next to zero. Mr. O'Connor stated that if there is not a need for housing then tell them and they will leave.

Mr. Legg stated that is not what he is saying he is just asking questions.

A woman representative from RUPCO stated that people qualify at the time they apply, and if they get a better job, they still get to stay. They are not limited to how much they can make.

Mr. Legg stated those are the people they are looking for, not those that work to get the apartment, and all of a sudden, they lose the job and are on welfare. Looking for people that need a place to live and can be part of the community and want to grow with the community to make themselves better.

The woman representative from RUPCO stated that when people have housing, they are less likely to go back on welfare, they will have their home and a place where they can base their life.

Mr. Kaplan stated that is not always the case, there are plenty of communities around here with subsidized housing, where plenty of those people are not part of the workforce. Hudson, NY, he lived in Hunter, there is housing there where people don't work. He asked if RUPCO had a department that helped people assist in applying for section 8 vouchers.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they are the section 8 provider for Greene County.

Mr. Kaplan stated that not only can't you discriminate, but you can help those people who are qualified to get the section 8 vouchers.

Mr. O'Connor stated absolutely.

Mr. Kaplan asked at full occupancy of this building, how many people did they anticipate.

Mr. O'Connor stated it depends on the bedroom make up, but approximately 130 people.

Mr. Kaplan stated fair to say if the workforce doesn't exceed those numbers, then people who are applying for section 8 qualifications could live year.

Mr. O'Connor stated it is possible. He stated that the term 'section 8' is treated unfairly. He stated in Ulster County, fully 1/3 of the section 8 recipients are seniors who are going to need subsidy for the rest of their lives. Often women who have earned less than men, don't have retirements, they may get social security that is \$900-\$1100 per month and rent is \$1400 per month. The other 1/3 is people that are permanently disabled, certified by the Social Security Administration. Sometimes there are families with children. So, 2/3 are either seniors or disabled on section 8.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the project in Hunter is project-based section 8. All of those units are subsidized. Section 8 housing with a voucher goes to individuals and they have a choice to go rent out in the market. There is a difference between a housing choice voucher where someone is income eligible and they can go anywhere in the market and rent versus a project-based section 8 where the subsidy is given to the project owner and those units are always subsidized for anyone that comes along that is income eligible.

Mr. Hart asked if there is a correlation to AMI's and what the income qualifications would be for section 8. He asked if the section 8 person used their voucher and came here, is section 8 at 50% AMI or is it lower.

Mr. O'Connor stated that section 8 is a federal program and statutorily it is at 50% AMI or below, but 75% must be at 30%.

Mr. Hart stated that he thinks the expressed need on the mountaintop is basically for people who are employed and workers. Those that may qualify for the vouchers don't necessarily work. They won't fill need of what the community is expressing. He thinks its very important, up front, that the community understands what this is, who might be here, how it works. He thinks everyone at this point has said workforce. It's important to educate people on what workforce means so there isn't a disconnect between what gets built and what the community expects, and that the people that are there are actually working. He stated that transparency is important in a project like this.

Mr. O'Connor stated that all housing is affordable. Workforce housing is tied to the income. He has given a sheet that shows the incomes they can serve and stated that whoever builds housing, whether it be them or someone else can have section 8 apply and no one can discriminate. He stated that when they build housing, they market for 45 days. He stated that people are welcome to market and make sure the word gets out locally so that the workforce knows about this opportunity and gets their application in. They have to lotterize because they always have more. When they are pulled in the lottery, they meet and screen the applicants. If they meet the income and requirements, they will be made an offer.

Trustee Thompson stated that she has been in the mental health field for several years and she is familiar with RUPCO, and knows some of her clients are on their list. She asked what is going to guarantee us that someone who is working here in Tannersville and cant afford the housing here, that they are picked by somebody that is already on your waiting list.

Ms. Hamilton stated that the waiting list is particularly for that property. They were not going to use a waiting list from another property

Mr. Legg stated that they can apply for another property

The RUPCO property manager stated that every property has its own waiting list and its only for those that apply for that property.

Trustee Thompson asked if a client comes to you and they want to get on a wait list, are they put on several wait lists or do they pick a property, so someone from Catskill could go on a wait list for Tannersville, so then we have people who are working in Tannersville can't find a home.

The RUPCO property manager showed a sample application and they can pick which property. Trustee Thompson interrupted, so then that puts them on multiple wait lists.

The Property manager stated that with workforce housing very few people apply for Prattsville, Kingston, Tannersville, etc., if they are not planning on working here.

Trustee Thompson stated that 90 % of her clients are looking for housing and don't have jobs and they are looking to live at whatever place is going to take them.

The Property manager stated that they are charging a rent and it has to be paid. He has plenty of section 8 tenants and mixed tenants. Bottom line if they don't pay their rent, they won't be living there. He stated that it doesn't matter if they are working or not working. There are people with great jobs that don't pay their rent.

Trustee Gallagher asked if there was any way to geographically give preference to people from the area, that are employed in the area.

Mr. O'Connor stated that currently federal fair housing law says we cannot discriminate. He stated that there was a great concern for Woodstock and that didn't happen. Most of the applicants were locals, have children in the school district, worked in the area. If people apply that don't have jobs, don't have section 8, they will not be able to afford their apartments. He stated that whoever builds housing will have the same issue. People can come from wherever and apply. He stated that there is no preference given to anyone.

Trustee Gallagher asked if there was any statistical data that says when we built this project this number of people came from the area.

Mr. O'Connor and Ms. Hamilton stated yes.

Trustee Gallagher stated that sort of information would be helpful.

Mr. Kaplan stated that Prattsville is relatively new, are those people from Prattsville. Mr. O'Connor stated he will get him those statistics. He stated that there was a senior housing project and commonly there are a few family housing units and that is fully subsidized.

The Property manager stated that he didn't know the numbers but a good amount is predominantly from Prattsville or were from Prattsville at one point in their lives and have come back.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they have been regulated for housing for over 50 years by the state.

Allyson Philips from Young/Sommer stated that the initial marketing period of 45 days, you can focus your efforts on the community.

Ms. Hamilton stated that she helps with the solicitation and will be out on the streets handing out applications, at the library, etc.

Mr. Legg stated at one point in time he asked the Town Assessor how many properties were off the tax rolls. He was told that there were \$15 million worth of properties off the tax rolls. He asked how the PILOT is going to work.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the state will have another round of applications in September and will probably be about a dozen applications from the capital region. This project is estimated to cost \$30 million and the state is going to give some subsidies and have private investors. For the PILOT, they are typically offering \$1000 per unit per year. He stated that he offering about \$60,000-\$65,000.

Mr. Hart asked if they are exempt from taxes.

Mr. O'Connor stated that yes they were.

Mr. Hart asked if this was a typical PILOT agreement.

Mr. O'Connor replied that this is not through the IDA, this is through state housing law. He stated that they want to contribute.

Mr. Legg stated the land came from the county.

Trustee Gallagher asked if there was another feasibility study that will be looked at or produced and what will happen in 5-6 years if there is economic downturn.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they are working on a market study.

Ms. Hamilton stated that their preliminary market study is to show what rents work with the income levels in Tannersville and you will be able to look at that. She added that financing does limit what they can build.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they want to build this amenity with the proximity to Tannersville, and fit within the goals of the DRI. They will survey businesses on Main Street and if this project is not a right fit they will back off. They will answer any calls.

Trustee Gallagher stated he was in support of the project, but stated he was asking questions as they get asked on the street about specifics.

The mayor stated he was very appreciative to work with the county for this property. This property has the most blighted building in our community and he is glad for the opportunity to address the needs of our community including full time workers that were thrown out of their homes. The Village did pay for the property and is not making a profit on it. They are going to incorporate the cost of the purchase, cost of any cleanup and legal fees and filing fees that are involved for the land acquisition of the project. Vision of the DRI to make a walkable community, and bring housing. The Mayor stated that the Hunter Foundation vetted RUPCO for several months and he thinks this is what the vision is and why he called this meeting to dispel any rumors. At the last DRI meeting there was great support for this project.

Sally Dolan stated that RUPCO is not only a housing developer they are a community development organization and have worked on many different projects including transportation in Kingston. They work on parks, streets, etc. and may be able to assist or advise Main Street grants.

Mr. Kaplan asked if anyone has looked as to what the burden on the school district will be, and asked about community host agreements.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they are generally net positive to the school district. He asked if we were losing children here.

Mr. Kaplan stated that the cost of educating the children is significant and to bring more children will increase the burden.

Mr. O'Connor stated it will also bring \$7000 per child in state aid.

The mayor stated he felt this would be a positive impact because the school was basically empty. He stated last year, we were on a 1:8 Teacher to student ratio, the ideal ration is 1:14 and this project wont come close to that. We can barely get teams for sports because the population is so low. The Mayor stated that to support Main Street we need a larger population. The infrastructure for the water, wastewater and school are not going to be negatively impacted. It would be a more vibrant community and support the businesses on Main Street.

Mr. O'Connor stated that there will be an estimated number of children based on apartment makeup and size. He claims they will not cost the school a dime, and will not add a bus, teacher, or cafeteria worker, but every child will bring \$7000 in state aid.

Mr. Hart asked if the AMI for a family of 4 is \$79,000 he asked if all of the numbers on the column are based on a family of 4. Ms. Hamilton indicated which were applicable to a 1 person, 2 person. 2 bedroom apartments can be up to 3 people, 3 bedrooms can be up to 6.

Mr. Hart asked if the higher number of people in the family the higher the income qualifications. Mr. O'Connor stated yes.

Mr. Hart stated asked what the salary range of people that are actually in need and will these income limits actually match the need. He asked if their market study can include that as a check to see if we are actually meeting the need, because the need based on the businesses may actually fall more towards 80% and not the 60%.

Mr. O'Connor stated that a certain number of units are fixed that have to meet those guidelines and will get those numbers.

Mr. Hart asked if they can break it down to show what the need vs market is.

Trustee asked if anyone could indicate how many people would qualify at the 100% mark. Vail is offering \$20/hour right now. He stated none of his waitresses would qualify at 60% or below. He asked if this would be only good for someone who is a dishwasher.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they are still lagging in terms to the incomes and will continue to work on that. He stated that he cannot build anything without the government support.

Trustee Gallagher stated reaching out to the businesses would be great.

Mr. Legg stated that Vail has people that are seasonal and asked if they would put seasonal residents in there.

Trustee Thompson asked about the people that work at Vail that live here and work for the season and don't work for the rest of the year.

Mr. Hart stated that its highly competitive and you just want to make sure the need works for the community and the community understands what it needs to be.

Trustee Gallagher asked if they could visit some of their sites, Prattsville/Woodstock. Mr. O'Connor stated sure.

Trustee Kashman asked if the demographics for Woodstock have changed over time. Mr. O'Connor stated that they could speak with Supervisor McKenna directly about that project. He stated that Woodstock was everything they set it out to be.

Mr. O'Connor stated that this project will be their first that is purely workforce housing and they are trying. He congratulated Tannersville on their DRI and what it brings to the potential for the project. He suggested that people reach out directly to HCR, Darren Scott, and he will go over what the states involvement in the process is.

Mr. O'Connor stated again that this is going to be purely for workforce housing and they cannot discriminate. He stated that they will test people's income when they apply and as they live there it is tested. If their income increases, they will pay more rent. Trustee Kashman asked what will happen if they lose their job.

Mr. O'Connor stated there are other programs out there that can help. He stated during the pandemic they did very well and were at 90% collection of rents. He stated that there are resources for people that lose their jobs.

Mr. Hart thanked Mr. O'Connor for answering the questions and stated that the County is supportive and will participate in this project. He stated that he is glad they are working with the foundation and Village and they have a great track record.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they will work to answer the questions raised and have some work to do, will look at the market study and incomes on Main Street.

The Mayor stated that the people are looking at Tannersville and Darren Scott came down for 2 days and toured the Village and stated what would be a good fit. He offered to come to the meeting today and sent a letter to the board addressing some questions, and would be willing to come down to address any further questions.

The Mayor stated that there will be another public meeting in June before the LPC meets in July. If the public has more questions they should come to that meeting. Its been held in transparency and will continue to get it out to the public.

Sally Dolan asked what people that are not J1 visas do in the off season when they are not working at the mountain.

Members of the audience replied, construction, multiple jobs, service jobs.

Mr. Legg said that there is the discrepancy that people assumed this was for Hunter Mountain. He stated that it would not be a good fit for the mountain since their workers are only here for a few months that come from other countries.

The Board took a 10 minute break.

The Mayor stated that he spoke with someone that helps seniors at the Prattsville complex and stated that it is a nice facility and it is mixed. Some dedicated to seniors and the other housing.

Trustee Thompson stated that her fear is that this will be come section 8 housing. The Mayor stated that 2/3 of the school population fits into that section 8 category.

Trustee Gallagher stated that there are those with section 8 vouchers all over the mountaintop.

The Mayor asked George Bain if he had an idea how many people may qualify for section 8 though the school. Mr. Bain replied that he didn't know the percentages but he did know that the school qualified for a grant to provide free breakfast and lunch to all students.

The Mayor stated that the property values are high and people can't afford to buy that is a regular person that wants to move here.

Trustee Thompson asked what jobs will be created to bring people here. Trustee Kashman asked how do you attract families and workers that will fit this mix and is 60% the right mix.

Trustee Gallagher asked if they could stay as close to the 60% as possible. Trustee Thompson stated that she concerned about the lottery and locals may not get it.

Mr. Bain stated that his parents, when they sold their house did not qualify for RUPCO and they were basically living hand to mouth on retirement. When they got to the point where they qualified, they didn't get in because they had a dog. He stated that if someone is working or has a pet he is concerned they won't qualify.

Trustee Kashman asked if Mr. Bain knew the starting salary for a teacher. He stated about \$40's or so. The Mayor stated they would qualify and especially if they had a child and that is a professional.

Trustee Gallagher stated that there will be apartments available for those at 80% AMI. Trustee Thompson stated very few and workforce housing is a very vague statement and you can't discriminate and you cant give preference.

Trustee Kashman stated that we shouldn't call it workforce housing, because his chef or waitresses won't be able to go there.

Trustee Thompson stated that if you look at their application, they can check any of the facilities they want to go.

The Mayor asked if they were saying we shouldn't do the project.

Trustee Thompson stated that she is all for the project but there is a concern that it's going to turn into what its not going to be.

The Mayor stated that this is a section 8 school district and more than 50% of the children qualify for free lunches.

Mr. Bain stated that there are millionaire's children that get free lunch too but its fair for everyone. The Mayor stated that he understands that we don't want the housing that went on in Hunter and they dispelled that it is a designated that building for section 8 building.

Trustee Gallagher stated that they asked for some things and some data and see what they come back with and see what the geographical catch will be. He also wants to see what Woodstock.

The Mayor stated Woodstock would be the best example of what to look at.

Trustee Kashman stated that if we are labeling this as workforce housing, then its how its communicated. He is not sure that most of the units at 60%....

The Mayor stated to call Darren Scott at HCR. Trustee Gallagher stated they will have to come back to them and give them a specific number of units.

Trustee Thompson read the following from the letter from Darren Scott: *A project may rent a 30% ami unit to a voucher holder, since the owner routinely collects a higher rental amount from the Section 8 program, and they've met their 30% ami set-aside. If they have more voucher holders win the lottery than 30% ami units, the applicants get placed in the higher ami units. It doesn't matter, and again, the Sec 8 payment will be based on the bedroom size, still a win for the project.*

Trustee Kashman stated that he wondered if they were kicked out if they didn't pay their rent. The Mayor stated that they said they had 90% rent collection.

Trustee Thompson said they got DSS.

Trustee Gallagher asked about the \$60,000 pilot and the cleanup of the site.

The Clerk asked if that \$60,000 covered all three taxes (Village, School Town/County). The Mayor stated yes and yearly and negotiated in contract of sale. They will pay the regular water bill.

Trustee Kashman asked why they don't pay taxes. The Mayor stated they don't have to.

Trustee Kashman stated that it doesn't work for their numbers and asked if there was a time frame. The Mayor said there is one month then the LPC votes on which projects get funded. Trustee Gallagher asked if we could do a resolution now for the sale of the property.

The Mayor stated that previously we were collecting nothing on it. We were also looking at putting our highway garage there. We paid \$30,000 to the County for the property and just received the deed a few weeks ago.

Trustee Kashman stated that its important for the LPC to understand these numbers.

The Mayor stated that we are going to have review on all of these projects. In terms of this one we cannot say we don't like who you are renting to as one of the parameters. Trustee Gallagher stated that we could look at density and capacity.

Trustee Thompson stated that they were not clear on their number of units. The Mayor stated that in the original DRI application, it was put in for 80 units and [RUPCO] brought it down to 65 on their own accord based on the market study which could change again.

Trustee Thompson stated Ed [Kaplan] told her that when the County sold the Village this property, it was intended for the DPW and not for this project. Trustee Kashman stated that it was the original goal.

The Mayor stated that the County wouldn't take ownership of the property and left a blighted building. The Mayor stated that we are not making money on this and trying to address the crisis in the community.

The Mayor stated that we will have to see what they come back with their data and market study.

The Clerk asked if they wanted her to reach out to other communities that had PILOTS.

Trustee Gallagher stated that \$60,000 is better than zero. The Clerk stated that the \$60,000 is not to us and is split.

Trustee Thompson asked if we could table this as she had groceries in the car.

The Mayor turned over the floor to Carl Giangrande. In the packet are sample laws from other communities regarding blighted buildings. Mr. Giangrande stated that Brookhaven's is good and they have a point system and enforcement allows for unpaid fees to go on taxes.

Mr. Giangrande stated that there aren't as many blighted vacant buildings as people think. If the Village were to pursue something like this that there is a tool to go after property owners that are not taking care of their property owners. The Board members liked the feel of Brookhaven's law.

The Mayor asked the board if would like to have a meeting to discuss this.

The Clerk stated the June meeting will be in June 15th.

Multiple conversations were being had at the same time.

The Mayor stated to email RUPCO about the market study, the allocation of units, AMI, and those numbers according to their market study.

Trustee Kashman stated that those numbers would be good for the LPC.

The Mayor stated that even if a project is awarded, these projects still have to go through site plan review.

Mr. Giangrande stated he has provided the board samples of STR laws from Lexington and Jewett. He said one of the communities is now looking at putting in a provision that you have to own the property for 2 years before you can apply for a short term rental. With caps and limitations, it could be severe. Jewett's law is addressing items up front and more workable so far. He said we are here to address issues, Jewett's law is simple and no limits as far as capping.

The Mayor stated we want bad actors under control and he is not in favor of capping.

Mr. Giangrande stated another thing with Jewett it gives the ability to look at these houses that may have tucked a room into or made their basement into a apartment.

Trustee Gallagher stated that he won't be interested in the 2 year waiting period but likes Jewett's laws.

Trustee Kashman also liked Jewett's.

Mr. Giangrande stated that Jewett also hired a service to identify the properties, costs \$6000/year. He stated that you will want to set your fee structure to cover the program and the additional work involved.

Trustee Kashman asked if we should be including a portion of the Albany Law with the Brookhaven Law for blighted/vacant buildings.

Mr. Giangrande stated that the Albany law is like a registration, and will be more work for our office. The Brookhaven Law goes directly to enforcement.

Trustee Gallagher stated that we have a lot of buildings that are vacant but being maintained, but we also have building not being maintained that are not vacant. We are more concerned about blight and not vacancy.

The Mayor stated we should reach out to these companies to do the scrub so we have our fee structure right. He stated that we had probably 60 that are currently known.

The Mayor stated that there are several companies that do the short term rentals.

Mr. Giangrande stated that the program used was Host Compliance. There are other programs, but fees were all over the place.

Trustee Kashman said they could look at companies online. Perhaps we could do this in house.

The Mayor stated that the clerk is preparing an advertisement for employment for a part time employee and stated that Robin will be in on the interviewing.

The Mayor stated that he will have the budget numbers so we know where we are at for the end of the year. He will adjust the sidewalk numbers for the LPC. He stated that he spoke with the Rabbi's and they were willing to work with them on the proposed sidewalk on Tompkins Street.

Trustee Thompson asked if Raspberry Lane was removed and the Mayor replied yes and Renwick is included.

The Mayor stated that it would go right to Sunset, but will have to look at drainage and such.

The Mayor stated that update on the lake, DEC will be coming out to show us what lily pads we can take out.

Trustee Gallagher asked if we are going to have a flooding issue coming on to the bike path. He asked if we were going to address the beavers.

Trustee Kashman stated that he will have Steve look at that.

Trustee Gallagher made a motion to close the meeting. Trustee Kashman seconded. Four in favor, one absent, motion carried.