1	BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON HOUSING, CONSTRUCTION, AND			
2	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT			
3	PUBLIC HEARING:			
4	RENT REGULATION AND TENANT PROTECTION LEGISLATION			
5				
6	Medgar Evers College			
7	medgar Evers College 1650 Bedford Ave Brooklyn, New York			
8	Date: May 16, 2019			
9	Time: 1:00 p.m.			
10	PRESIDING:			
11	Senator Brian Kavanagh			
12	Chair			
13	PRESENT:			
14	Senator Michael Gianaris			
15	Senator Brad Hoylman			
16	Senator Robert Jackson			
17	Senator Liz Krueger			
18	Senator John C. Liu			
19	Senator Zellnor Myrie			
20	Senator Gustavo Rivera			
21	Senator Julia Salazar			
22				
23				
24				
25				

			2
1	SPEAKERS:	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2	Beverly Newsome	23	
3	President Ebbets Field Tenants Organization		
4	Darryl Randall	23	
5	Member	23	
6	Sara Lazur Member	23	
7	Crown Heights Tenant Union		
8	Michael Barbosa Assistant Attorney General in Charge	35	42
9	Brooklyn Regional Office		
10	Benjamin Dulchin Executive Director	45	57
11	The Association for Neighborhood & Housing Development		
12	J.T. Falcone	45	57
13	Policy Analyst United Neighborhood Houses	43	57
14	Carmen Vega-Rivera	74	85
15	CASA Leader Anita Long		
16	CASA Leader CASA		
17	Nilda Rivera	95	105
18	Tenant Leader Woodside on the Move	7 3	103
19		95	105
20	Ivan Contreras Lead Organizer, Woodside on the Move Also, Campaign Coordinator,	95	105
21	No More MCI Coalition		
22	Sandra Dominguez Member	95	105
23	Woodside on the Move		
24			
25			

Г

			3
1	SPEAKERS (Continued):	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2			
3	Kathleen Wacom Member Julia Easterlin	109	125
4	Member Andrea Shapiro		
5	Program Manager Metropolitan Council on Housing		
6			
7	Adam Meyers Deputy Director, Preserving Affordable Housing Program -	134	
8	Group Representation Unit Brooklyn Legal Services Corporation A		
9	Chavette Jackson	134	
10	Senior Staff Attorney Brooklyn Legal Services NYC,	134	
11	Brooklyn Branch		
12	Xiao Ling Chen Member of Chinatown Tenants Union	162	172
13	Coalition Against Anti-Asian Violence		
14	Melanie Wang Translating for Xiao Ling Chen		
15	Clara Perez Joseph	177	190
16	Member Marcela Mitaynes	_,,	100
17	Tenant advocate and organizer Neighbors Helping Neighbors		
18		101	
19	Delsenia Glover Executive Director, New York State Tenants and Neighbors	194	
20	Information Service, Also, Executive Director, New York State		
21	Tenants and Neighbors Coalition		
22			
23			
24			
25			

			4
1	SPEAKERS (Continued):	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2	Ona Burns A Tenant	200	215
4	Martin Kofman	200	215
5	President, American Package Company Also, Owner of an IMD Building in Green Point		
6		0.0.0	0.1.5
7	Diamond Harding Member, Fifth Avenue Committee Member, Stabilizing NYC Citywide	200	215
8	Tenant Union		
9	Paimaan Lodhi Senior Vice President	218	226
10	Real Estate Board of New York		
11	_ , _	0.00	0.0.5
12	Amshula Jayaram Senior Campaign Strategist Demos	282	295
13		202	205
14	Nakeeb Siddique Director of Housing for the Brooklyn Neighborhood Office	282	295
15	Legal Aid Society		
16	Esther Diaz Member	302	
17	Make the Road New York		
18	Julian Gomez Translating for Esther Diaz	302	
19	Tenant Organizer, Make the Road		
20	Giselda Matza (not present) Member, Make the Road	302	
21	Written Statement read by Julian Gomez		
22		309	
23	Christine Malden (ph.) A tenant	309	

			5
1	SPEAKERS (Continued):	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2		200	
3	Ximena Garnica A Tenant Allison Dell	309	
4	A Tenant New York City Lost Tenants		
5	Eric Adams (not present)	332	
6	Brooklyn Borough President Written Statement Read by	332	
7	Anthony Drummond, Housing Policy Analyst to Eric Adams		
8	Laura Mascuch	340	
9	Executive Director Supportive Housing Network of New York		
10	Emily Mock	340	
11	Tenant Organizer, CAAAV Representing Chinatown Tenants Union	310	
12	Jackie Del Valle	340	
13	Stabilizing NYC Coordinator Urban Justice Center	340	
14	Nancy Sher	357	
15	A Tenant Brooklyn		
16	Matthew Berman	357	
17	Partner Valli Kane & Vagnini, LLP	337	
18	Alicia Boyd	357	
19	Member Movement to Protect the People	337	
20			
21	Frederick Johnson A Tenant	357	
22	Esteban Giron Member, Organizing Committee of	385	
23	Crown Heights Tenant Union Also, Member, Tenants PAC Board		
24			
25			

			6
1	SPEAKERS (Continued):	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2	Lisa Mathis	385	20-21-01-2
3	Member Crown Heights Tenant Union	385	
4		400	
5	Lynne Timko Member GOLES	400	
6		400	
7	Tyrone McDonald Government and Community Relations Neighborhood Housing Services	400	
8	of Brooklyn		
9	Jennifer Weber Member	400	
10	CIRCL		
11	Mark Gering Founding Member	409	
12	New York City Loft Tenants		
13	Mateo Cartegena A Tenant	409	
14	Victoria Hillstrom	409	
15	A Tenant		
16			
17	00		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

So I'm Senator Brian Kavanagh, Chair of the Housing Committee.

And, first of all, let me begin by welcoming everybody here.

This is our second hearing of the Senate

Housing Committee on tenant protection and the rent
laws.

And we are very happy and proud to be right here in Brooklyn, where we know much of the concern and much of the effect of what we're trying to do here will be felt directly in our communities.

We do, as anyone who came through the front door of this building know, have a great deal in testifying.

We have about 140 seats in this room, and we have a very long list of people who are interested in testifying, and we're going to try do our best to get everybody, particularly those who signed up in advance, up here.

I'm going to keep my remarks very brief, but
I have a wide range -- a whole bunch of senators
here, most of whom are members of the Housing
Committee, and others of whom are joining us today.
And I'm going to give each of them an opportunity
now to say something briefly, if they choose to.

1 But, we have Senators Myrie, Salazar, 2 Krueger, Gianaris, Liu, Rivera, and Jackson with us 3 today. So I'm going to actually turn over the floor 4 to any of them who wants to say something to begin. 5 6 SENATOR RIVERA: Should we start with Robert? 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: So we'll start -- why don't we start on my left with Senator Jackson. 8 9 SENATOR JACKSON: Hi, everyone. I'm Robert Jackson. I represent Marble Hill, 10 11 Inward, Washington Heights, part of West Harlem, 12 going down to Upper West Side, down to midtown, to 13 Chelsea area, 13 miles long, a very gerrymandered 14 district in Manhattan. 15 And I looked at the list of rent-stabilized units. Gustavo Rivera and myself, we have the 16 17 highest number of rent-stabilized units out of all of 39, all of the New York State senators, out of 18 63. 19 20 We have 68,000 units in our senatorial 21 districts that are rent-stabilized. 22 So with that, I look forward to listening to

the testimony.

I'm signed on to all nine bills.

23

24

25

I am a rent-stabilized tenant myself --

[Applause.]

SENATOR JACKSON: -- so what I do affects you, and it affects me and my family.

Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

Next up, Senator Rivera.

SENATOR RIVERA: Good afternoon to everybody.

Gustavo Rivera, State Senator for the

33rd District in the bogey-down Bronx

(hand-gesturing). I got to throw up my Xs, got to

do it, particularly --

[Applause.]

SENATOR RIVERA: -- particularly when I'm all the way down in Brooklyn. I don't necessarily come down to Brooklyn unless it's very important, like what we're doing today.

Now, as Robert said, it is -- it's actually fitting that he spoke first and I spoke second because, in the number of rent-stabilized units in the entire state, the number-one Senate District is Robert's, the number-two district is mine.

Now, when -- a couple years ago I would have told you about 70,000 units.

The reality is, that we are below 67,000 now

in my district.

And that is precisely what we're talking about in these hearings, and why we are doing the work that we're doing to strengthen the rent laws.

Now, I should tell you that, I've been in New York since 1998, and I've been living in a rent-stabilized unit since 2000. I've been living in my same building in a rent-stabilized unit.

I moved in 2010 from a studio to a one-bedroom, but the fact is, that I would not be able to live in the city or thrive in the city were it not for rent regulation, rent stabilization.

And, I'm one of the lucky ones.

There are families that come to my district office every day, talking about the issues that they have to deal with.

So I'm looking forward to hearing from all of you.

One last thing that I will say before I pass it on to my colleagues, I know that we're going to be talking about a lot of things.

One of the things that I'm going to be very much paying a lot of attention to is major capital improvements (MCIs).

The reality is --

1 [Applause.] SENATOR RIVERA: The reality is, that MCIs 2 are not equal to maintenance. 3 "Maintenance" is what you do to keep your 4 apartments livable. You don't wait until they're 5 6 all messed up, to then be able to get some extra money out of your tenants just because you haven't 7 fixed it to make it livable. 8 9 So we -- so that's just one of the many 10 things that we're going to be talking about today. 11 But, whether it's independent apartment 12 improvements or MCIs, I'm going to be paying a lot 13 of attention to that. Thank you for being part of this process. 14 15 And, I'm also a co-sponsor on all of the nine 16 bills. 17 Thank you so much. [Applause.] 18 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you -- thank you, 19 20 Senator Rivera. 21 Next up, Senator Liz Krueger. 22 SENATOR KRUEGER: Hi, I'm Liz Krueger from 23 Manhattan --24 [Applause.]

25 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- and I've been in the

Senate for 17 years.

And one of my reasons for allowing myself to be drafted to run for the Senate 17 years ago was to finally fix our rent laws.

So it's taken a hell of a lot longer than I imagined it would ever take --

[Laughter.]

SENATOR KRUEGER: -- but I am confident that, before we leave session at the end of June, we have -- we'll have done an amazing job at addressing some of the fundamental problems facing the future of New York, making sure we have affordable, stable housing for people to live in and for their families to stay in.

And people think, Manhattan, what kind of problems do you have?

Well, I'll tell you, we've been ground zero of everything that you're seeing in the rest of the boroughs now.

And when a reporter says to me, "Well, isn't rent regulation just a problem in Manhattan?" I say, Where you been living for the last 25 years?

[Laughter.]

SENATOR JACKSON: Everything wrong that happened in Manhattan has spread throughout the

1 entire city of New York. So, things that you think are new in your 2 communities and your buildings, check with us from 3 Manhattan, we'll tell you our stories from 20 years 4 5 ago. 6 So I am proud to be here with this great 7 panel. And I know, I can tell you, that 8 9 Brian Kavanagh and Zellnor Myrie have been leading us in our housing working-group efforts. 10 11 And those of you who don't know them, should 12 know, you couldn't be prouder of these two 13 legislators for doing the work that we need to do --14 [Applause.] 15 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- to bring us over the 16 finish line in coordination with the Assembly. 17 Thank you all for being here. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 18 19 [Applause.] 20 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you,

21

22

23

24

25

Senator Krueger, for your kind remarks.

Next up, our hometown senator, who I think needs very little introduction in this room, Zellnor Myrie.

[Applause.]

1 SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you. I really want to thank the Chair, 2 3 Brian Kavanagh, Senator Kavanagh, for bringing this hearing to Central Brooklyn. 4 I think it means a lot to the tenants of my 5 6 district, but really tenants all over the city, for 7 you to bring the New York State Senate into a place where affordability is at a crisis level. 8 So, I really want to publicly thank you for 9 that because it means a lot to us. 10 11 I want to thank Medgar Evers College for 12 being an excellent host and accommodating us. 13 I'd like to thank my colleagues. 14 We're also joined by Assembly 15 Member Walter Mosley whose district we are in. 16 [Applause.] 17 SENATOR MYRIE: And it would not be a public hearing on housing in Brooklyn if the unofficial 18 hearing didn't start outside on the corner --19 20 [Laughter.] 21 SENATOR MYRIE: -- for those of you who were 22 here earlier.

I too am a rent-stabilized tenant. I am -- grew up in a rent-stabilized apartment four blocks from where we are right now.

23

24

I went to elementary and middle school three 1 2 blocks away from where we are right now. 3 I would not be who I am today if it were not for the protections of rent regulation. 4 5 So this is an issue that is very, very personal to me. It is the number-one reason why 6 I ran for office. 7 And I am honored to be sitting and amongst 8 colleagues who care just as deeply for protecting 9 our communities throughout the state. 10 11 So I look forward to hearing the testimony 12 today. 13 Please, we have accommodated you in order to 14 give us everything that you think we should be 15 paying attention to as it pertains to rent 16 regulation. 17 So, thank you again to all of the tenants 18 that have made their way out from all over the 19 state, and I look forward to hearing your testimony. 20 [Applause.] 21 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Senator Myrie. 22 Next up we have Senator Salazar. 23 SENATOR SALAZAR: Thank you.

[Applause.]

SENATOR SALAZAR: Thank you, everyone.

24

Thank you for coming here today for the second in a series of hearings that the Senate is hosting on rent regulation.

I want to thank both Assemblyman Mosley and Senator Myrie for hosting us in their district, for Senator Kavanagh as the Chair of the Housing Committee.

This issue is personal to me.

Years ago I was a tenant in a building that was not protected by rent stabilization, and organized a small rent strike, to try to get our neglectful, abusive management company and landlord to make urgent repairs in the building.

Ever since then, have been deeply invested in the fight for housing justice in New York State.

I'm the senator for the 18th, or as I call it, the "great-teenth," District, in North

Brooklyn, where we have seen a lot of tenants suffering from the rapid loss of rent-stabilized housing in the district, particularly due to deregulatory policies that I believe we need to repeal ahead of the rent laws expiring in just 30 days from now.

I'm really excited to hear from tenants and stakeholders today so that you-all can inform what

we do next in the next few weeks to really strengthen our rent laws.

Thanks.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Senator Salazar.

Next up we're gonna -- we have -- I think a lot of people in the house from Queens, and we'll hear from -- first, from Senator John Liu.

[Applause.]

SENATOR LIU: Thank you.

This is -- I guess I'm the beginning of the Queens section on the dais.

Let me start by saying that I am not, and I have never, been a rent-stabilized tenant, but this is an issue that is core to New York City.

Unlike most cities in this country where,

typically, you have one-third of the residents

living in -- as tenants, in New York City we have

the vast majority of people living as tenants; more

than two-thirds.

And so we have a system where the rents have been, or at least been kept, somewhat reasonable because of a housing shortage and housing emergency.

That's how it's been defined under the law.

1 But the problem is, over the last couple of decades, the laws in New York have continued to 2 eliminate unit after unit, hundreds of hundreds, 3 thousands of thousands, of rental units from the 4 5 rent laws, from their stabilized-rent laws, and that 6 is making our city unlivable for too many people. 7 As our population continues to grow, the number of affordable housing units continue to 8 decline. 9

> This is a trend that must be stopped and must be reversed.

And that is why we are deliberating and discussing and, hopefully, passing, in short order, the entire package of rent-reform laws.

So, I'm here to hear all of you.

I am also with my colleagues on these bills, and, the bottom line is, we need to do this.

We need this reform because the rent is (motioning)...

THE AUDIENCE: ... too high!

SENATOR LIU: I think everybody is on board.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Senator Liu.

Next up, Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Thank you.

24

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

[Applause.]

2 SENATOR GIANARIS: Thank you.

Thank you, thank you.

I also am part of the Queens contingent, proudly, and I happen to represent the district that has the most rent-stabilized units in Queens, although, as Senator Rivera pointed out, that number is decreasing too quickly.

It's some of the fastest gentrifying neighborhoods in New York: Astoria, Long Island City, Sunnyside, Ridgewood, and, of course, Woodside.

My friends in Woodside are here.

I too sponsor all nine bills in the platform $\label{eq:proof_sponsor} \text{and proud of it.}$

[Applause.]

SENATOR GIANARIS: But, you're probably only going to hear me talking today about the bill that I authored and sponsored, which is the elimination of MCIs.

[Applause.]

SENATOR GIANARIS: I think you saw some of my friends outside that came to talk to me about the MCIs.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR GIANARIS: And the only other thing
I would mention is, that I want to commend so many
of my colleagues up here, who, like me, have refused
to take contributions from landlords and the real
estate industry any longer.

So as --

[Applause.]

SENATOR GIANARIS: -- as we do this important work, it's important for us to make clear that we stand with our tenants, and we will not be influenced by any political support from anybody else.

So, I want to hear from the folks, I'll cut it off there.

But, thank you all for being here.

And, in a couple of weeks, hopefully, we'll get this done the right way.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, all.

So now we come to the purpose for which we're here, which is to hear from the many witnesses that have signed up.

We also have a few additional people who are requesting to testify, and we are going to try to accommodate everybody.

We are scheduled to be here until 8:00, and not much later than that, given our understanding with Medgar Evers College.

But, again, so just a few ground rules that we would appreciate people respecting during this hearing.

There is a 6-minute timer. It is -- it should be down there (indicating).

You all probably can see it, I can't see it.

There's another version of it there on this very official cardboard box (indicating), which means we can see it.

We would ask that, if you are testifying, that you -- your testimony, meaning your initial remarks, be contained within that 6 minutes.

In addition to that, if members of the panel up here, members of the Senate, have questions for you, they will ask.

That does not count as your 6 minutes. That is the time of the senators.

Some of you will get questions, and some of you may not, because, again, although we want to hear from you, and may have, you know, thoughts and questions about your testimony, we are also gonna -- I'm going to ask all of my Senate colleagues to try

to move through this so -- because, again, we have 50-some-odd people that would like to talk today.

In the same spirit, two things:

Although we all -- we all enjoyed the rousing rounds of applause for some of our colleagues, we are going to ask people to keep audience reaction to a minimum.

You're going to hear a lot of things that your fellow testifiers, that you like. You're gonna hear some other things maybe that you don't like so much.

But if we kind of applaud each time we hear something we like, and, you know, do that, and something else each time we hear something we don't like, that will just diminish the number of people get to speak today.

So we are trying -- again, our goal is to come to Brooklyn to hear from everybody.

And, we are going bring people up in groups, just because it's easier, you get three people seated.

We're going to try to keep you in sort of groups that are of similar perspective, but, obviously, you're all welcome to testify as you see fit.

So -- and we're -- you know, we know that some people are outside and still trying to get in because there's a limited capacity in here.

So, I'm going to call names.

If you are not -- if the person's not here, we will -- you know, we'll call the name again a little later.

If you hear somebody's name, and you know them and they're not here, please, you know, text them or let them know that they've been called, and they should let us know when they come back into the room.

Okay, so without further ado, I think we're going to begin with some of our -- given that we're here in Brooklyn, I think we will start with Beverly Newsome and -- of Ebbets Field Tenants
Association (sic), and, Sarah Lazur and Darryl Randall of the Crown Heights.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So just -- the way this works, these folks are handling the A/V. This whole thing is recorded.

So please begin by stating your name, and any organization you're representing, and then proceed with your testimony.

1 So, thank you. BEVERLY NEWSOME: Can you hear me? 2 SENATOR LIU: Just a little closer 3 (inaudible). 4 BEVERLY NEWSOME: A little closer? 5 (Indiscernible cross-talking.) 6 7 BEVERLY NEWSOME: Oh, okay. 8 Oh. 9 Okay, thank you. 10 Good afternoon. 11 My name is Beverly Newsome. I'm president of Ebbets Field Tenants 12 Organization, so I represent the tenants of Ebbets 13 Field. 14 15 Today I would like to draw attention to the 16 application of MCIs in Ebbets Field. 17 We've received elevator MCIs for at least 18 two buildings on the property. 19 The cost was broken down into cost per room, 20 which increased the cost per apartment by 21 approximately \$16, which, after three months, this cost was added to the total amount of the rent. 22 23 After the MCI, the elevators continued to breakdown with the same level of frequency as they 24

did prior to the MCI work being done.

According to "The New York Post," for

January 1, 2019, FDNY visited the property

159 times, rescuing individuals from the elevator.

We are now in housing court because elevators were either not working or poorly working.

Tenants didn't know when they got home if the elevators will be working at all, but we continue to pay the MCI increase; that hasn't changed.

In addition to our management exploiting us with MCIs, we have preferential leases which are being used to manipulate tenants out of their rights.

Preferential leases not only prevent tenant engagement, it is used with bias.

I have seen tenants be denied a rent increase because they engaged in a building-wide decrease in services, and we won.

I've seen a tenant's rent go up to \$1,000 because she began an HP action for having fallen down a broken handicap ramp.

I've seen a single mom's rent be increased by \$700 because she reported to the press her inability to get needed repairs addressed.

Preferential leases create transient communities, allowing landlords to evict tenants by

just increasing the rent out of their reach. 1 Preferential leases must be stopped. 2 3 Many landlords use tenants' homes as if they are banks, using them as leverage to purchase other 4 5 properties without maintaining the properties they 6 currently have. 7 Tenants regularly paying rent, but finding it necessary to do an action in order to get repairs 8 done. 9 We are counting on our electeds to balance 10 11 the scales. 12 Thank you. 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 14 [Applause.] 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: So we have a question. 16 BEVERLY NEWSOME: Sure. 17 SENATOR RIVERA: Really quickly, 159 times? BEVERLY NEWSOME: Ah, yes. 18 19 SENATOR RIVERA: And how long, in a year? 20 BEVERLY NEWSOME: A year. 21 SENATOR RIVERA: 159 times in one year? 22 BEVERLY NEWSOME: 159 times in one year. SENATOR RIVERA: Thank you. 23 24 BEVERLY NEWSOME: You're welcome. 25 SENATOR RIVERA: That's (inaudible).

DARRYL RANDALL: Hello.

My name is Darryl Randall, and I'm a member of the Crown Heights Tenant Union, and I organize with UHAB.

I lived at 944 Marcy Avenue for 22 years.

My landlord is Jeff Groner (ph.). He owns
16 buildings throughout Central Brooklyn.

My building is facing multiple MCIs, rent increases, and people are going to have to move out.

I am currently unemployed and I'm living off a very tight budget, and our newest pending MCI rent increase will make it harder for me to pay for food, utilities, and transportation.

It might eventually mean that have I to move out of the neighborhood I have called "home" for 22 years.

This is my issue with MCIs:

Landlords are using them as a tactic to kick out long-term residents.

MCIs undermine rent stabilization by allowing landlords to increase rents very quickly.

According to RGB data, the owner of an average rent-stabilized building made a total of \$1.87 million in net operating income from that building between 2011 and 2017.

I know that, from public record, that my own landlord reported over \$230,000 of net operating income from my building last year, yet he tells us in meetings that he cannot possibly afford to make upgrades to the building without passing the cost off to tenants.

My building is also getting deregulated apartment by apartment.

I'm sure you are familiar with this pattern of using the vacancy bonus, IAIs, MCIs, et cetera, to deregulate apartments and convert them to market rate.

Tenants in my building who are not rent-stabilized are afraid to organize because they are not guaranteed a lease renewal.

Even though they face the same issues as us, including a broken elevator, they do not feel like they can fight for their rights because they know the landlord can just not renew their lease.

There are a lot of smaller buildings in this district that are not even subject to rent stabilization.

Passing good-cause eviction, that would provide basic protection to 27,000 people in my Senate District.

This is our chance -- this is our chance to act and to preserve the New York that we all love.

I strongly believe that every bill in this package needs to be passed together in order to create the change we need to see.

From my experience, having a landlord that exploits every loophole available to him, I know that getting rid of the vacancy bonus without getting rid of MCIs, for example, would just mean that tenants will see more MCIs in our near future.

I believe in universal rent control as a path towards addressing the grave injustices that have been committed towards people of color across the entire history of housing policy.

We need you to pass all nine bills so that we can feel secure in our homes and strengthen our communities.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

We're going to begin the clock again.

And just to be clear, we're gonna do 6 -we're going to offer people 6 minutes per person
testifying, but you're welcome not to use all
6 minutes, as two people have done so far, which is

very welcomed, so other people get to speak.

Also, I just want to note, if you do have written testimony and it is, you know, maybe longer than you want to read, if you submit a written document, it will be considered part of the record of this hearing.

So feel free to submit your written testimony as well.

And proceed, thank you.

SARA LAZUR: Good afternoon.

My name is Sarah Lazur.

I'm a lecturer at Barnard College, and a member of the Crown Heights Tenant Union as well.

When I moved to Brooklyn, I had no idea what rent stabilization was.

When I found out about it, I got my rent history, I decoded it on my own, and I found out that my apartment used to be stabilized, but had been destabilized five years before I moved in.

I was disappointed, but this became anger when I saw that the pathway to that destabilization included illegal increase percentages at multiple times, no accounting for increases, and even a failure to register one year, followed by more illegal increases, preferential rents, and

destabilization.

The rent history also told another story, one in which long-term tenants move out and are followed by a turning mill of short-term tenants, people who stay for one year and then evaporate, signing leases whose numbers make no sense, but who clearly were not around long enough to discover the problem or try to rectify it.

When I researched further, I found that the number of destabilized units in my building diminished regularly with every passing year, and the same was taking place in every building owned by the same landlord.

This couldn't be a coincidence, could it?

Since joining the Crown Heights Tenant Union and learning more and more about the laws, I've helped friends and neighbors to decode their rent histories, and similar same patterns immerged:

Illegal increase percentages;

Vacancy turnover, accelerating in the 1990s after vacancy decontrol was enacted;

And loss of stabilized units across their landlord's portfolio since 2007.

This can't be a coincidence, can it?

In my working with the CHTU, I have met

hundreds of my neighbors who have been dealing with lack of heat and hot water in the winter, lack of repairs, refusals to give leases, and overcharge, and this is even with the protections promised by current laws and with landlords having MCI and IAI allowances at their disposal.

Now, if they can push the cost of a new boiler on to the tenants indefinitely through MCIs, how is it that my neighbors are still without heat?

It's because MCIs are not being used for their stated purpose.

The entire purpose of letting someone go without heat is to make their living condition so bad they choose to leave.

And if you churn through enough stabilized tenants, you can get through enough vacancy bonuses to get to the brass ring, decontrol.

Crown Heights North ranks fourth in the entire city in how quickly the price per square foot is increasing, and, at the same time, Crown Heights North ranks fourth in the entire city in terms of serious housing-code violations per unit.

This can't be a coincidence, can it?

I can admit, I'm scared to be putting my decontrol story out there.

So far I've been lucky.

I have a good relationship with my landlord, and my rent increases have been at levels I have been able to manage, although, 4 to 5 percent every year will eventually be too much when my income increases only 2 percent every year.

But because my landlord -- because my

apartment isn't currently stabilized, if my landlord

changes his mind about liking me having -- having me

in the building, if I try to start a tenant

association, or if he finds out that I'm talking

about the rent laws in public, or if I make too many

requests for repairs, there is nothing to prevent

him from choosing to not renew my lease in the

future, nor to prevent him from raising my rent by

50 percent or 100 percent.

I'm a good tenant.

I pay my rent on time, I take good care of the place, and that still might be enough -- not be enough to stay in my home and in my community.

And there are more of us among the unregulated tenants that you might -- than you might think.

Repealing the vacancy decontrol would be a godsend.

My stabilized neighbors dealing with harassment could get peace of mind that their rights will remain, and my destabilized neighbors and I would get the security of a lease renewal back.

Passing good-cause eviction would ease the existential dread felt by my neighbors in unregulated apartments, and would bring

New York State into line with commonsense policies in places like Germany.

For all the reasons I've stated, I'm nervous to speak today, but I chose to speak because these laws are too important to remain silent.

This housing crisis is not the result of coincidences.

It has been engineered through bad policy, and my neighbors and I are asking you to do the right thing and enact these good policies.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, all.

And I am going to add, we would all like to applaud, but I'm going to ask everybody to hold their applause till -- you know, as we move forward.

Any questions for anyone on this panel? Okay.

1 Thank you so much for your testimony.

Next up we are going to have Michael Barbosa, representing our Attorney General Letitia James, who I think has some familiarity with Brooklyn.

ASST AG MICHAEL BARBOSA: Good afternoon, Chair Kavanagh and distinguished members of the Committee.

My name is Mike Barbosa.

I'm an assistant attorney general in charge of the Brooklyn Regional Office.

I thank you for allowing me to share testimony on behalf of our Attorney General James.

There is perhaps no more important issue facing this chamber than the one we're discussing today.

Just under 2 1/2 million New Yorkers live in rent-regulated apartments, mostly in New York City, but also in parts of Long Island, Westchester, and Rockland County.

Statewide, 46 percent of all households are renters, the highest percentage of any state in the nation.

8.3 million New Yorkers live in rental housing statewide.

As we are all aware, that people in New York

face significant challenges with finding safe affordable housing.

In New York City, 30 percent of renters pay half or more of their income toward rent.

In Brooklyn it's slightly higher, at 31 percent.

Rent regulation is meant to alleviate the pressure by not only providing for housing that is affordable, but also assuring the long-term stability of families and neighborhoods.

But weaknesses in the law have let this valuable source of affordable housing slip away, and has eroded the protections that families rely for housing stability, such as the right to renew their leases, as discussed, protections against reductions in services, and reasonable rent increases.

The laws governing how and when landlords can increase rent, pass along fees, or deregulate units altogether have proven to be inadequate.

Because of these weaknesses in the law, we're losing rent-regulated housing at an alarming rate.

Since 1994, when vacancy decontrol was reintroduced in New York City, 291,000 apartments were lost to deregulation. Of these, 155,000 units were lost to vacancy decontrol.

Rent-regulated housing makes the bulk of apartments that are affordable to families in New York City.

Those with fewer resources may become homeless, and others may choose to leave New York for good.

It's no coincidence that, as more apartments become deregulated, homelessness has increased.

Since January of 2017, there's been at least 48,000 evictions citywide, with 13,500 evictions in Brooklyn alone.

That is, on average, each month, 482 families were thrown out of their apartments in Brooklyn since 2017.

The waves of displacement we've seen in neighborhoods throughout Brooklyn and across the state have been fueled by speculation harassment, speculative capital, and weakened (sic) in the law have resulted in an eviction machine.

But let me just talk about our office, because I'm really speaking to the crowd.

As the Attorney General, we take an active role in protecting the rights of tenants against landlords that engage in harassment, intimidation, and fraud.

And I thank the Committee and the

Senate for your assistance in passing

Senator Krueger's-sponsored bill, the Tenants

Protection Act of 2019, which will give our office more tools in holding landlords accountable for harassment.

But while the act gave us more tools to fight harassment after it occurs, it would be even better to prevent tenants from being harassed in the first place.

This moment is ripe with opportunity to reform a rent-regulation system that, at this time, is not serving its intended purpose.

This chamber is debating a number of bills that would greatly affect the lives of tenants in New York State.

While I cannot comment on the specifics of these bills in this venue and at this time, I do want to state, unequivocally, that our Attorney General and the Office of the Attorney General supports the aims of these bills, to protect the rights of tenants, and to reform a system that landlords have too easily been able to manipulate at the expense of working families and seniors.

The current system leaves tenants vulnerable

to harassment and fraud, displacement, and despair.

The system needs to change.

Through the course of our several investigations, our office has gained firsthand knowledge of the ways in which landlords abuse the laws governing rent regulation.

We put some landlords in jail, others has paid fines and direct restitution to tenants they have harmed.

But for every bad actor they bring -- we bring to justice, there are countless other families who feel powerless to stop the harassment or abuse of the law used to force them out of their homes.

We cannot address tenant harassment and displacement if we do not address the underlying cause, which is greed, enabled by a rent-regulation system that rewards landlords for punishing (sic) tenants out of their apartments.

So the enactment of vacancy decontrol led to the loss of 155,000 rent-regulated units, many were once affordable.

As we lose more units to decontrol, we have fewer and fewer apartments that are affordable to low-income New Yorkers.

Because the vacancy decontrol exists, so does

the temptation of landlords to raise rents by abusing the law.

Similarly, the vacancy bonus incentivizes landlords to turn over apartments as quickly as possible by pushing out tenants.

These bonuses can quickly add up.

We also talked about -- it's also been discussed about the MCIs and the IAAs (sic).

This system allows landlords to claim rent increases when they make building improvements.

It's broken.

There's far too little oversight, and we know, because of our investigations, that landlords fraudulently abuse the system.

Currently, DHCR relies on landlords to faithfully represent the amount of work done when claiming these increases, which can lead to abuses.

But our office has received complaints from tenants about landlords' abuses by inflating the cost of the renovations and not doing the work.

Preferential rents.

Landlords claim to charge regulated tenants a lower preferential rate when local -- are lower than the legal rent allows for rent regulation.

The number of households with preferential

rent is increasing as landlords scoop up allowed rent increases even as they charge in reality.

And then there is the Emergency Tenant Protection Act (ETPA) and the good-cause eviction.

Both these measures would expand the protections afforded to tenants across the state.

More than 2 million tenants statewide are not protected.

The good-cause bill, giving tenants the right to renew, could allow tenants to request repairs without fear of reprisal, as previously discussed.

But I also need to talk about manufactured homes.

There are 85,000 New York households living in manufactured homes.

As a result, park owners have little power over as residents because they have to pay for the land.

And they need protections as well.

The Attorney General is committed to protecting individual and family tenants from unscrupulous landlords, but we need your help as well.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask to you wrap up, even though the clock just said you had

1 99 more minutes. And --[Laughter.] 2 ASST AG MICHAEL BARBOSA: Thank you. 3 Too many tenants have already had their lives 4 5 disrupted because of unscrupulous landlords' behavior. 6 7 We have a moral imperative to act. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to 8 9 testify. 10 [Applause.] 11 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 12 Again, we'd appreciate, hold the applause, 13 just to get more people to speak. 14 Any questions? 15 SENATOR KRUEGER: Just urge the Governor to 16 sign the bill we passed. 17 ASST AG MICHAEL BARBOSA: Thank you. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, some -- I think you 18 19 do have questions, though. 20 So, first up we have Senator Gianaris. 21 SENATOR GIANARIS: Thank you. 22 I appreciate your testimony. And, as someone from the office that deals 23 with enforcement in a lot of these things, 24 25 I appreciate you identifying the problem properly.

I wanted to ask about MCIs specifically.

Many of us are concerned that, if we do a lot of reform on the other issues, but leave MCIs as something landlords can exploit, they're going to end up exploiting it even more than they are now.

In other words, if that's the remaining loophole, they're going to drive a truck through it.

Is it your opinion that the MCI program is salvageable at all, or, like some of us would like, just to get rid of it entirely?

ASST AG MICHAEL BARBOSA: Well, the
Attorney General has not made a public opinion on
the specifics of MCI.

Our investigations show that there is fraud in MCIs and IAIs in some instances, and not in others.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Further questions?

SENATOR SALAZAR: Yes.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Salazar.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Thank you.

And thank you for your testimony.

I also want to thank the Attorney General for supporting the good-cause eviction bill that I'm the lead sponsor of in the Senate.

I wanted to ask, because you mentioned the

need to enhance enforcement as well, if you and the 1 Attorney General have specific steps that you think 2 we can take to improve enforcement by HCR? 3 ASST AG MICHAEL BARBOSA: Well, with our 4 5 office, we just need more and more written complaints. 6 7 Many times, with increases, there's a certain time limit, and it's too late for us to enforce due 8 to statute-of-limitation issues. 9 So we would encourage all tenants to continue 10 11 to complain, and continue to write complaints, to 12 our office. 13 SENATOR SALAZAR: Thank you. 14 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Any other questions? 15 Thank you again. 16 And please send our regards to the 17 Attorney General. 18 ASST AG MICHAEL BARBOSA: Thank you. 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next up we're going to 20 have Ben Dulchin, of The Association for 21 Neighborhood and Housing Development. 22 Is Ben in the room? 23 Okay, Ben may have stepped out for a minute. 24 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: No, he's here.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Oh, there's Ben. Good.

25

Come on down, Ben.

And on deck, actually, if J.T. Falcone of the United Neighborhood Houses is here.

Whenever you're ready.

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: Thanks very much.

So, thank you, Chairperson Kavanagh; thank you Committee members.

I'm very pleased to be here this morning testifying.

My name is Benjamin Dulchin.

I'm the executive director of the Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development.

We're an umbrella organization of

103 neighborhood-based not-for-profit organizations
that work on affordable-housing issues and
economic-development policy across the city.

But half our members are mission-driven affordable-housing developers, and are currently managing about 30,000 units of affordable housing, and have built or preserved about 139,000 units of affordable housing over the last three decades.

I mention this to say that we really do understand the issue from both sides.

We both are deeply involved in research and analysis and support around tenants-rights issues,

affordable-housing preservation issues.

But, as managers, we also understand that income needs to meet expenses, and that, you know, without that, that a building can physically suffer, and that a building has to be managed appropriately, and that all sides need to -- need to fulfill their obligations.

So I want to talk primarily -- so, just to start off, ANHD supports all the major legislation in the Housing Justice For All platform.

But I want to focus my testimony this morning particularly on the rent-increase loopholes, and how we think that, since 1994, they have fundamentally undermined the mechanism that really allows rent regulation to work, what's really been the core of it.

I've attached to my testimony a white paper that ANHD recently released on the actual use of the individual apartment improvement increase, which we think really is the keystone of the loss of affordable housing in the city.

So -- I mean, I think, you know, sort of, everybody here knows the major changes that happened in 1994 when the Republican-controlled Senate pushed for some significant changes in rent regulation.

That was really marked the moment, where, what was effective about rent regulation, the core mechanism, was really fundamentally undermined.

So, again, like, you know, it's not about good landlords, bad landlords; good landlords, bad people.

It's about speculation; it's about the way in which rent regulation had been an effective preventative against speculation.

So, you know, what rent regulation fundamentally does is it controls the expectations of the market.

So when you buy a building, you buy a building understanding that you're going to need to, you know, sort of pay a price, that it can be supported with the tenants in place, expecting only modest Rent Guidelines Board increases.

If you have these rent-increase loopholes, such as individual apartment improvement increases, you suddenly open up the market to imagine that they can pay significantly more for a building because they can expect unlimited upside for the building.

And that's speculation, and that's really what's -- that's what's broken; that's what, sort of, fundamentally changed.

So let me give an example, actually, of the building around the corner from here, probably in Senator Myrie's district.

In sort of looking at -- doing research around this, I looked at the building my mother grew up in, right around the corner.

When she grew up in that building, it was a working-class, immigrant-dense building, very affordable, and it still is today, you know, which, given the changes that the neighborhood has gone through, is rather remarkable.

But it's really not remarkable, because looking at every sale that building has -- every sale on that building over the last 40 years that we can track the sales, that building has been bought and sold for around 10 times the rent roll, which is an appropriate price. Right?

If you buy a building for 10 times rent roll, you can make a decent profit as a landlord, and landlords have the right to make a decent profit, still maintain the building, right, without having that pressure, having an expectation, of pushing out the low-rent-paying tenants.

Unfortunately, my mother's building is an anomaly. Right?

The majority of buildings that we're seeing now marketed today aren't being marketed for 10 times rent roll, aren't being marketed at reasonable prices, assuming that they're not speculative.

They're being marketed at 16, 17, 20 times rent roll, which is a clear recipe for displacement. Right?

So that speculation is the keystone of displacement. Right?

Why do you displace somebody?

You displace them so that you can dramatically increase the rent.

How do you dramatically increase the rent?

Through those -- through major loopholes in the law, like the individual apartment improvement rent increase.

So what the white paper points out is that, you know, in looking at data that we collected, that the Housing Rights Initiative collected, on the individual apartment improvement increase, is that it is not fundamentally used, as we have heard the landlord lobby claim, to make modest improvements where it's needed, to bring up the quality of the apartment in a reasonable way.

It is really being fundamentally used to dramatically drive up rents in a portfolio of buildings that -- that they had data for, that we analyzed with them.

Looking at well over 100 apartment rent histories, we found that the average IAI-derived rent increase was 107 percent increase over the previous rent. Right?

The average rent was about 1500, and it was raised by -- well, you know, to almost twice that with an IAI increase.

So, IAIs are not functioning to incentivize modest improvements.

They are fundamentally functioning. They were designed to be, the formula is designed to be, a fundamental mechanism that leads to displacement.

And I'll just sort of say, you know, one more thing before I close, one thing we've heard a lot about is that, you know, if you close these rent-increase loopholes it's going to damage mom-and-pop landlords.

You know, looking at the data for the market, we think that there is a real overstatement of the centrality of mom-and-pop landlords in the market and their vulnerability.

The nature of the rent-stabilized real estate market has really changed in the last couple of decades.

You know, earlier, sort of in the -- you know, before the aughts, you know, there really -- there was a prevalence of some mom-and-pop landlords.

That really started to change in the early -you know, in the 2000s, where you began to see
large, sort of, institutional-money-backed investors
coming in and buying up large portfolios of
buildings.

That is -- both, that is driving out
mom-and-pop landlords because it's driving up
prices, and that has really been, sort of, one of
the driving factors behind speculation in the
market.

You know, generally, you know, we've seen this, and we've sort of seen this with the buildings that our members manage, Rent Guidelines Board increases have -- over the years, have more than accounted for basic increases, and the (indiscernible) basic increases in operating costs.

Responsible landlords generally don't need to take these -- these -- you know, major

rent-increase loopholes.

You drive major increases through rent-increase loopholes when you've speculated on the building, when you're accounting on being able to pay that high price, by pushing out low-rent-paying tenants.

Those need to be closed.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So I'm going to -- we do have copies of your testimony. I think you also will have a few questions, but I'm going to cut you off, and thank you for your testimony.

But I'm going to ask J.T. Falcone to testify first.

J.T. FALCONE: So, thank you Chair Kavanagh and members of the Committee for the opportunity to testify today.

My name is J.T. Falcone.

I'm a policy analyst at United Neighborhood Houses (UNH).

UNH is a policy and social-change organization representing 42 neighborhood settlement houses across the state.

Over the past century, UNH's member settlement houses have shepherded communities across New York State, offering a wide variety of

programming and leading social-reform movements.

Settlement houseworkers have fought to ensure that all community members have access to opportunity by promoting fair laws and regulations, and holding up those in power to keep them accountable.

In this way, settlement houses have been particularly influential in fighting for housing and quality-of-life reforms, establishing the first-in-the-nation tenement laws regarding low-income housing and ensuring the safety of all residents.

Today we're here to continue that legacy of promoting fair laws by urging the Committee to enact real rent reform and right the wrongs done in the 1990s when New York City's rent laws tipped in favor of the landlord.

New York settlement houses see this movement as a tipping point for our communities.

In order to preserve the city we love and ensure there remains a diverse place where residents of all income brackets can make a living and afford a decent home, we must return to a strong system of rent regulations with commonsense reform and real accountability for those who choose to cheat.

UNH joins our partners and fellow advocates in calling on the New York State Senate to pass commonsense rent reforms that corrects for the disastrous changes made in the 1990s, and that have led to the loss of hundreds of thousands of protected units at a time when income inequality and rising rents threaten the future of low- and middle-income communities.

Specifically today I want to focus on some of the big top issues that we see, especially around preserving systems and communities.

So that includes ending vacancy decontrol.

I think that's something that I can kind of skip over because it seems like everybody is, more or less, on the same page there, but, so are we.

Same with the eliminating the vacancy bonus.

Combined with vacancy deregulation, the vacancy bonus has proven disastrous for our communities.

I can't tell you the number of settlement houses that look around and see completely different neighborhoods from where they were founded, and a lot of that has to do with the fact that their neighborhoods are changing at a pace that's too rapid for communities to keep up.

And, because of the rising income inequality, because of the rising rents, their constituents are unable to hold on, and they're losing the heart of their neighborhood in that way.

We also are very concerned with MCIs and IAIs.

Specifically, we want to lift up the fact, as has been noted already, that the system is ripe for abuse and fraud because it falls on tenants to track and report suspicious activity.

We were definitely excited by the inclusion of funding for the office of rent administration and tenant-protection unit at HCR, but we don't even know how that's going to shake out yet, we haven't seen results.

So, we want to make sure that MCIs and IAIs are not something that falls on tenants to address if they continue to exist at all.

Obviously, the current allowable increase for MCIs and IAIs is much too high.

6 percent is an amount that allows landlords to skirt the careful deliberations of the RGB.

They spend a lot time weighing testimony and thinking through what's a reasonable increase for that year.

And with a loophole open like this one, that you could drive a truck through, as has been noted, it leaves -- it leaves too much potential for abuse.

And, finally, the fact that MCIs and IAIs,

I don't have to tell any of you, the fact that
they're added on to legal rent causes cascading
issues, given that all rent increases are weighed by
percentages.

And so, for years and years and years to come, that sits on the tenants and it sits on the communities.

So I just -- I wanted to come here from the settlement-house perspective and say,

New York City's institutions, settlement houses, are fully behind the protections that this committee wants to see, to support and safe in our community.

As Benjamin noted, this is about speculation.

This isn't about good or bad landlords, although, I think we all have heard enough stories to know that there are bad landlords out there.

This is about communities, and for us, this is about seeing a New York City for the next 100 years that we've seen for the last 100 years, and preserving that diversity and that shine.

1 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you for your 2 testimony. 3 So we're gonna -- we're gonna go from left to right on the panel, and then -- and that's strictly 4 spacial and not ideological. 5 6 But, anybody on -- to my left have a 7 question? 8 Okay. 9 Mr.Dulchin. 10

SENATOR RIVERA: So I want to actually -- to

And also, Mr. Falcone, "J.T. Falcone," I just want to say on the record, coolest freaking name, ever, J.T. Falcone, it's a great one.

[Laughter.]

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SENATOR RIVERA: But, actually -- but, actually, I want to delve a little bit deeper into the whole idea, the whole notion, of mom-and-pops, right, mom-and-pop landlords.

So your -- I've -- my staff, by the way, Rachel Ferrari, who is my brain when it comes to housing issues, loves you folks because of all your data.

So you've gone through all the data, and you probably have some of it in your head.

If not, I'd really appreciate it if you could

get me this.

There are, obviously, thousands and thousands of landlords in the city of New York.

There's -- you know, I don't know how many buildings the city of New York, that are -- you know, millions of buildings, probably.

So, what would you -- what would be your definition, roughly speaking, of a mop and -- mom-and-pop landlord?

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: Well, I mean, I think -- we use the term very informally as it is used.

Right?

It's often used as sort of an ideological shield, like, oh, it -- nothing bad can happen because it's mom-and-pop landlords.

SENATOR RIVERA: So since you folks are data people, tell me, data-wise, if you have to make -- if you have to define such a thing, how would you do so?

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: You know, I think, you know, we would define it as, you know, a landlord who owns no more than, you know, three or four buildings. Right?

Use, four.

SENATOR RIVERA: So, four.

So if you consider the data that you've seen, as far as ownership, what do -- would you even have a guess as to what percentage of the total number of landlords that there are in New York amount to mom-and-pop landlords?

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: You know, it is tricky to know because every individual building is generally -- is -- is filed under its own individual LLC.

SENATOR RIVERA: Yes.

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: We are -- we are currently working with some colleagues on this data project, and might have some interesting data to report to you.

SENATOR RIVERA: It would be -- I would be -- as you scour the data, it would be really, really -- we would be really interested, I certainly would be really interested, in kind of finding this out, because, as you mention, it is used as an ideological shield.

But if you have the -- I'm going to guess -- obviously, the data will speak for itself when you crunch it.

But I'm going to guess, that if you have people that own 5, 10, 15, 20, 50 buildings, that --

obviously, that's not considered a mom-and-pop. And then the impact that their decisions have on entire portfolios, and, therefore, on entire neighborhoods, you know, can certainly be measured.

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: Look, the housing market has fundamentally changed in the last 20 years.
Right?

There was a long time when rent-stabilized real estate was a backwater. Right?

People invest in it, they owned a few buildings, you really could say the typical owner was a mom-and-pop landlord.

Rate of return was 5, 6 percent a year, it was a boring but very steady, very reliable, you know, investment that you could maintain while respecting the integrity of rent regulation and only following Rent Guidelines Board increases.

That was fundamentally broken initially in 1994 with the changes in the rent laws.

And then with, in the early aughts, this tsunami influx of private-equity-backed money into the real estate market, recognizing that these, you know, buildings, like my mother's, like these sort of rent-stabilized buildings in the outer boroughs, were not, you know, sort of islands of affordability

that should be respected; but, rather, were untapped assets that you could invest a lot of money in with an aggressive speculative strategy of pushing out low-rent-paying tenants. Then using the rent-increase loopholes as the mechanism for that.

So those two things really go together.

That's not the mom-and-pop landlord who is increasingly a smaller and smaller portion of the market.

That's -- that's -- that's institutional-backed money. That is -- increasingly, that is what we see as the driver of the loss of affordability.

I'll just sort of point out two numbers.

We're losing about seven and a half thousand units a year through (indiscernible) control.

But that isn't even really the key number.

The key number, because a lot -- you can lose affordability, but not reach that decontrol threshold.

We've actually -- the rent guidelines, with the -- Rent Guidelines Board recently, the housing vacancy survey reported, that, since 2014, there were 166,000 units renting below \$1500, were lost just between now and 2014.

That's a 12.5 percent loss in the percentage 1 of those relatively affordable units. 2 3 Those are probably -- many of those are still counted as rent-stabilized, but they are no longer 4 5 affordable in the neighborhoods in which they -- you 6 know, in -- in -- in which they are. 7 And, unquestionably, like, we know this from deep, deep experience, the mechanism for the loss of 8 every single one of those units was IAIs. That is 9 the keystone of the speculative --10 11 SENATOR RIVERA: As you crunch those numbers, 12 I would really, really appreciate it, because I want 13 to dig deeper into that. 14 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 16 I think Senator Krueger has a question. 17 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. I like your name also, Ben Dulchin. 18 19 BENJAMIN DULCHIN: No, you don't. No one 20 does. 21 SENATOR KRUEGER: It might not be as cool, 22 I don't know, but I like your name.

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: I don't want to testify with J.T. again.

[Laughter.]

23

24

25

SENATOR KRUEGER: And I also appreciate so much your being here, and we've known each other for, I don't know, 30, 25 years.

And I so appreciate the work of ANHD.

So in your testimony, as you've highlighted it, the IAI issue is huge for us to address.

But you were really targeting the speculation that has gone on by people buying up these buildings and imagining they can turn around and get 15, 20 percent profit rapidly.

Besides all the bills we all know very well and are discussing, is there something else we can or should do in the next few weeks, as part of the package we are fighting for, to address limiting the ability to speculate, by limiting how banks loan money, and what you have -- what standards would have to be met before the banks could loan the money, to slow down the speculations?

I don't know if I'm saying it right -BENJAMIN DULCHIN: Yeah, no --

SENATOR KRUEGER: -- but what do we do to further protect this happening in the first place?

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: -- yeah, so, I mean, one factor in the (indiscernible) speculation that we've seen has been overly aggressive, sort of, investment

money, often backed by mortgages, with -- you know, sort of based on unsound underwriting. Right?

So, sort of, in the early aughts we saw a lot of underwriting that wasn't fundamental -- loan underwriting, right, sort of first-mortgage underwriting, that wasn't based on the existing tenants. Right?

So the thing we look at is the debt-service coverage, right, and the debt service coverage has to easily be met by the rent roll that's in place.

If it doesn't, then you know that that loan was made with the expectation of tenants being pushed out.

You know, under -- you know, with the advice and pressure from a lot of community groups, a lot folks who are in this room, actually, the

New York State Department of Financial Services

(DFS) recently released a set of guidelines for how banks should lend on buildings with rent-stabilized properties, that we think are very strong guidelines that talk about:

Not lending based on preferential rents;

Lending, you know, at least a

1.2 debt-service coverage, you know, based

on the in-place on the rent roll;

And, not lending to proven harassers. Right?

Not lending to people who have a proven history

of -- you know, of harassing people out.

We think those are all excellent guidelines that would be, you know, well-followed by anybody.

But I would say that, you know, while we've been very focused, you know, on -- sort of on bad lending, whether or not you have bad -- and, certainly, bad lending exacerbates bad behavior, you know, sort of, by -- by -- you know, by speculative landlords.

It is those rent-increase loopholes, that is preferential rents, that is IAIs, that is (indiscernible) things that you control, that -- you know, and -- and, to a certain extent, MCIs, that are the foundation of that strategy for any landlord and the banks that love them.

SENATOR KRUEGER: You had a follow-up answer?

J.T. FALCONE: I don't want to take us too

far off-track, but you mentioned speculation.

And I just wanted to say, Senator Salazar's introduced the small-home anti-speculation tax.

And that's something that would also be very, very helpful, in terms of, not as much on this issue, but in terms of protecting communities across

the city. 1 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. 2 Thank you, both. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 4 5 Okay, I think we had, Senator Myrie has a 6 question. 7 SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you, both, for your testimony. 8 9 Can you speak to the notion that eliminating a lot of these loopholes will completely 10 disincentivize investment in the housing stock? 11 12 I know that -- and can you speak to that, specifically as it regards to MCIs and IAIs? 13 BENJAMIN DULCHIN: Sure. 14 It's a ridiculous notion. 15 16 [Laughter.] 17 SENATOR MYRIE: Is that the legal term? BENJAMIN DULCHIN: It is -- it is -- it is 18 absurd on its face. 19 20 [Applause.] 21 BENJAMIN DULCHIN: And, again, I would sort of -- I don't mean to be glib. Right? 22 I mean, there was a fundamental shift in the 23 24 way the housing market functioned after 1994, but --25 you know, in the change of the rent laws.

But, really, you know, with the sudden, you know, sort of influx of all of this private-equity-backed money in the early aughts, you can buy and sell real estate. You know, it is a commodity that can happily be bought and sold, as long as the profit expectations are reasonably contained by the rent-stabilization laws and by Rent Guidelines Board increases.

That system functioned reasonably well prior, you know, in earlier decades.

That was -- you know, at that time, when you didn't have those rent-increase loopholes, and rent regulation succeeded, was successful in maintaining sort of pushing down speculation.

Again, I would sort of give the example of my mother's building around the corner. Right? That building was bought and sold five times in the last number of decades.

Every time it was bought and sold, somebody made a nice profit, I assume. Right? You know, otherwise, why would they have bought and sold it?

The average rent, though, is still a little over \$1,000 in that building, to this day, because the price of that building was kept in proper proportion to the rent roll from the building.

Right?

If you buy and sell a building for 10 times rent roll, the way rent stabilization imagines you'll -- you know, fundamentally imagines you should, you can have healthy buying and selling of buildings, you can have healthy profits, you can make, you know, 5 or 6 percent, but, you're not going to have that expectation of pushing out the tenants, you're not going to have that expectation of displacement and harassment.

So what we will see, if these rent rolls are closed, is not that the housing market's going to suddenly collapse around our feet; but, rather, it will return to sanity the way it was a few decades ago.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I think Senator Liu had a question.

SENATOR LIU: Yeah, I think, actually, Senator Rivera addressed the -- this concept.

We've been -- you know, we hear from a lot of people, like, Oh, if you take away the MCIs, we're not going to be able to maintain our property, especially since we're mom-and-pops.

First of all, I'm not sure that somebody who owns three or four buildings is really a

mom-and-pop.

2 [Applause.]

SENATOR LIU: Okay?

I mean, I don't think my mom and my pop could own three or four buildings.

So if we -- if we, you know, more precisely define what "mom-and-pop" is, I suspect that they would have an even smaller proportion of the market.

But I second Senator Rivera's request, that if you could provide us with, you know, roughly, how much of the market are we talking about?

Are we -- you know, we -- sometimes we're led to believe that 20 to 30 percent of the rental market -- rent-stabilized market is owned by "moms" and "pops."

I suspect it's much smaller. I suspect it's probably in the single digits, and perhaps even in the low single digits.

But it would help us if you -- it will help me, and probably Gustavo, and perhaps others, if you could give us some sense as to what portion of the market really is owned by small-owners.

I don't even want to say mom-and-pops anymore.

Just small-owners.

And by "small-owners," I would -- I would -- you know, I think the reasonable person on the street would be, a "small-owner" is somebody who may have, like, you know, a couple of units here or there, but not more than -- you know, say, not more than a dozen. And I'm just even throwing "12" out there as a random number. But it's certainly not in, like, three or four buildings.

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: Yeah, so, I mean, we'll do our best to put together some data with our colleagues.

It's difficult data to get, just 'cause (indiscernible).

SENATOR LIU: I understand.

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: But I guess, in some ways, it's a red herring, because, you know, I guess -- you know, taking -- you know, aside from -- you know, sort of putting aside the -- sort of, the ideological use of this concept of mom-and-pop that it's used for, it probably is the case that there is a less efficient economy of scale if you have fewer units, so it's little bit less efficient to manage the building.

But the truth is, and I say this, right, you know, with our member organizations that currently,

you know, sort of own -- you know, manage about 30,000 units of affordable housing, you can properly manage affordable -- you know -- and, you know, maintain stable, decent housing, based on Rent Guidelines Board increases, which, over the years, have more than accounted, right, historically, more than accounted for increases in operating costs.

You can properly manage and maintain those buildings without resorting to Draconian rent increases, as long as you haven't paid too much for that building, right, as long as you have not paid a speculative price for the building.

SENATOR LIU: Right.

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: And that's where the market needs to return to.

SENATOR LIU: And that was actually my second question, that if you could give us some kind of demonstration as to how the Rent Guidelines Board increases, especially after -- especially under the previous, you know, administration, that how those increases would have been enough for the reasonable landlord, or the conscientious landlord, to keep up her or his property.

BENJAMIN DULCHIN: Yeah, I can pull those numbers for you.

They -- they -- those increases have far

outstripped increases in operating costs.

SENATOR LIU: Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Yeah, just more a -- more

of a comment than a question, because Senator Myrie

kind of touched on what I wanted to ask you.

But, I appreciate your answer on the MCIs, because there are advocates of reform, rather than elimination, that keep citing this point of, we need the MCIs to incentivize any repair work at all.

And so to hear an expert like yourself say that's completely unnecessary is actually very important for us to gather.

And to hear landlords crying poverty over the ability to maintain these buildings, when they're actually making money off of people who are genuinely in poverty in their buildings, is infuriating.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I am going to ask people to please, you know, refrain from responding.

Thank you.

SENATOR GIANARIS: And the other thing is not so much for you.

I just wanted to clarify for the record, that 1 the Attorney General, I think her rep is still here, 2 in "The Queens Chronicle" did actually come out for 3 the elimination of MCIs back in October. 4 So she is on the record on that as well. 5 6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, 7 Senator Gianaris, representing our Attorney General. [Laughter.] 8 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, any other questions 9 for this panel? 10 11 Okay, hearing none, thank you, both, so much 12 for your testimony, and all the work you do, and all the analysis that you've already provided for our 13 14 work. 15 Next up we are going to have 16 Carmen Vega-Rivera of CASA, and Anita Long, also of 17 CASA. [Applause.] 18 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And while they're getting 20 set up, just so that we have -- the next folks can 21 be ready to come up, the next panel will be 22 Nilda Rivera of Woodside on the Move, and 23 Ivan Contreras, also of Woodside on the Move.

[Applause.]

24

25

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Can we at least let these

people testify before you applaud the next panel.

And then -- and, in addition, I think we're also going to hear from Sandra Dominguez.

So if those three folks could be ready to go, we'd appreciate it.

Whenever you're ready.

CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: Good afternoon.

My name is Carmen Vega-Rivera.

I'm a CASA leader with Community Actions for Safe Apartments in The Bronx.

I'm also a proud member of the Upstate

Alliance fighting for universal rent control so that
all tenants, both regulated and unregulated in the
state, have basic and expanded rights.

I'm here today to demand that the entire

New York State Senate support universal rent control
and pass the full platform.

Every single bill on our platform needs to be passed, including good-cause, and elimination of major capital improvements and individual apartment improvements.

Over half the families that live in The Bronx are rent-burdened.

And I want to highlight that our senator,

Gustavo Rivera, has been instrumental in helping us

to address these issues.

Rent stabilization barely keeps us in our homes.

It does not mean our rents are affordable or that we live in good conditions.

What about the millions of tenants without basic rights in New York State that would benefit from good-cause and expanding the emergency tenant protection?

I'm here today to share a picture of what
I've been going through, and how the impact of weak
rent-stabilization laws, and how our neighbors have
also lost their homes, because of the loopholes in
rent stabilization.

You can't make piecemeal reforms to a system designed to benefit landlords and exploit tenants and displace us.

I live in a very well-known building created by Emery Roth, an architect.

It is 888 Grand Concourse, right on a pivotal corner of East 161st Street in the Grand Concourse.

I moved from the Lower East Side in the late '70s to The Bronx right before I would have been displaced.

My previous landlord, Louis and

Jonathan Bombart, owned the building since 1987, four buildings in The Bronx, and a few in Brooklyn, and it was a family business.

No, they sound small, but they were wealthy.

They made millions off the misery that they put us through. Left their family \$50 million of my rent money.

After organizing and fighting for decades, we finally got rid of our landlord.

Our building entered into foreclosure, and we almost auctioned off -- were auctioned off to one of the worst and biggest corporate landlords in The Bronx, Finkelstein.

During this time, a receiver was appointed after we requested it, that one will be so, in Supreme Court.

A new boiler was installed by the receiver with our rent-roll money as tenants, that we paid into.

Now we have a new landlord, and not much better than the old one.

They are doing all kinds of building work that will eventually all lead to major capital improvement, anywhere from 10 to 13.

After No More MCI Coalition met with the

Commissioner, Ruth Anne Visnasukas, and her team, last year, we were told that my new landlord would be eligible to apply for an MCI for the same boiler that we as tenants pay for it.

How does this make any sense?

Reforming the MCI system would leave loopholes open for landlords to exploit.

No, it's no secret, DHCR and the

New York State Division of Homes and Community

Renewal doesn't enforce the current rent laws,

doesn't have the staff or the resources to

legitimately process MCIs and scrutinize the

application.

They're actually there to help also support tenants, yet I feel that they're part of the problem because they're helping to displace us.

Even when we organize, we have an attorney challenge the MCI, the outcome is the same.

Over 90 percent of the time, the agency rubber-stamps MCIs, has one inspector per borough to eliminate MCIs, and doesn't investigate or research how much a bathroom should really cost.

Landlords don't need incentives like MCIs or IAIs. That's a myth.

Landlords of rent-stabilized buildings

already enjoy the highest rent of profit of almost any property owner in the nation.

That is a fact.

It is validated by the Rent Guideline (sic) Board yearly report.

This year's report from the RGB confirmed the following:

Rent-stabilized landlords keep making money.

Again, they keep making money.

In fact, they're operating net income has steadily grown for 13 years.

In 2017, 95 percent of rent-stabilized landlords made a profit.

As our elects, and as our Senate representing all New Yorkers, my question is simple: Do you care about the 400,000 low-income New Yorkers living in rent-stabilized housing, or do you care about the 5 percent of the landlords who can use the hardship exemption?

You have to pick, and I'm hoping you're gonna to choose and move to the tenants' side.

So let's change the narrative.

Landlords don't need incentives, like MCIs or IAIs.

What gets lost in that conversation is that

tenants are the ones paying for the capital improvements.

Landlords didn't pay for the boiler.

Tenants will end up paying for the boiler forever, and our rents will go up permanently.

So it's not an incentive.

It's just another tool to drive up legal rents, push rents past the deregulation threshold, and displace us.

If landlords are truly struggling, they can apply for a hardship exemption.

Landlords are currently spending millions of dollars to influence and lobby our elected officials.

They know their time is up, and universal rent control is long overdue.

Why doesn't the landlord lobby spend these millions educating their members on how to actually register apartments with DHCR, or -- well -- as to how to apply for existing government subsidies, like J-51 and weatherization programs?

Our landlord, I believe, is exploiting and flaunting the entire rent-stabilization system.

The studio apartment next to me in my building was \$800, until recently, when my neighbor

moved.

2 After an IAI, it is now \$2000.

The two-bedroom right next to me, that was no more than 1800, is at the threshold of 2700.

Someone explain to me all the fuzzy math, because I just don't get it.

This is why we are demanding to end major capital improvement and to end IAIs (individual apartment improvement).

The system cannot reform it.

It must be eliminated.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

ANITA LONG: Good afternoon.

My name is Anita long, and I am a CASA leader with Community Action For a Safe Apartment in The Bronx.

I'm also a proud member of the

Upstate/Downstate Alliance fighting for universal

rent control so that all tenants, both regulated and

unregulated, in this state have basic expanded

rights.

I am here today, specifically, to share how

I have been impacted by major capital improvements,

and how thousands of my neighbors in my communities have been fighting MCIs on their own, and organizing with their neighbors, and have still lost their homes, because of MCIs and other loopholes in rent stabilization.

Since June of 2018, I have received two MCI permanent rent increase from my landlord, who's a corporate landlord.

On top of that, a rent increase under the Rent Guideline (sic) Board.

Now, back in the fall of 2016, CASA and Northwest Bronx Community and Clergy Coalition formed the No More MCI Coalition in The Bronx.

Together, we are actively organizing over 18 buildings, representing 1500 families, fighting almost \$18 million in permanent monthly rent hikes.

We organize together with one same vision: Eliminate MCIs forever.

We targeted "DHCR," that's the department of homes and community renewal, because we knew they had the power to make policy and administrative changes.

Thank you, Senator Rivera.

The MCI process is unfair, and landlords are always given every benefit of the doubt, while the

burden is on the tenants to provide the oversight as if they themselves are the enforcement agencies.

According to the DHCR data submitted to the Rent Guideline (sic) Board in 2017, over 90 percent of MCI applications were granted in 2017.

That's unfair.

We met with the commissioner,
Ruth Anne Visnauskas, and her team, several times
with the same message: We are being displaced by
MCIs.

DHCR is not doing a thorough job of examining these MCI applications from the landlords.

They are not allocating enough resources and inspectors to actually inspect every building, and they are denying tenants their basic rights, such as language access.

A deep systemic overhaul is needed and long overdue.

After meeting and hearing directly from the commissioner and the executive team, one thing became clear: The system cannot be reformed.

Reforming the common MCI system will only contribute to the problem.

MCIs are designed to only benefit landlords, and not just any landlords, but, particularly, large

landlords that own many buildings and have large portfolios.

When the landlord lobby began their campaign a few months ago, they posted a simple fact on social media.

The landlord lobby said: According to DHCR in 2017, barely 1 percent of the landlords of rent-stabilized buildings applied for an MCI that year. That MCIs are used sparingly.

And we agree with that, that's a fact.

We -- we keep -- why keep the MCI program when 99 percent of the landlords don't actually need it or use it?

Why keep MCIs for the bad landlords, like my landlord, who owns over 75 buildings in The Bronx and who imposes multiple MCIs on their tenants?

The reality is, landlords do not need incentives.

Landlords already have capital, and they use MCIs to displace long-term tenants of color citywide in the most vulnerable and poor communities in New York City because they are betting we will be gentrified and leave.

From The Bronx, to Chinatown, to Brooklyn, to Queens, to Manhattan, we are being evicted and

displaced because of MCIs and other loopholes, and we are saying, no more MCIs.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

Okay, again, I'm going to, please -- as we have about 40 more people who want to testify, to please, you know, we have just -- if we could please restrict responses.

Proceed.

ANITA LONG: I'm here today to demand that the entire New York State support universal rent control -- New York Senate support universal rent control, and pass the full platform.

Every bill on our platform needs to be passed, including major capital improvement, individual apartment improvement, and also that good-cause.

I am being affected personally by the good-cause.

I have a son who is a renter in the South Bronx, who lives in the three-family home.

His landlord came to him on March 31st of 2019 and told him, "Your lease expires March 31, 2019, and I'm not granting, renewing, a lease. You have to move out by May 31, 2019."

My son came to me because he knows I'm an advocate, I'm an activist, out here fighting.

He said, "Can you help me?"

It was heartbreaking to tell him, "I cannot help you because you're not regulated."

This is why we need good-cause.

If good-cause was in place, he would at least, like other tenants, have the opportunity to appear in court before a judge to plead his case, as well as the landlord, and let the judge make that final decision.

But he's standing there, like, I've never been to housing court in my life. I've lived here for nine years. And my landlord is not even giving me a reason why they're not renewing my lease.

This is why we need good-cause to be on the bill and to be passed.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

And thank you, you know, for just pointing one thing.

Good-cause is often talked about as something we're going to do for the rest of the state.

But just point -- it's very important to point out that it would affect a very large number

of people who live within New York City as well. 1 2 So, thank you. And I think Senator Rivera has a question. 3 SENATOR RIVERA: So, obviously -- well, first 4 5 of all, thank you for coming all the way down to Brooklyn. 6 7 If I would have known, I would have given you a ride. 8 9 [Laughter.] SENATOR RIVERA: Come on. 10 11 SENATOR KAVANAGH: (Inaudible) he's available 12 to give you a ride. 13 SENATOR RIVERA: Exactly. 14 So I'm -- but I'm actually -- I'm actually 15 going to play the devil's advocate. 16 Let's assume that I've never met you fine 17 people before. And then let's say, you know -- but, you 18 19 know, this whole MCI thing, let's talk about it for 20 a second. 21 Have you ever seen anything like this? 22 This is only 200-plus pages. 23 This is one MCI, you know, application. 24 You can go -- how much time do you have to go 25 through this?

1 CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: None. 2 SENATOR RIVERA: No, no, but, just, if you 3 get one for your building, as a tenant, how much would you have? 4 CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: We don't have time --5 SENATOR RIVERA: Oh, you don't? 6 7 CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: -- nor do we have the 8 support. Right? 9 SENATOR RIVERA: But why not? It's just 10 200 pages. 11 CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: We don't have the legal 12 support, the wherewithal, to put this together. 13 We didn't put the application. That 14 shouldn't be passed on to us. 15 Landlords are using MCIs, three times --16 SENATOR RIVERA: But this is --17 CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: -- charging it to us --SENATOR RIVERA: But this is --18 19 CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: -- taking it off on 20 their taxes. 21 SENATOR RIVERA: But this is -- but this 22 is -- is it -- I'm just -- okay, okay, okay. 23 So, you have 200-plus pages. 24 I mean, there's only -- you know, I only see 25 architectural drawings and checks and invoices and

```
1
        descriptions.
               I mean, you could -- you -- you don't -- you
 2
        wouldn't be able to do this in 45 days?
 3
               CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: That shouldn't be --
 4
               ANITA LONG: No.
 5
 6
               CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: -- the responsibility of
 7
        tenants.
 8
               And, no, we're not able to do it.
               It shouldn't be our -- our --
 9
10
               SENATOR RIVERA: Okay.
11
               CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: -- it shouldn't be us
12
        answering that.
13
               Landlords have no right adding MCIs when it's
14
        their capital asset, it is their property, it is
15
        their responsibility to maintain the building.
16
               SENATOR RIVERA: But would it --
17
               CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: We pay rent, there's a
18
        rent rule.
19
               What that should say is --
20
               SENATOR RIVERA: But what --
21
               CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: -- this MCI will not be
22
        approved, being that you've already double-dipped.
23
               SENATOR RIVERA: This is perfect, this is
24
        perfect.
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: I would ask the landlord
25
```

advocate not to -- to stop interrupting the witness.

SENATOR RIVERA: Okay.

Would it --

[Laughter.]

CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: And please note, that just because his last name is Rivera, we are not related.

SENATOR RIVERA: No, but -- no, she's my cousin, actually.

But, actually, in all seriousness, in all seriousness, we've worked on this a lot together, and it is -- it is -- it is one of things that, just for the record, I'm looking forward to hearing from other folks in other parts of the city because -- I know, because of the work that we've done together, and the work that you've done in our backyard, that this is normal for this -- what is normal for a process that is, you know, millions of dollars for, you know, I don't know, terracotta pointing, that has no actual -- you know, that -- that -- the reality is, that landlords then put this in front of you and say -- and DHCR says, You only have, like, a month and a half.

It's not like you -- you know, you're -- some -- some of the folks in those tenants might be

lawyers, but most of them are not.

Some of them might be experienced in construction. Most of them are not.

And so you are asked, as a tenant, to actually look at this --

CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: Right.

SENATOR RIVERA: -- and say, I have to give -- and actually what you said, Ms. Long, I really take to heart, the idea that, currently, sadly, the current system makes it so that tenants have to kind of be the authority, kind of have to be the --

ANITA LONG: Right.

SENATOR RIVERA: So one thing I was going to ask you, because you mentioned weatherization -
And I'm wrapping up.

-- but it was, like, you mentioned weatherization.

Could you tell us a little bit more about that?

Since it seemed there's also a criticism, that this is the only program that's available, IAIs and MCIs are the only things that are available, to landlords to be able to -- you know, get some money for their buildings.

Is that accurate?

CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: Yeah, I -- no.

SENATOR RIVERA: Oh, it isn't?

CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: I have weatherization --

SENATOR RIVERA: Oh, why not?

CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: -- going on in my building right now, with asbestos and the parapet, and the bricks and mortars have to be replaced.

There are weatherization programs.

There are lots of programs that they can apply to.

What landlords don't want to do is, that same application that the tenants are getting, they don't want to sit there and do the work, and open up their books to show what their profits are, and where the money's coming.

So there are programs in place, as I speak, that will allow landlords to get the benefits that they need if it's so deemed so, in terms of, that they don't have the financial capital to do so.

So, in my case, and the weatherization is happening right now, we are netted from roof to the bottom of the building, is I'm very concerned, because I said that I'm facing 10 to 13 MCIs.

That application you show me will be 13 size

that amount that you just showed us. That is huge.

And in there is the weatherization of, not only the parapet with the asbestos were we exposed to, but it's the weatherization of the bricks and mortars.

ANITA LONG: It's, also, landlords can apply for the J-51 tax abatement.

My landlord has applied for it before he had did the MCI.

When we got the notice regarding the MCI, we notified DHCR regarding that J-51.

So, what DHCR did, told me: Here's the MCI. This is what you're going to pay. Yeah, we know that he did get the J-51, but you're going to continue to pay this amount until we muddle through the paperwork. And then we'll come back and let you know what your real bill should be.

That's unfair to the tenant.

CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: And in addition to the J-51, which our building had with the previous landlord, that it took us 2 1/2 -- 25 years to get rid of, is that they did have a J-51 in the early '90s.

25 years have passed.

Weatherization issues in that building are

paramount because of the movement of the trucks and the buses that pass by 161 of the Grand Concourse, and you see all the cracks in our building.

So there has to be another way that they could apply for another J-51, an Article 11, and all the other hardship loans that are out there.

One of the issues, in speaking with our new landlord, they said, they don't want to open up the books to show that they are making a profit, and they do have the capital do it.

So they're gonna pass it on to us.

But they could go back, and they should be able to go back, for another J-51, without passing it back on to the tenants.

SENATOR RIVERA: The bottom -- the bottom line is, I thank you for all the advocacy that you've done over this -- over the years on this.

There's a lot that I've learned by seeing the situations that happened in our neighborhoods.

And you have been an important part of that.

And -- and I -- and as -- and as we discussed at the beginning, I was not on the nine bills.

And it was part of the work that -- the work that you folks did and the Northwest Bronx Community and Clergy Coalition did that kind of convinced me

that all of them I needed to be on. 1 So thank you so much for that. 2 CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: Well, we thank you. 3 ANITA LONG: Thank you. 4 5 [Applause.] 6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 7 Any further questions? 8 Okay. Thank you, both. 9 10 CARMEN VEGA-RIVERA: Thank you. 11 ANITA LONG: Thank you. SENATOR KAVANAGH: So next up I mentioned 12 13 already, the Woods --OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Give her a ride back 14 15 home. 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- and, hopefully, 17 Senator Rivera has a large vehicle. Next up, we have -- we'll take copies of the 18 testimony. 19 20 We have the Woodside on the Move folks 21 I mentioned before. And following up, again, just -- following 22 23 up we have, Kathleen Wacom of Met Council on 24 Housing, and, also, if I'm -- Andrea Shapiro, also 25 of Met Council on Housing.

NILDA RIVERA: Good evening, everyone. 1 My name is Nilda Rivera. 2 I'm a tenant leader from Cosmopolitan in 3 Woodside, Queens. 4 We started to get MCIs 2017 and 2018, which 5 6 our rents got too high for tenants to pay. 7 When landlords can buy building after building, definitely, they can maintain and improve 8 their own property and not to fall back on the MCIs. 9 10 Tenants are not property owners and should 11 not be subjected in buying equipments for landlords. 12 The so-called law says, the improvements 13 benefits tenants, but, the law is incorrect. 14 Who benefits 100 percent are the landlords. 15 They own the property, our money for the MCI, 16 and the equipments we buy for the landlord's 17 property. We all know, when you buy, you own, and 18 19 tenants don't own nothing. 20 Some millionaires/landlords are using MCI to 21 increase the property-value enhancements, and even 22 the improvements of those for free, but tenants get stuck with the bills. 23

In real estate side is a monopoly, but in the

tenants' side it's a (indiscernible).

24

25

We tenants call for the elimination of the 1 2 MCI to stop the abuse and misuse of the MCI that are 3 causing the displacement of tenants. Last year we will meet with senators on the 4 MCI. 5 They were saying, We need the majority of the 6 Democrats in the House for those nine bills. 7 Well, we voted more Democrats in the House, 8 and still MCI is stuck in the House. 9 So what's the problem now? 10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Still, Democrats in the house are considering reforming MCI.

MCI shouldn't be reformed, only elimination.

All landlords should be responsible for their own property and not on the backs of the poor.

We all know actions speaks louder than words.

Since you now know half the majority of the Democrats in the House, show us your actions, that you are for tenants instead of for the rich landlords that are looking to increase their bank accounts.

Show us that you are for the struggling tenant side, and not all for-profit landlord side.

Senator Kavanagh and Senator Krueger, please sign the elimination of no more MCI.

1 Thank you.

2 [Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

And just -- Mr. Contreras, just before you start, is Sandra Dominguez here and planning on testifying as well?

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Yes, she is.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. Do you want -- why don't you come on up as well.

IVAN CONTRERAS: Thank you.

And thank you, everyone, thank you, everyone, from the Committee.

My name is Ivan Contreras.

I'm the No More MCI campaign coordinator, and also the lead organizer of Woodside on the Move.

You have to pardon my voice, since I was screaming the hell out of today at the press conference, and, also, it was weird to me to see a bunch of employees outside screaming, and to see working-class people fighting against working-class people.

I was debating with them, and I called one of them, and I asked him, "What are you fighting for?"

They have no idea what they were fighting for and what they were screaming for outside.

And that just made me feel how the real estate is using its money again to put people on the street, to work and to fight against another working-class people.

And I think that's outrageous.

I was trying to prepare, so, coordinate, structure, a speech today for all of you, but I think I'm tired of being tired, and you guys have been hearing all.

I have been having meetings with all of you, if not me personally, the number of MCI Coalition have been having meetings of all of you.

And we have been telling you, and dismantle by -- by -- one by one, why you should eliminate the MCI, which is, with good-cause, the bill that the real estate is fighting against the mass.

And you know why.

And you know why.

You already know why.

We told you this many times: It's the quickest way to get rich through the expense of the tenants.

Period.

The tenants are paying for something that doesn't belong to them, and that's not fair.

We have been telling you this many times.

And I'm so glad that the expert today fro

And I'm so glad that the expert today from ANHD told you exactly what we've been telling you for many years, but you guys still keep thinking about reforming.

I just have a beautiful example with what happened with one of my buildings.

I've been working in around 16 buildings, all of them with several MCIs.

Just to give you an example -- just to give you an example:

Cosmopolitan buildings, they have been massively and systemically attacking with MCIs.

That's why we're entering in this fight.

So right here, I have a meeting, regular meeting, with my tenants, because one of my tenants came to my office and said, Ivan, what is this?

And I told you, This is an MCI application. We're going to have to fight against this.

She said, I'm for it.

We're going to do a meeting at the building and all the process that organizers do.

I went to the building. I'm looking for where the landlord was in the meeting.

I asked the tenants if they wanted the

landlord to be in the meeting, and they said, yes, that's fine.

I did the meeting, and explained to the landlord that I was going to revise, point by point, if what they were claiming in the MCI, which was around \$255,000, was, in fact, what he spent on invest on the building. And I told him that we're going to go with a couple of lawyers, that we're going to hire different experts, that we're going to this, that.

To my surprise, next meeting, the landlord decided to drop the MCI.

He sent me a letter, and he said, you know what, Ivan? I'm not going to apply for the MCI anymore. I don't think that I have my tenants to pay for the MCI.

And then he said, But the only thing that I want from you, and he's telling me, a proposal that he want me -- he want the tenants to pay \$18,000.

So he lowered himself from two fifty-five -- \$255,000, to \$18,000.

And he say like that, he say, Everything that I want you guys to pay, and it's just one payment. You not gonna continue paying.

And then I said, like, No. I actually want 1 to see if what you spend on everything that you 2 saying is at \$18,000. 3 And you know what happened the next meeting? 4 5 He said, I'm not going to charge you a penny. 6 So this is just an example of, like, how the 7 DHCR, in conjunction with the landlord, are using this to displace the tenants without any kind of 8 enforcement. 9 If you try to reform this program, this 10 11 problem is going to continue. 12 The only solution that we have to the MCI is, 13 what? 14 (All audience members say: Elimination!) 15 IVAN CONTRERAS: That be the only thing that 16 we can, and this is just an example of many, many buildings that are happening. 17 18 Okay? 19 So, please, eliminate the MCI, and pass the 20 all nine bills. 21 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 22 [Applause.] 23 SANDRA DOMINGUEZ: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for your time to coming here to 24

this meeting with us and listen to any testimony

25

1 here. 2 And, I'm coming to the -- from my country 3 20 years ago, and I living in the same apartment. SENATOR KAVANAGH: (Inaudible) could you 4 state your name for the record so that they have it 5 6 on the -- just your name for the record, and then 7 proceed. SANDRA DOMINGUEZ: 8 Okay. Sandra Dominguez. 9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 10 11 SANDRA DOMINGUEZ: And I'm coming from 12 Cosmopolitan Associates. I'm a tenant from the 13 Cosmopolitan for 28 years. 14 It's only apartment I'm having when I coming 15 to the city. I never moved to another apartment. 16 That's the only I have it. I have it two childs. My two childs born in 17 18 that apartment too. 19 My husband working two jobs to care and 20 afford it, to pay everything. 21 Sorry.

Sometimes I need to choose, pay half rent so I can afford some money to buy food for my childs.

22

23

24

25

And I'm coming to get -- no, personal, I'm personal. It's -- that's why I'm here.

1 And I have to say public here, thank you so much to Ivan, because when I had the first MCI, I 2 don't know -- I don't know anything. 3 But I want to say, the second one, \$240. 4 This is something like almost I have to be 5 6 homeless with my two childs, and my husband too. 7 And I have to say thank you so much. Thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you, 8 Lord, to have Woodside on the Move to help for me, 9 to help my -- to help me every day. 10 11 Anything can I say, I have to say, thank you, 12 Ivan. 13 Thank you. 14 God bless you, always. 15 And the thing is, please, please, please help 16 the people. 17 Help for the people, because my landlord looking only for the good-looking outside to the 18 19 buildings. 20 I'm invited to you guys, come into my 21 apartment. You're very welcome. Check everything. 22 My ceiling is broke for 1 1/2 year, and 23 nobody fix it yet. 24 My walls is almost fell down.

So explain to me why I have to pay the MCI,

25

because, just in case I have the money, I have no
problem to pay it. But the thing is, I don't have

it.

And, anyway, he only looking, like the

And, anyway, he only looking, like the womans, look from outside, beautiful, paint, but what about inside?

So come into my apartment and look everything, and nobody help me until this point.

It raining one day, twice, is coming to my bedroom, to the fifth floor to the one floor.

Everybody coming to my apartment, 3:00 in morning, and asking me, What happened? What happened to your apartment? Why you throw away the water everywhere?

And I said, No, it's the raining. It's the ceiling.

And I have it, I have a video. And I show everybody, and everybody is scared, even me.

So, please, help me to don't lose my apartment.

I need a place for live with my two childs after coming to a school and asking me, I have a home.

Thank you so much for your time, and God bless you guys.

1 [Applause.] SENATOR KAVANAGH: And I think we have 2 questions here. 3 Thank you so much for being here and sharing 4 your time with us. 5 I think we'll start from the right and work 6 7 our way over. 8 So Senator -- oh, before I do that, I just 9 want to acknowledge that we've been joined by Senator Brad Hoylman of Manhattan. 10 11 [Applause.] SENATOR KAVANAGH: And next up, 12 Senator Gianaris. 13 14 SENATOR GIANARIS: Thank you. 15 Let me thank Sandra for sharing your story 16 with us. 17 I know it's hard to get in front of so many people and be so personal, but, this is what the 18 19 senators need to hear. 20 So thank you for doing that. 21 Nilda, can I ask you to come back up? 22 I have a question for you be also. 23 Nilda, by the way, is also not related to 24 Gustavo Rivera, just in case...

[Laughter.]

25

SENATOR GIANARIS: But -- but -- and, Ivan, thank you for the example you used, because I feel constantly, like, the people that advocate for reform, even if they're coming from a good place, are assuming, at the end of the day, that there's good faith on the part of the landlords.

So they assume, if we write the law in a good way, they will adhere to the law and good things will happen.

But the problem that you pointed out, and that we're hearing over and over again, is MCIs for landlords are not a way to upkeep their buildings.

It's a business strategy to make money and to displace their tenants.

NILDA RIVERA: Exactly. (Indiscernible.)

SENATOR GIANARIS: Well, the reason I asked you to come back, Nilda, is we -- I did visit your building, and Sandra's building, and I saw Sandra's video.

But I want you to talk about the MCIs.

Some of the MCIs you all were charged for, that don't actually benefit anybody living there or the building, because the things you were pointing out to me were ridiculous, and they were charging the entire building for these minuscule things that

were clearly just an excuse to jack up the rents and, eventually, get people out of those homes.

So can you tell us some of the things that we saw in the common areas and the outside, just so everyone else can hear what the MCIs were being charged for?

NILDA RIVERA: Well, in my part, it started with the gas pipes. And they put the gas pipes outside of the wall. Even some of the gas pipes are inside, it goes through the bedrooms.

Okay?

So this is dangerous, and they still did it.

Okay?

I don't know if stopped because somebody complained to Ivan. I don't know if it was stopped.

That's one of them we got an MCI for that.

Also, cameras, that some of them do not work. Some of them do and some of them don't.

And when you need someone to access, you know, something happens, access, they don't have information on the camera because it's not working, but we're still paying the MCI for it.

SENATOR GIANARIS: The place where we met, too, had that garden that they -- I don't even want to call it a garden. It was like the size of this

1 chair. 2 SANDRA DOMINGUEZ: Exactly. SENATOR GIANARIS: But we were standing 3 around this plant, basically, that was also charged 4 as a common-area improvement, right, for you folks. 5 SANDRA DOMINGUEZ: Exactly. 6 7 But, see, it shouldn't be charged because you it's not something that you really need. 8 It's just something that -- it's like to 9 beautify and enhance the building. 10 That's it. 11 12 SENATOR GIANARIS: Well, it's an excuse. 13 That's what it is, it's an excuse. 14 SANDRA DOMINGUEZ: It's an excuse for an MCI, 15 that's all. 16 SENATOR GIANARIS: Thank you. 17 SANDRA DOMINGUEZ: Yes, you're welcome. 18 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Any further questions, 19 comments? 20 Okay. 21 Thank you all very much for your testimony. 22 [Applause.] 23 So, again, if we can get Kathleen and Julia up here from Met Council on Housing. 24 25 And then we are going to follow up with a

1 panel of folks from Brooklyn Legal Services. I think we have Adam Meyers and -- sorry --2 and -- sorry, there are a couple of people from 3 Brooklyn Legal Services. You probably know who you 4 5 are. 6 So, we'll have that panel next. 7 Thank you. Anyone from Met Council wants to join the 8 9 panel and give testimony, this would be a great 10 time. 11 Thank you. 12 So, again, we'll begin the clock, and please 13 begin by identifying yourself by name, and then 14 proceed with your testimony. 15 KATHLEEN WACOM: Okay. 16 Good afternoon. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And if folks exiting could, you know, let us proceed, we'd appreciate it. 18 19 KATHLEEN WACOM: Good afternoon. 20 My name is Kathleen Wacom, and I'm a member 21 of Metropolitan Council on Housing. 22 For over 40 years I have lived in my 23 rent-stabilized apartment in the East Village, 24 Lower East Side.

My landlord is Madison Realty Capital, a

25

private-equity firm.

I am here to talk about the need for the Senate to pass good-cause eviction.

My building is one of 15 that

Raphael Toledano purchased in September 2015 for

\$97 million.

In March of 2017, Toledano files bankruptcy.

The New York State Attorney General's Office cited that this bankruptcy proceeding is part of an ongoing property-flipping scheme which started in September 2015 when Toledano purchased

15 rent-stabilized apartment buildings using financing provided by Madison.

According to "The Real Deal" in 2017, a federal bankruptcy judge granted Madison the right to replace Toledano as the property manager of these buildings.

Madison would pay less than \$10 million so that Toledano would be able to pay off creditors.

Presently, Madison is warehousing apartments in my building which is on East 12th Street.

Of the 37 apartments, 18 have been vacant since 2016.

Market-rate tenants have not had their leases renewed. No reason was given for renewal denial.

Their apartments remain vacant.

One couple, who is expecting a baby, moved to a smaller apartment uptown.

Others are doubling up with tenants elsewhere.

Good-cause eviction must be passed to protect market-rate tenants from lease-renewal denial and self-eviction due to inability to pay astronomical rent increases.

Throughout the state, market-rate tenants are fearful to report no heat or hot water, to ask for termination of bedbug and rodent infestation, to request necessary repairs.

They are fearful because their leases may not be renewed.

Good-cause eviction will stop this fear because tenants will know that their leases will be renewed at reasonable rates.

Also, good-cause eviction will provide stability to buildings and communities.

According to the Right Council Coalition, over 250,000 evictions in the city are due to inability to pay rent. Many are among the more than 62,000 homeless people living in shelters.

Rent regulation expires on June 15th of

this year.

You have the power to stop the housing crisis across New York State.

You need to pass all nine of our bills that make up our universal rent control platform so that we can feel secure in our homes and strengthen our communities.

Our homes are not commodities for private-equity firms to flip and make further profits while tenant leases are not renewed or their rents increased at unconscionable rates.

I thank the Senate for these hearings.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next.

JULIA EASTERLIN (ph.): Good evening,
everybody.

Congratulations.

I'm just (indiscernible) -- and congratulations.

I was there to see -- oh, this is off the books.

I was up there Tuesday to give you a package from statewide -- State Citywide Council.

I left it up there with your secretary,

1 through that package, and to send it to you. 2 SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you. 3 JULIA EASTERLIN (ph.): You're welcome. My name is Ms. Julia Easterlin (ph.), and I'm 4 a member of the Met Council for, like -- the old 5 Met Council of 12 years, and the new one, one year. 6 7 One year? 8 Yeah, one year. What -- you have to wake -- you have to wake 9 up the Democrats, 'cause they're sleeping, because, 10 11 before we had this vacancy, we didn't have no 12 vacancy, we didn't have no MIC (sic), and everything 13 did good. 14 Now the tenants are poor, they can't pay the 15 rent, and it's really bad for them -- for the --16 ya'll say one thing. 17 I'm not saying you, because you knew. (Indiscernible) you've got to talk them up 18 19 there up there when you negotiate. 20 So this is the thing what we're having, they 21 say one thing, and do another. So the thing is, they know the landlords are 22 23 crooked. Someone is not regulating the buildings. Come to find out, when I went to the 24

testimony in Broadway, 250 Broadway, and the thing

25

is, we have to get rid of the management, because 1 they're harassing. And I'm in court now. 2 (Indiscernible) said they're going to get 3 4 assets. And then we told them that we wanted wait to 5 6 hear from the commissioner and the mayor. 7 We haven't heard from the mayor. He was off at something else. 8 9 The commissioner, Vickie Been, she was at something else. 10 11 And we had a serious emergency, problem with 12 heat, heat, from December 2014 up until now. 13 Then he take us to court, we had this 14 problem. 15 And nobody (indiscernible) when you call, 16 I went to Brad Lassen (ph.) office, they didn't do 17 nothing. I went to Robert Cordidi (ph.), he didn't do 18 19 nothing. 20 I stepped over boundaries at 250 Broadway. 21 They said they were going to help me and my 22 brother for the building. 23 We are senior citizens. We have children in 24 the building.

And that's emergency, the heat shut off.

25

1 We called 311. They told us, Don't say "heat." Say "the 2 boiler." 3 And we went to -- he told us to go to the 4 building department, 280 Broadway. 5 We went to the building department and we 6 talked to them. I said, the heat's shut off and 7 all. 8 So he said he was there, he got a fine for 9 something, I don't know. 10 11 12 it was a clogged-up pipe, heat -- from the heat

But, anyway, he went back out there and saw, coming up on the first and all.

Nobody hasn't done a darn thing, and that's wrong for us to suffer for five months -five years.

Okay?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Then the building department came back out to check it again. They went down there before.

Everything is a violation. The whole building is a violation.

So when they came out, they said it's a clogged-up pipe.

I gave it to -- I sent it to the mayor, the commissioner.

I wrote -- we wrote three times. 1 Vickie Been -- Commissioner Vickie Been, she 2 3 never answer, three times. Brad Lassen office, I went to him. 4 Then his -- what you call them, the one that 5 6 you do the appointments? 7 No, no, no. Schedule. 8 9 Thank you. The schedule, so, you know, that we can meet 10 11 with Brad Lassen. 12 So the schedule fellow was going to give me 13 the date, but the one, Susan, (indiscernible) told 14 her, don't do it. 15 So I then went to the supervisor, APD, on the 16 eighth floor. 17 We did everything. 18 And nobody didn't do anything, and I don't think that's fair. 19 20 When you say "emergency," you have no heat 21 and hot water. 22 Somebody, and I called emergency, they say 23 was coming. 24 All of a sudden nobody come. 25 You see?

1 That's wrong right there. Then I went to MIC (sic) and the -- what's 2 the other one? 3 KATHLEEN WACOM: 4 IAI. 5 JULIA EASTERLIN (ph.): -- IAI. I don't know too much because this is my 6 7 first time in the apartment where I'm at now. So I always lived in a private house. 8 So these are the things that you have to be 9 aware of what's going on. 10 11 And get rid of the management. 12 The landlord had, for 100 buildings, they 13 should know how to handle them, like they did before. 14 15 The manager harassed tenants, and charge a 16 lot of money. 17 They can't pay it, they move. They're, like, 18 in and out, in and out. 19 And you have all different nationality, from 20 White on down. 21 So it's not fair. 22 And I'm in court now because, if I made a

mistake, the lawyer is supposed to help us, and she

didn't do nothing that the landlord -- the lawyer do

23

24

25

everything.

1 So now we have to wait.

We getting word, the tables are turned, said, God don't love ugly.

So now we in the front of the row, so he has to do everything in our apartment before September of 2019.

But this -- and the other thing, the vacancy, you know, we didn't have -- Senator, they had stopped that, and they brought it back.

People was living good.

And they went and they came in a vote, you know, up to legislators. And then they vote this bill back again, with that MCI and the vacancy, and that's wrong.

People can't -- that's why you got a lot of homeless because they can't live like this.

Okay?

And another thing, and the harassment.

These management need to go.

Let the landlord be accountable for what they do, because they get away with a lot of stuff, a lot of things.

I was a landlord once, and I know how -- I'm not nasty like some landlords.

Some is good and some is bad.

So I've been a landlord, and now I'm a 1 tenant. But they shouldn't do the people like that. 2 Fortunately, thank God, that, you know, I'm 3 not struggling. 4 5 But, you know, for other people, they're 6 struggling. It's bad no matter what shade or color. 7 They should do the right thing towards people. 8 That's what I feel. 9 Let me see. 10 11 Okay, yeah. Okay, thank you so much. 12 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 14 [Laughter.] 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: That was actually a 16 perfect use of 6 minutes, so very impressive. 17 And, Ms. Shapiro, would you like to go? ANDREA SHAPIRO: Hello. 18 19 My name is Andrea Shapiro, and I'm the 20 program manager at the Metropolitan Council On 21 Housing. 22 The Met Council has been fighting for tenants 23 for 60 years, and it's hard to tell the difference 24 between our signs for today and our signs 10 years

ago, 20 years ago, 30 years ago, 40 years ago, they

25

almost say the same exact thing. We even have the same Governor's name on some of them.

We've been fighting this cause because, since 1959, when we were founded, we have seen tenants being harassed and scared to speak up.

We simply can't answer the phones fast enough on our hotline to answer all of the questions that are coming in.

And, more than likely, we actually don't have a good answer for the tenant.

What their landlord is doing is, unfortunately, legal, but we know legal doesn't mean it's right.

That landlords are able to raise the rent on the market-rate tenants with as little as 30 days' notice, ask them to leave.

It's a very common question.

We sit there calculating, "when does that 30-day window start?" not being able to tell them, No, you have a right, you have ability, to really fight back.

The answer is, Have you thought about moving? which is not the answer you want give tenants.

It's not why we're here.

We believe that tenants have -- should have

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

the right to choose when they're moving, and where they're moving to, not being forced from one neighborhood to another, hoping that they'll get a new lease in the new place, and that they'll find that rent-stabilized apartment that still has a low rent.

At our clinic, which we have one downtown, and one uptown in Inwood, we are constantly seeing preferential rents.

Most people don't know that they have them.

It's not as the simple as saying, you signed a lease and you know what you got.

When you're signing a lease, you see two numbers on it.

You're told you're paying one number.

It doesn't explain how preferential rent works.

They think they're paying a lower amount, that's the amount they have.

Then three, four years, usually, later, the rent goes up and they have no recourse.

That's just how it works.

And we know that it's four years or five years later because there's an overcharge being hid in the past.

About a year ago, while Zellnor was campaigning to be state senator, he took a morning off to help me at Ebbets Field, as we were getting ready to start the HP court case, helping tenants file rent reductions.

Tenants were coming to us with their rent histories and their leases, to find out, sort of, if they were rent-stabilized, and if they had a preferential rent.

For a long time we thought all Ebbets Field is rent-stabilized. It's a huge complex, it's built before 1974. The rents are relatively low. It should be.

And one tenant after another, we realized they actually weren't only rent-stabilized.

That landlords had used vacancy bonuses, MCIs, and deregulation to get tenants out.

The building used to be filled with families, multi-generations.

That's my favorite thing about going to tenants' meetings, is I hear about everyone's kids, everyone's grandparents. Everyone is connected to each other in these buildings.

Now there's, more and more, the landlord's turning the apartments over, getting transient

tenants who aren't paying attention, don't have family in the building, aren't from the area, and harassing the long-term tenants out, bringing them to court case after court case, of non-payments, of refusing to cash checks, lying about when checks come in, in order to get them out, to put -- to deregulate these apartments to get more and more money.

The fact that the elevators took two years to get any repairs even started, when a building is filled with seniors, is a clear sign the landlord's trying to get tenants out.

They are not doing this by accident.

These are how the laws were designed by the New York City Council, the New York State Senate, the New York State Assembly, and former governors.

You all have the chance to finally correct these mistakes, and then help more tenants.

Granted, tenant emergency, it only makes sense that we provide more protections, and that would include market-rate tenants.

The unregulated tenants of New York City and New York State can't live 30-days notice.

You can't find a new apartment in that.
You can't plan your life.

You can't plan your children's schooling. 1 It's a matter of, not just housing justice, 2 3 but racial justice, women's rights, health care, educational justice, all of the things I know you 4 all care about beyond housing. 5 And so we need you to pass these nine bills, 6 7 and we need you to do it before June 15th. We can't let landlords give out notices to 8 the landlords -- to their tenants to scare them 9 about June 15th, that they won't have regulations 10 11 after that date.

We need it done early for once.

Thank you all.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

Can I --

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JULIA EASTERLIN (ph.): One more -- just one more.

Another thing, my Senator --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: We're going to give hometown -- a brief hometown exemption from the 6 minutes, just for you, but please keep it brief.

JULIA EASTERLIN (ph.): Get rid of -
30 years ago -- 30 years ago I was in front, with

me, Met Council, when I realized nobody never asked

```
1
        on the platform.
               It was 10 landlords and 2 tenants.
 2
               30 years later, the Met Council gave, at
 3
        St. Francis College last June.
 4
               Now we got one tenant, he was so scared. And
 5
        it's not fair. It's should be five tenants and five
 6
        landlords.
 7
               Do you agree with that?
 8
 9
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, well, I'm just going
10
        to say --
11
               JULIA EASTERLIN (ph.): No, I'm talking to my
12
        senator.
13
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- the questions go this
14
        way. Okay?
15
               JULIA EASTERLIN (ph.): Oh, oh. (Inaudible.)
16
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: But we appreciate it.
17
               Perhaps the Senator wants to address your
18
        point.
19
               Any questions from Senators?
20
               Senator Hoylman first.
21
               SENATOR HOYLMAN: Yes.
22
               Hi, nice to see you, Kathleen.
               KATHLEEN WACOM: Oh, hi. It's nice to see
23
24
        you, Senator.
25
               SENATOR HOYLMAN: It's good to see a
```

constituent.

I had a question about, if you could just describe for my colleagues what it's like not to have a traditional landlord anymore.

Since you, thankfully, lost Toledano, but now you have this nameless, kind of faceless, financial institution.

How has -- has the situation improved with -- with you and your fellow tenants?

Who do you go to when you don't have hot water or -- or -- or heat?

KATHLEEN WACOM: Oh, HPD, because not only do we not have a regular landlord, because we sent our checks to, you know, 325 East 12th Street, LLC, we have not had a legal super since March of 2013, and the building is horrendous.

And according to the AG, the manager of the building is Madison Realty Capital, under -- and, also, they use their subsidiary Silverstone to manage it.

However, I went on HPD, and the real owner is David Goldwasser who lives in Florida.

So there's a lot of hanky-panky, and the lawyers don't even know what's going on.

I've talked to them, and, you know, well, I'm

too busy, whatever.

And the real owner is David Goldwasser who lives in Florida, and, meanwhile, Madison Realty Capital is continuing funding the whole East Village.

Now they're trying to take over Campos Plaza, which is a NYCHA development in the East Village.

And that was the last residence of our co-founder, (indiscernible), by the way.

But, really, Madison and the other private equities, they're running rampant.

And there are no more mom-and-pops, because when you talk about number of buildings, you should talk about number of units, because two buildings can encompass 200 units.

Okay, thank you, Senator Hoylman.

SENATOR HOYLMAN: Thank you.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next up, I think Senator Krueger has a question.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes.

Hi.

Thank you.

When you talked about Madison Capital, I just wanted to just read into the record, that when they

attempted to buy a building in my district, they were explaining in their written materials that they estimated they could get rid of 75 percent of the regulated tenants within two to three years.

And that was actually sort of their -- KATHLEEN WACOM: Business model.

SENATOR KRUEGER: -- business model, thank you. So they're a, potentially, disturbing group.

But, Andrea, I wanted to ask you, are you seeing an increase in landlords trying to break preferential-rent deals this year?

ANDREA SHAPIRO: Yes.

I mean, we have -- according to DHCR, 30 percent of tenants have preferential rents.

And I feel like we've been seeing much higher numbers, and that would make sense, of people who first have preferential rents, and then preferential rents going up.

And we have several tenants in The Bronx who are, I guess, on a partial rent strike, which were -- they were hoping that you guys would pass these laws back in March, because they don't know what else to do.

And, also, their entire building lost their preferential rents, starting in about February of

this year.

We have seen that in a number of other buildings.

SENATOR KRUEGER: And one of the reasons

I ask is because we hear, anecdotally, that as the real estate industry sees what we're very likely to pass in the Legislature this year, they want to jump ahead of us.

So if they can get rid of preferential rents for individual tenants now, even when we change the law, saying they can't do that, it's too late.

ANDREA SHAPIRO: Yes.

SENATOR KRUEGER: We're also very concerned that, as we move forward with major reforms of rent regulation, that, at least in some parts of the city, real estate will quickly reevaluate whether they want to do a condominium conversion and get themselves out of this completely.

So we're trying to do what we believe are the right things, and also try to predict how to protect against what I call "unintended consequences" of everybody knowing what we're trying to do.

ANDREA SHAPIRO: Yes, we definitely see preferential rents going away.

All of a sudden, MCIs that had been sort of

pending for years, are being put forward.

And I know Mike (indiscernible), he has a lot of thoughts on dealing with the concern that club conversions could become a thing again, that we lose a lot of rent stabilization too, that he's happy to share thoughts on, and you can ask him.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Myrie.

SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you.

Thank you, Andrea, for the work that you are doing, and that you continue to do.

Ms. Easterlin, I want to thank you for your testimony.

And, also, just for the record, state that

I think you were bringing up the composition of the

Rent Guidelines Board.

And, you know, I think it's important, that as we are considering these reforms, that we consider the Rent Guidelines Board as well, because we do not operate in a vacuum.

I know that there are some of us who have expressed that, in the interim, while we are considering and deliberating, that there is a rent freeze, and that there are a number of things that are under the RGB's jurisdiction that we should be

looking at to protect tenants.

So I just want to say thank you for bringing that up, and we will be taking that into consideration.

JULIA EASTERLIN (ph.): Good. I appreciate that.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

And, Senator Jackson, I think you had a question.

SENATOR JACKSON: First, let me thank you all for coming in, and the rally that was up in Albany, and lobbying.

We have to keep the pressure on, let me just say that.

Just one rally and we think that, okay, the Assembly and the Senate are going to unify and come with a united bill. And then we have to face the 800-pound gorilla in the room, the Governor and the Real Estate Board of New York.

And I heard people come up and give testimony earlier, that, you know: We put you all in office.

Now there's, you know, Democrats in the Senate and Democrats in the House, meaning, the Assembly, now get it done!

I wish it was so easy.

And I think that what we need to do, is to
make sure that everyone knows that it's not over

until it's over, and it's not over until it's done.

And so the pressure must be continuous, so we feel the heat, and so that the Governor feels the heat, and so that all of the other Assembly Members and the Speaker and the Majority Leader feel the heat.

Now, some people say, well, you know, don't say that.

They are the leaders, the three leaders of our state, and we are the foot soldiers, and we have to communicate loud and clear to them our priorities.

And that's why -- that's what we're doing.

And I say to you that, both Brian Kavanagh and Zellnor Myrie, in leading the work group, are doing an excellent job.

I have the ended all of them, and I plan on continuing to go to all that they have, in order to speak out on behalf of all of the people that I represent, and all of the people that I don't represent that are in the same boat as the people that I represent.

So, please, it's not as easy as you think

you -- it is, but keep the pressure on all of us. 1 2 Thank you. And thank you for your advocacy, all of you. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 4 5 Any --[Applause.] 6 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Any further questions or 8 comments? 9 Okay. Thank you all again for your testimony. 10 11 Next up we have Adam Meyers of Brooklyn Legal 12 Services, and Chavette Jackson, also of Brooklyn 13 Legal Services. 14 And there was someone else who was expected 15 from Brooklyn Legal Services, who I think hasn't 16 checked in. 17 But, anyone else from Brooklyn Legal Services planning on testifying, this is your moment. 18 19 Then next up after that, we are going to 20 have -- I apologize if I'm not pronouncing this 21 properly -- but, Xiao Ling Chen, and I think 22 Melanie Wang is going to translate, and they're both from CAAAV. 23 24 ADAM MEYERS: Okay. 25 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Welcome.

ADAM MEYERS: Thank you, and good afternoon, Senators.

My name is Adam Meyers, and I'm an attorney with Brooklyn Legal Services Corporation A.

It assures the first three words of the other Brooklyn Legal Services. We're actually different organizations.

And my office has been representing tenants and tenant associations in north and east Brooklyn for 50 years now.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak at this hearing.

You've heard a lot today about the package of nine bills, about what we need to do to get MCIs ands IAIs and preferential rents under control, and extend good-cause protections to other tenants who are not yet protected.

And these are all crucial measures, and we fully support each and every one of them; they should all be passed.

But I'm here to talk to you about something additional.

What I keep pushing is my "tenth bill," which is -- it's about owner's-use evictions.

It's a modest reform, it's pragmatic, it's

achievable, and it is something that would tie up what is currently a massive, massive loophole in the rent-stabilization system, even if it doesn't get so much attention as MCIs are right now.

So what is "owner's-use eviction"?

"Owner's-use eviction" -- uh, as you guys all know, as a general rule, rent-regulated tenants, rent-stabilized and rent-controlled tenants, have the right to renewal leases at regulated rents.

They can, basically, stay in their apartments as long as they don't break the lease or cause a nuisance, or something like that.

"Owner's-use eviction" is an exception to
this rule which says that, if an owner declares that
he or his family wants to move into a
rent-stabilized or rent-controlled unit and occupy
it, he's allowed to do so, and he's allowed to tell
the tenant, no matter how long they've lived there,
that you're not entitled to a renewal lease and
you've got hit the road.

One can think back and understand why this was probably passed.

It's not a crazy idea, if you imagine small landlords with maybe only one building. They want to retain some flexibility with respect to renting a

unit now, but then, maybe, when the kid comes back from college they need a place to stay, or something like that.

But over the last 20 years we have seen a rampant, sort of, escalation and abuse of the way owner's-use eviction is being used.

The biggest problem with the law is that it imposes no limitation upon the number of units that can be recovered by a landlord for their own use.

There are big landlords who own dozens of buildings that are using the law to clear out entire multi-family properties and convert them to these extravagant single-family mansions.

There was a big high-profile case back in the mid-2000s, where, eventually, the court of appeals declared that a couple landlords on the Lower East Side were able to clear out all the tenants in this six-story, 11,000-square-foot building, and turn it into just a giant mansion for themselves and their baby.

I'm currently -- my office is currently working with a great number of tenants facing these cases, just in one neighborhood of South Williamsburg.

At 374 Wallabout, this a 6-unit building,

where the landlord is trying to evict two long-term tenants; one's been there 40 years, one's been there 20 years. He's trying to evict them so that he can convert the entire building into a single-family home.

At 157 Lorimer, just a few blocks away, it's the same story.

The landlord is trying take this 6-unit building and turn it into, basically, a duplex, so that his two kids can live on either half of the building.

And then, at 273 Lee, another building, again, just a couple blocks away, landlord is trying to take a large portion of the 8-unit building and is evicting three long-term Latino tenants, so as to put his kids in there.

These are just a tiny sample of the problem. This is going on across the city.

And the thing that I want to emphasize, and this touches on what -- something Senator Krueger said a moment ago, we expect this problem to get bigger; we are talking about unintended consequences.

And if we are going to pass these other critical reforms, reforms of MCIs and IAIs, that

while they extend huge new protections to tenants, they're going to make landlording of a rent-stabilized building a bit less profitable, we can expect more and more landlords to decide, you know what? Rather than make less money, I would rather live in a fancy house.

And so we need to tie up this loophole now while we still can.

Luckily, Senator Kavanagh has introduced a bill that would do just this. This is S4130, and this would make a number of changes to the law that would, basically, tie up the loophole.

First, it would strictly limit the number of units that a landlord could get through this kind of eviction. He's limited to one, and that's all you need for, you know, if your elderly parent is downsizing from their home, or if the kid comes back from college. It's not enough to take massive numbers of units out of circulation.

Second, this bill would provide additional protections to rent-stabilized units, and would provide that a rent-stabilized unit could only be recovered by the landlord in the case of urgent or compelling necessity, rather than simply on a landlord's whim.

And then, finally, it would create additional 1 protections for tenants who have lived in their 2 apartments for 15 years or longer. 3 These changes are modest and they're 4 5 targeted, and they're going to be effective, and 6 they're just -- just imminently reasonable. It's critical that these changes be made now 7 before this problem gets bigger. 8 9 And, thank you all for your time, and for everything that you're doing on these issues. 10 11 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 12 And I'll hold my comments, other than to say, 13 if I had known what you were going to testify about, 14 you know, we would have brought you up sooner. 15 ADAM MEYERS: Yeah, perfect. 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: But thank you for your 17 (indiscernible). Thank you, for the other Brooklyn Legal 18 Services now. 19 20 CHAVETTE JACKSON: Hi. 21 My name is Chavette Jackson. 22 I'm a staff attorney at Legal Services NYC, 23 in our Brooklyn branch.

I'd like to thank Senator Kavanagh and the

Committee for this opportunity to offer testimony.

24

25

We applaud the Committee's efforts to provide desperately-needed protections for vulnerable tenants struggling to pay unaffordable rents and avoid displacement of homelessness due to a myriad of loopholes in the existing system of rent regulation.

Legal Services NYC is one of the largest law firms for low-income people in New York City, with 18 community-based offices and numerous outreach sites located throughout each of the city's five boroughs.

Legal Services NYC's mission is to provide expert legal assistance that improves the lives and communities of low-income New Yorkers.

New York City and New York State are facing an ever-deepening affordable-housing crisis.

45 percent of New York City tenants are rent-burdened. Hundreds of thousands of New York City tenants must defend themselves in eviction proceedings each year.

The vast majority struggling to pay rents that have risen above their means.

60,000 families currently reside in the city's homeless shelters.

At the root of this crisis are insidious

loopholes punched in the rent laws by past legislatures oblivious to the social cost of weakening controls on cut-throat -- on the cut-throat real estate market.

Meanwhile, literally, millions of tenants in unregulated smaller properties live with constant fear of displacement because they have no protection against arbitrary eviction by their landlords.

I'm one of them.

The newly-introduced rent-regulation reform bills would provide desperately needed protections to millions of vulnerable working-class and middle-class families throughout the city and state, closing scandalous loopholes that provide -- that allow predatory landlords to enrich themselves at the expense of our families and our communities.

Legal Services NYC believes that all the bills included in the Housing for All campaign will immeasurably benefit our clients, and help curtail the epidemic of homelessness and rent hardship that afflicts working families throughout the state.

Senate Bill 3482 will repeal the current law that allows landlords to permanently deregulate apartments upon vacancy when the maximum legally-collectable rent exceeds 2773, even if the

landlord actually charges less than that amount.

Vacancy deregulation provides a powerful incentive for landlords to charge less -- or, to displace tenants through harassment, as well as through the aggressive use of housing-court eviction proceedings.

Even where the market will not support rents above that threshold, landlords still seek deregulation to deprive their tenants of rights and protections available under rent stabilization.

Deregulation, therefore, affects thousands of tenants in low-income neighborhoods where market rents are below the threshold.

Deregulation operates as one of the principle drivers of displacement and neighborhood instability in New York City.

S1593 will repeal the current law that permits landlords to increase rent-stabilized rent by 20 percent upon vacancy.

This increase is not tied to any increase in the landlord's costs, which are already compensated through the annual rent increases approved by the Rent Guidelines Board.

The 20 percent vacancy bonus does not require any improvement to the apartment either.

It is a pure windfall to landlords and a major cause of inflated rents, and must be abolished.

Due to existing loopholes in the rent-stabilization law, the maximum stabilized rents actually exceed market rents in many neighborhoods.

Current law allows landlords to charge market rent under the name "preferential rent," while registering often much higher -- a much higher legal rent.

When market conditions change, landlords are free to revoke the preference upon expiration of the tenant's lease, subjecting tenants to increases of 50 to even 100 percent.

In some low-income neighborhoods, one-third to one-half of rent-stabilized tenants are currently being charged revocable preferential rents.

S6527 will require landlords to base renewal leases on the original preferential rent for the life of the tenant's occupancy so that tenants will not be displaced by drastic rent hikes.

In 1997 the Legislature enacted a law, requiring judges to order tenants to deposit outstanding rent during the course of an eviction case, and mandating the dismissal of the tenant's

defenses if they could not afford the deposit.

The law unconstitutionally prevented tenants from challenging illegal overcharges if they could not afford to deposit the illegally high rent, and allowed landlords to evict tenants from freezing substandard apartments without giving them a chance to defend -- to demand a rent abatement.

S4526 will bar judges from striking the defenses of indigent tenants, and give tenant advocates appearing, under the Universal Access to Counsel Project, the time they need to properly prepare their cases and assert essential defenses for their clients.

Current law protects dishonest landlords who charge rent in excess of the legal limits by barring tenant overcharge claims after four years elapse.

The law penalizes tenants, particularly low-income tenants, who are unaware of their legal rights and fail to act within the four-year period.

Indeed, landlords often lull tenants into inaction by charging them lower preferential rents -- excuse me -- only to revoke the preference after four years.

Senate Bill 280 will protect landlords who provide -- who file truthful, lawful registration

statements, while allowing tenants to challenge registrations rendered unreliable due to fraud or dishonest practices.

Thousands of tenants in New York City and throughout the state who are not covered by rent regulation may be evicted by their landlords for any reason or no reason, even when they're willing and able to pay market rents.

Such tenants live perpetually in fear that their landlords -- of their landlords, afraid to request repairs and are vulnerable to harassment.

S2992 restores simple justice to the unregulated rental market.

Landlords will be able to recover apartments for bona fide reasons, but will no longer be able to arbitrarily evict law-abiding tenants.

Under our current system, landlords that upgrade systems and individual apartment finishes are able to pass costs of those repairs on to tenants forever.

However, many of these building systems -system repairs are necessary after years of neglect,
and landlords often overstate the cost and extent of
renovations.

Individual apartment improvements are even

more susceptible to abuse because they are not 1 monitored by HCR, and can lead to doubling of rents 2 and the immediate decontrol of apartments. 3 The proposed bills will protect tenants from 4 these predatory practices which eviscerate the 5 6 State's efforts to keep rents affordable for working families. 7 Thank you. 8 9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. Questions for this panel? 10 11 SENATOR KRUEGER: Gustavo first. 12 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Seems like we have 13 several. 14 First, Senator Rivera. 15 SENATOR RIVERA: Okay. 16 I'll point out, we've been joined by 17 Assembly Member Richardson. I'd like to hear later about that video that 18 19 you posted about, someone who's paying people 20 outside? 21 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Yes. 22 SENATOR RIVERA: That would be -- that would 23 be really -- I'd love to hear that.

But, for you two folks, thank you for being

24

25

here.

You both are both -- both are attorneys, and have represented many tenants, and you represented tenants in MCI cases, to try to get them to fight MCIs?

You have, ma'am?

CHAVETTE JACKSON: I have not particularly.

SENATOR RIVERA: Okay.

You have, sir?

ADAM MEYERS: I've represented a few, yes.

SENATOR RIVERA: Okay.

So if -- if you could tell me, just briefly, kind of give us the worst-case scenario.

I'm just -- the one that you remember, particularly, because, as you might have been here earlier, this is just one, right, application.

This is for a \$2.2 million renovation on restore -- on facade restoration, a lobby renovation, et cetera.

But if you could tell us a little bit, just from a point of view of a professional, because this is what you do for a living, you represent tenants, could you tell us a little bit about the worst experience that you can remember of trying to defend tenants that were going through an MCI process, and then still seeing it go through at the end?

Or maybe tell us a good story as well.

ADAM MEYERS: No, I have no good stories about MCIs.

The case that I've dealt most directly with MCIs is a building that I represented -- a tenant association I represented in a building up in Greenpoint on Manhattan Avenue.

It's only a 6-unit building, and so it didn't get up into the 2 1/2-million-dollar range, but it was several hundred thousand dollars. And it -- the landlord was seeking rent increases for the tenants that translated into, I believe, between one and two hundred dollar rent increases per apartment, which for low-income folks is extremely difficult.

And so we -- you know, we did spend months working with the tenants, collecting what evidence we could, about what work was done at the property, whether or not it was done in a workman-like fashion, whether or not it was effective or necessary, or whether it actually benefited the tenants.

In this case, a lot of the benefits actually went to a commercial tenant that was occupying the first floor, that DHCR, frankly, did not really recognize the true extent of their presence there,

and so didn't attribute enough of the expense to them.

But, long story short, we weren't able to do a lot with it.

The decision came down.

It's currently under what's called
"a petition for administrative review," so, it's,
theoretically, on appeal. But that's a long
process, and it's going to be a while before the
tenants see any relief from that.

SENATOR RIVERA: To follow up a second, so the -- you said that DHCR did not, in this particular case, recognize the extent of the presence, I think is what you said, the extent of the presence of that particular commercial tenant?

ADAM MEYERS: Yeah, and it gets a bit complicated, and I don't want to drag us into the weeds --

SENATOR RIVERA: Okay.

ADAM MEYERS: -- but, basically, commercial tenants who occupy buildings, and where some of the benefit of renovation work goes to those commercial tenants, the costs are suppose to be transferred to the commercial tenants sort of in relation to the amount of space that they occupy of the property.

And our big argument was that, DHCR undercounted the space that was occupied by the commercial tenant, and gave too little expense to the commercial tenant and too much to the residential residents.

SENATOR RIVERA: I guess the guestion I'm

SENATOR RIVERA: I guess the question I'm really asking is related to the role of DHCR.

Since you made the -- your statement was, they didn't take (indiscernible) into account.

Obviously, that's a situation, as far as the commercial tenant.

There might be many situations that are similar.

Would it -- do you have a sense, in your experience, based on your experience, do you think it's because of an inability of DHCR to do that type of work? Maybe too much on their plate? Or maybe the law doesn't allow them to take into consideration that commercial tenant's --

ADAM MEYERS: Yeah, I think it's a resource issue.

I don't think that they lack the ability to do it.

I've met inspectors that work -- worked for DHCR that are very sharp.

But, I think that they have a lot of these cases to deal with, and their practice is at a place where they tend to give a lot of deference to landlords when they are handed those 250-page stacks of paper.

SENATOR RIVERA: Got it.

And, ma'am, you said you have not represented tenants yourself.

Maybe you're -- maybe -- do you know of any cases like that in your -- that maybe --

CHAVETTE JACKSON: I think the biggest issue we encounter with -- I've encountered with MCIs are in these DHCR rent-registration histories, where we're trying to go back four years, and we're trying look for overcharges, and the landlords are either claiming owner's use or MCIs for past tenants.

And that's the way they're using the MCIs to jack up the rents for current tenant.

And so it's very hard -- it's very difficult to go back and to trace these apartment improvements on these dilapidated buildings to see what the landlords have done, either individually in apartments or, overall, to the structure, the overall building structures.

So sometimes we can't see what work has been

done at all, either in the past or for our current 1 2 client, to justify these increases that the landlords are trying to charge. 3 SENATOR RIVERA: Thank you both. 4 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: We have several questions 7 on this one. I think we're just going to keep going 8 across, if that's okay. 9 10 So, Senator Krueger. 11 SENATOR KRUEGER: It's actually not a question I -- to Adam Meyers. 12 13 I want to thank you for highlighting 14 Senator Kavanagh's other bill on single-use 15 eviction, and I just want to high -- owner's-use 16 eviction. 17 So in the beginning I made a statement that Manhattan has seen everything go on forever, and now 18 the rest of the city is seeing the same thing. 19 20 So when I was first elected, I think almost 21 17 years ago, one landlord named Steve Croman, he went on to much great fame. 22 23 He evicted 20 tenants in my district in one building to build himself a mansion. 24

Just saying.

25

So this has been a growing crisis.

So as -- you're absolutely right, as neighborhoods gentrify more and more, there is more and more motivation for us to see things people used to imagine nobody would ever do that anyway.

So, it's very important.

SENATOR RIVERA: Can I ask just one last quick question, because I just realized something?

To the gentleman that's represented, very quickly, so in your experience, based on the cases --

How many have you done, as far representing tenants in MCI cases?

ADAM MEYERS: I don't know.

SENATOR RIVERA: 5? 10? 15?

ADAM MEYERS: Yeah, around five, probably.

SENATOR RIVERA: Around five, but, obviously, you're not like things that you can get done in a couple of days. They're complicated.

ADAM MEYERS: No, they're complicated.

SENATOR RIVERA: -- so in your experience, do you think that tenants that do not have the luxury, in your case, the luck, of having someone who can work for them pro bono, that just a run-of-the-mill tenant with a run-of-the-mill life in a

rent-stabilized apartment, whether that person 1 could, on their own, go through this process and be 2 able to advocate effectively on their own? 3 Do you think that's possible? 4 5 ADAM MEYERS: Do I think it's possible? 6 Do I think there are extraordinary individuals who sort of rise to the occasion? 7 Yeah, probably, but, it's extremely 8 burdensome. 9 But it's long odds against them if only due 10 11 to the fact that, when a landlord's filing an MCI 12 application, he's doing it with well-paid counsel. 13 And so if the lawyer's going to add any value 14 to the situation, and, professionally, I have to say 15 that it does, the tenant's at a disadvantage just by 16 virtue of being unrepresented. 17 SENATOR RIVERA: Thank you. SENATOR KAVANAGH: And you've added value to 18 19 our hearing as well. 20 Next up, Senator Myrie. 21 SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you for your testimony. 22 Mr. Meyers, on the issue of owner-use 23 eviction, it happens to be something that I support. 24 I'm not just saying that because I'm sitting

next to the sponsor of the bill.

25

Can you speak to, without getting, you know, like Comm Law 101, the constitutional argument against it, that people will say, or landlords will say, You're telling me that I can't live in the property that I own and that I've bought?

ADAM MEYERS: So, it's a good question, and I'll confess that I haven't done a deep-dive research into the constitutional issues.

But I don't think they're going to be a big problem here, and the reason I think that is because, there is a substantial body of law affirming New York State and New York City's ability to sort of put restrictions on the way that property owners, and especially landlords, are allowed to use their property.

This bill would not prohibit landlords from using their own properties for their own occupancy.

It would simply require that they do it either with one unit, or they wait until units become vacant, or, negotiate buyout agreements with tenants.

That's actually one of the really interesting issues with the current state of the law, the fact that, if you purchase a rent-stabilized building full of below-market tenants, and you want to turn

that into a higher-rent building, sort of a luxury rental, the way you do that is you offer people buyouts, and the market sort of interacts with you and the tenant and you arrive at prices, you know, maybe this tenant will take 100 grand. That tenant will take a hundred fifty, whatever it is.

You can get them out if you offer them enough money.

But what New York State does, under the current law, is it subsidizes landlords who, instead, want to take these units completely off of the market and turn these, you know, 10-unit buildings into mansions.

New York State subsidizes them to the tune of the buyouts they would otherwise have had to pay to the tenants, and that's a big problem.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Salazar.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Thank you.

Thank you both for your testimony.

My question is for Ms. Jackson.

In your testimony, when you spoke about the need to reform preferential rents, or close the preferential rent loophole, certainly, the -- there's, currently, the proposal that you spoke to of making those preferential rents the legal rent

for the remaining period of the tenancy.

But, there is an alternative proposal to actually make the preferential rent the legal rent beyond the current tenancy.

I assume -- I know the answer to this -- well, I don't want to assume that I know the answer to my question, but, do you -- is it -- in your opinion, the second option, is it viable, and is it preferrable?

CHAVETTE JACKSON: It's certainly preferrable.

I think, in a lot of cases, in my experience, where I'm representing large clusters of buildings, and tenants either facing eviction, or, especially when coming from under regulatory agreements, where the landlords are lawfully allowed to restructure rents and double and triple tenants' rents, preferential rents become very important to tenants.

And so what we often negotiate in settling those cases are preferential rents for the tenants, and the fight we get from the landlords is succession rates, and the rights for these preferential rates to enure, not just for the life of the tenancy, but for any successors.

It is our position that it's important that

successor tenants have the right to enjoy these preferential rents as well.

We don't know what's going to happen during the life of the tenancy.

We don't know what the landlords are going to do in the interim to these tenants.

And so it's important that any successor tenant will have the opportunity to have the affordable rent that their family member had, any children or anybody remaining in the apartment.

So we definitely support it enuring for even longer than just the life of the tenancy.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator.

Senator Hoylman.

SENATOR HOYLMAN: Thank you,

Senator Kavanagh, and thank you for your bill on the issue of owner-occupied units.

Question for you: How prevalent is it?

Is it increasing in number?

Do you have any sense of borough?

I know there's a lot that has occurred in the East Village, and even the -- in the wider Greenwich Village in my district.

But I was wondering if you see the trend line

continuing?

ADAM MEYERS: And so my answer here is going to be entirely anecdotal, based on the fact that, to the best of my knowledge, there is no governmental body that tracks this stuff at all. It's completely unmonitored.

But, to the best of my knowledge, it is increasing.

We are seeing an increasing number of these cases in Greenpoint, we're seeing an increasing number of these cases, and this is where I'm really seeing most of them, in South Williamsburg, where the Hasidic community is using these cases as their population expands, and they are displacing, largely, Latino long-term tenants via owner's-use eviction.

SENATOR HOYLMAN: Well, it is the ultimate, like, fat-cat landlord move, to say that, my family is better than yours and you have to move out of your apartment to accommodate, you know, my kids and parents.

ADAM MEYERS: It's a really bad look.

SENATOR HOYLMAN: It's a real -- it is so outrageous.

So thank you, Senator Kavanagh, for your

bill.

And thank you for advocating for it.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And I'm just going to follow up with one -- one or two quick questions.

So you've talked about a common phenomenon, where the goal is to clear out lots of people to make few dwelling units.

Like, and we had, I think, 20 -- I think it was 28 units on East 3rd Street, I think you may have ref -- that made me think of the same case that was from a number of years ago.

But there's also -- this is also useable by multiple family members for multiple units as well; right?

ADAM MEYERS: That's correct.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So if I am a landlord and I have lots of relatives, and I want to take an occupied rent-regulated building, and I want to designate each apartment as the new home of each of many of my relatives, I can use that as the basis for taking all of those units out of deregulation -- out of regulation?

ADAM MEYERS: That's correct, yeah.

If -- they would have to be immediate family members, but, assuming they're immediate family

members, you don't need to prove that you need these 1 2 units for any reason or that you don't have other 3 places to put them. You only need to prove that this is what you 4 5 want. SENATOR KAVANAGH: And to your knowledge, is 6 7 there any ability on the part of HCR, or any other agency, to follow up subsequent to the deregulation, 8 to ensure that your relatives are still living 9 happily in these units? 10 11 ADAM MEYERS: It -- I have no knowledge of 12 any program by DHCR to follow up on this. 13 DHCR does have a rule, I believe, that, if

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you evict someone for owner's use, you must, as the owner or as the owner's family, occupy that unit for three years after that eviction.

But I think, if you violate that rule, all that happens is that there is a sort of rent-increase penalty imposed on the building.

And, two, you're exactly right, that I don't think DHCR looks for that independently.

It would only be brought to their attention by super-observant tenants, you know.

> SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

Again, thank you, and we have your testimony,

```
1
        and we would like to follow up with you on this.
 2
               ADAM MEYERS: Thank you.
 3
               SENATOR KAVANAGH:
                                   Thank you.
               Okay, great. Thank you very much.
 4
 5
               Next up, as I -- as previously mentioned, we
        have Xiao Ling Chen, and, Melanie Wang, who I think
 6
        is going to translate, with CAAAV (the Coalition
 7
        Against Anti-Asian Violence).
 8
 9
               And then next up after that we have Neighbors
10
        Helping Neighbors, and that is going to be
11
        Abigail Martinez and Clara Perez Joseph, and
12
        I believe Marcela Mitaynes is also here.
13
               XIAO LING CHEN: (Speaking Chinese.)
14
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
15
               So, hello to the State Senators, and all of
16
        our allies, and ladies and gentlemen here today.
17
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
18
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
19
               So my name is Chen Xiao Ling, or Xiao Ling
20
        Chen.
21
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
22
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
               I'm a member of the Chinatown Tenants Union
23
24
        at CAAAV.
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
25
```

(Translated to English by a translator.) 1 So I live in Chinatown on Eldridge Street, 2 135 Eldridge Street, Apartment 1-C. 3 (Speaking Chinese.) 4 (Translated to English by a translator.) 5 I came to Chinatown in 1981, New York City's 6 7 Chinatown, and I moved into this apartment in August of 1982. 8 (Speaking Chinese.) 9 10 (Translated to English by a translator.) 11 My daughter was born in this apartment on November 3rd of 1982. 12 13 (Speaking Chinese.) 14 (Translated to English by a translator.) 15 So I've come here today to support 16 Housing Justice For All's nine bill proposals, and 17 also, particularly, to ask you for your support in 18 ending the MCI program. (Speaking Chinese.) 19 20 (Translated to English by a translator.) So I didn't come here today to make a speech 21 or to tell stories. 22 23 I came here just to share with you the true experience that I've had and the impact I've 24 25 suffered from MCIs.

(Speaking Chinese.) 1 2 (Translated to English by a translator.) So, from 1982 to 2014, we lived very happily 3 in our building. 4 Our building was owned by a small Chinese 5 landlord who, for 30 years, followed the letter of 6 the law and followed the annual RGB rent increases 7 when increasing the rent. 8 9 (Speaking Chinese.) (Translated to English by a translator.) 10 11 Then in 2014, our current landlord, a large 12 corporate company, bought our tenement building. 13 (Speaking Chinese.) 14 (Translated to English by a translator.) 15 So from that point on our lives changed 16 greatly. 17 (Speaking Chinese.) 18 (Translated to English by a translator.) So in the beginning, our landlord told a lot 19 20 of the tenants who were living in the building, who 21 had previously shared their apartment with others or lived with relatives, that their situations were 22 23 illegal and, thus, forced those tenants out. 24 (Speaking Chinese.) (Translated to English by a translator.) 25

For example, when I moved into my apartment, 1 I was still pregnant with my daughter, so, 2 naturally, my lease just has my name on it. 3 And then this new landlord, when they came in 4 in 2014, tried to tell us that my daughter couldn't 5 live with me because her name wasn't on the lease. 6 7 (Speaking Chinese.) (Translated to English by a translator.) 8 9 And I would try to pay them rent by check, and they would refuse to take the checks and send 10 11 them back. 12 (Speaking Chinese.) 13 (Translated to English by a translator.) 14 And I even ended up having to go to court 15 with them. But, eventually, their own lawyers said 16 that they would have to take the checks that I sent 17 in. (Speaking Chinese.) 18 (Translated to English by a translator.) 19 20 And then, in 2015, I received a letter from 21 the housing department, saying that they had 22 inspected my apartment and that my apartment had 23 lead in the apartment. 24 (Speaking Chinese.) (Translated to English by a translator.) 25

```
And at that time, my daughter had three
 1
        children already.
 2
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
 3
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
 4
               And the oldest was 9.
 5
 6
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
 7
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
               The second was 7.
 8
 9
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
10
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
11
               The third was 4 years old.
12
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
13
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
14
               So when the government said that there was
15
        lead in the apartment, they had to do repairs and
16
        clear up the lead violations.
17
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
18
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
19
               And I remember very clearly --
20
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: And just forgive me for
21
        interrupting, but, in fairness, since this has to be
22
        translated, we're going to -- I think we're just
23
        going run the clock again.
24
               XIAO LING CHEN: (Speaking Chinese.)
25
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
```

So then they notified me that they would have 1 to do repairs to fix the lead issues, and my 2 daughter at that time was working. 3 (Speaking Chinese.) 4 (Translated to English by a translator.) 5 So I had a relative in China who was sick and 6 7 was about to pass away, so I asked my landlord, give me four weeks' time, I'm going to China, and can you 8 wait until I come back to do these repairs? 9 (Speaking Chinese.) 10 11 (Translated to English by a translator.) 12 And they agreed. 13 (Speaking Chinese.) 14 (Translated to English by a translator.) 15 And when I came back in May, I found that 16 they had completely destroyed my apartment. 17 (Speaking Chinese.) 18 (Translated to English by a translator.) And my daughter told me that the landlord had 19 20 come in to do the repairs because that they said 21 they couldn't wait to do the repairs, and my 22 daughter was at work. 23 (Speaking Chinese.) 24 (Translated to English by a translator.) 25 So a long time ago we had fixed up our

kitchen and our kitchen cabinets. And the landlord, in order to fix the lead violations, had placed additional siding on the walls all around the kitchen, and completely re-adjusted our cabinets so that everything in the kitchen was crooked and working improperly.

(Speaking Chinese.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

So they had found their own people, own contractors, to come and do this work.

But when the State came back to inspect, they found that there was still evidence of lead in the apartment.

So it took them two or three times of repairs before they finally got a licensed contractor to come and do the repairs.

(Speaking Chinese.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

So then, in order to increase the rent, the landlord did a lot of construction on the building, including construction to fix the facade, and then the commercial spaces on the ground floor.

And because I'm on the ground floor, and there's only a wall between my bedroom and these spaces, there was a lot of impact to me, including a

```
1
        giant hole that was knocked into my wall and damage
        to my bed.
 2
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
 3
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
 4
               So the hole was so big that I could see --
 5
        from my side of the wall, I could see into their
6
        space, and I could see them.
7
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
8
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
9
10
               And I couldn't sleep there anymore.
11
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
12
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
13
               Then they said that there was a small hole in
14
        the wall next to my bed, and they said it was my bed
15
        that created the hole. So they got a lawyer to
16
        write a letter to me, and requesting monetary
17
        damages.
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
18
19
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
20
               So they also did facade repair work, and last
21
        year we received two MCI applications from the
        landlord to increase the rent.
22
23
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
24
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
25
               The first one was for every room, increasing
```

```
1
        the rent around $50.
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
 2
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
 3
               The second one was for every room, increasing
 4
        the rent about $20.
 5
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
 6
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
 7
               So, luckily, the second MCI application DHCR
 8
        has already rejected.
 9
10
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
11
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
12
               But their reasoning is that, they've repaired
        the facade --
13
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
14
15
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
16
                -- and done water re-piping.
17
                   (Speaking Chinese.)
                   (Translated to English by a translator.)
18
19
               But since 2015, after they did the water
20
        re-piping, the water situation in my home is
21
        actually a lot worse, and there's very little water
        coming out of the faucet.
22
23
               And my grandchildren that live in the
        apartment are often sick and have runny noses
24
25
        because they're not able to wash properly.
```

1 (Speaking Chinese.)

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yeah, I'm going to ask you to wrap up this testimony. I think you -- we'll have some questions as well, so...

XIAO LING CHEN: (Speaking Chinese.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

So, I have many things to say and I can't possibly finish them all.

(Speaking Chinese.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

So I just want to say that the construction the landlords are doing is not improving our lives at all.

It doesn't have nothing to do with us, and, in fact, has made my life worse; has made it so that I don't have proper water in my apartment, that there are actually water leakages from the re-piping, that created mold damage that ruined a lot of things in our apartment.

(Speaking Chinese.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

After they did the exterior renovation and rented the space out to a bar, the mice in the building have increased substantially, and so that there are mice in my apartment all the time.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask you, if you -- if we could conclude.

Maybe we have a couple of comments from the senators, anyway.

XIAO LING CHEN: (Speaking Chinese.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

SENATOR KAVANAGH: No, if you could stay for just a moment.

XIAO LING CHEN: Thank you very much.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And thank you.

I also want to begin by acknowledging that, you know, CAAAV -- you know, my staff has been working with CAAAV, and with, I think, the Urban Justice Center is also represented in the room.

And, just, those organizations have done tremendous work in, I think, what is just one of the worst cases of a landlord abusing every aspect of the law that -- that is available to them.

So I just -- I -- first of all, I appreciate your work here.

And I would also just note that this is a rare case where, HCR, the state agency, has actually imposed -- they've refused to move forward with the applications; they've imposed rent freezes; they have, in some cases, rescinded -- you know, ordered

some money to be returned to tenants.

But it just continues to be a horrific situation.

My question for you is:

As you -- as the folks in your building have been dealing with this terrible situation, have you -- have you managed to, you know, organize, you know, all of the tenants in your building?

Are you -- are you working, you know, together and -- to address this with CAAAV and with the other organizations that have been working with you?

XIAO LING CHEN: (Speaking Chinese.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

So all of us old tenants who have been in the building for a long time are working together.

But the newer tenants moving into the building are paying much more in rent than us.

And a friend of mine looked into their rent situation.

And, you know, for us, the older tenants, we pay, more or less, around \$1,000. But the new tenants pay upwards of \$3,600 for the same size apartment.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And you perceive that --

1 this -- that to be the purpose of a lot of this 2 activity, is to harass the old tenants out to get new tenants in who will pay much more? 3 (Speaking Chinese.) 4 5 (Translated to English by a translator.) Of course. 6 7 (Speaking Chinese.) (Translated to English by a translator.) 8 9 My grandchild, who last year turned 7, told Grandma, the landlord isn't for us. He doesn't 10 11 want to rent this apartment to us. 12 You know, the young children understand. 13 Even they understand. 14 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to -- and by -you know, thank you for bringing your, you know, 15 16 story to us today. 17 And thank you for, you know, in spite of 18 enduring all these terrible things, you know, working to try to change them, and -- and bringing 19 20 your testimony to us, to help us figure out how to 21 change the laws. 22 Thank you. 23 [Applause.] 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: We have one -- we have 25 additional questions for you.

1 Senator Myrie. SENATOR MYRIE: Again, thank you for your 2 3 testimony. On a good note, I wanted to let you know that 4 5 you -- your daughter shares my birthday as well, November 3rd. 6 7 But I also just wanted to ask if you could --SENATOR SALAZAR: Every day is your birthday. 8 SENATOR MYRIE: Wait, right, yeah, inside 9 Senate joke. 10 11 Get it together, please. 12 I wanted to ask if you could talk about --13 this is a difficult situation to begin with for any 14 tenant. 15 But if you could speak specifically to 16 whether or not it is more difficult when English is 17 not your first language? XIAO LING CHEN: (Speaking Chinese.) 18 19 (Translated to English by a translator.) 20 So the landlord, you know, is not someone who 21 speaks Chinese, and this presents a lot of

And within their company they only have one staff person who is Chinese and able to communicate with us in our language.

communication difficulties for us.

22

23

24

25

(Speaking Chinese.) 1 2 (Translated to English by a translator.) 3 So, often, when we make phone calls, we can't reach anybody. When we leave messages, no one 4 5 responds. 6 SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. Further questions? 8 9 Okay. 10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you again very much for your testimony.

MELANIE WANG (translator): I just want to speak to, Ms. Chen's building has -- DHCR did reject one of the MCI applications, and they've also gotten a rent reduction.

But we believe strongly that this is through the strong advocacy work Ms. Chen and her neighbors have done in participating in the No More MCI Administrative Reform Campaign, meeting with DHCR administrators more than once, right, and with other elected officials, and strong work with our legal-services partners. Right?

So it's only through strong tenant advocacy that we believe special attention has been paid to this building.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yeah, and as I mentioned,

extraordinarily strong advocacy on behalf of these 1 tenants by these organizations. 2 3 But there are many, many, many tenants that are not so lucky. 4 And thank you again for your work. 5 6 [Applause.] 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next up we'll have the Neighbors Helping Neighbors panel. 8 9 And then we're going to be followed by 10 Delsenia Glover of Tenants and Neighbors. 11 CLARA PEREZ JOSEPH: Good afternoon, members 12 of the dais, Senators. 13 I especially want to thank you for coming 14 down here because we've been pushing up to Albany 15 all the time, and it's a grueling trip, but we have 16 to do it and it gets done. 17 But it's nice and refreshing that it's here. With my COPD, I appreciate it because I'm 18 19 only three blocks away. 20 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 21 CLARA PEREZ JOSEPH: I also want to thank the 22 newly-elected -- congratulate the newly-elected 23 political officials. 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 25 And can I ask you to identify yourself.

CLARA PEREZ JOSEPH: Yes.

My name is Clara Perez Joseph.

I've been living in Crown Heights for 52 years; about 13 years rent control, and then, after 39 years, rent-stabilized, and rent stabilization was very important to me.

I was a very young divorced mother with three children, and I was able to raise them and give them stability, protection, a sense of community, not to be, you know, sending them from school to school.

And I also put all of them through college because, you know, at the time, the rent was affordable.

I'd like to talk about -- first of all,

I want to start, instead of closing, I want to start

by urging you to please support us with the nine

bills, and not just eight, or seven, because if one

doesn't get passed, that leaves a loophole.

And the system is broken, it's cracked, and we know that we can't put Humpty-Dumpty back together again.

So we just need these bills, this platform, to pass.

I would like to talk about preferential rent.

My first experience with that was when

I accompanied my daughter to get her first apartment after she graduated college. And she was very excited that now she was going to be independent.

We went to the real estate office. I had no idea what that kind of lease was, and there were two amounts, and I thought it was strange.

And I asked the young real estate agent, you know, Why two amounts?

He said, Well, we have an \$800 and \$1200. Don't worry about the \$1200. We're going to give her the apartment for \$800, we're giving her a break, and we're giving her preference.

Well, she got the apartment. She didn't want me to make any waves. And invested in some furniture. She's paying student loans, after two master (sic) degrees, trying to do the right thing; young adult up and coming, the -- our future.

And then a couple years later, two years later, I think she gets hit with the \$1200.

So now, sadly, she goes from independent status, to roommate status and furniture in storage.

That is horrendous.

But that is the "monster" bill, the "monster" law, because it's the quickest way to raise the rent and get the tenants out.

Now, the other bill that I really am concerned about is the vacancy bonus, because that just gives the landlord the incentive to keep harassing the tenant.

I'd like to thank Senator Krueger for the work that she did for protect -- tenant protection, but, we need to do more.

And between the vacancy bonus, the preferential rent, and the MCIs, and the IAIs, those are ways to displace us quickly for gentrification.

Now, I say that MCI is the biggest robbery
I've ever seen, legally, because, you know, robbery
is robbery. And, whether you get mugged and your -you know, your purse gets taken, or someone goes
into your account, this is robbery as well, because,
if you pay for a service, you pay for a service and
this is the amount, and you paid for it, okay, you
shouldn't get paid peren -- he shouldn't make a
perennial profit.

So that has to go.

I was looking at, the other day, the movie "The Pursuit of Happiness," with Will Smith. A lot of you have seen it.

The Declaration of Independence tells us we

have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of 1 2 happiness. How the heck can you pursue happiness when 3 you don't even have a place to live? 4 5 Okay? 6 It's very, very difficult to see your 7 neighbors moving. The stores, it's a -- the storefront is a 8 9 blight, because they push out the mom-and-pop 10 stores, and no one else wants to pay those rents 11 either. 12 So you have -- you walk down and there's no 13 shopping strip whatsoever. 14 Also, I would like to speak on behalf of 15 rent-control tenants and also non-regulated tenants. 16 Housing is a human right. 17 So we need to pass that good-cause bill for unregulated tenants because they have a right also. 18 And the rent-controlled tenants should not 19 20 have to pay that NBR, 7.5, or whatever it is, every 21 year. 22 They should have the right that rent-stabilization tenants. 23

Okay, if I'm -- I'm proud to be a tenant

leader, it's a privilege.

24

25

If I were a public official, I would feel it 1 was priv -- it would be a privilege tenfold. 2 3 And you have the power, and I urge you to use that power. 4 And in the words of Emma Lazarus: Give us 5 your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning 6 7 to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send those, the tempest-tossed to me, I lift 8 9 my lamp beside the golden door! There's no golden door for us. 10 There's no door for us. 11 12 The doors are closed. 13 Use your vote and open those doors for us and 14 save our homes. 15 Thank you. 16 [Applause.] 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. MARCELA MITAYNES: Hello. 18 Ms. Avigail Martinez is unable to meet with 19 20 us because of work commitments, and I'd like to read 21 her testimony for the record, please. 22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. So, just identify 23 yourself for the record, and then --24 MARCELA MITAYNES: Sure.

Marcela Mitaynes from Neighbors Helping

25

Neighbors, Avigail Martinez representing Neighbors Helping Neighbors.

Avigail Martinez moved into her apartment at 680 53rd Street in Sunset Park in 2014, with her husband and 4 children, ages 4 and 13 years old -- 4 through 13 years old.

She began paying \$2,200 a month in rent.

She had help paying her rent because she had roommates; however, when her roommates moved out, she lost the rental income and she seeked help.

She came to Neighbors Helping Neighbors, where she learned about her apartment being rent-stabilized and that she had rights.

When she reviewed her rent history, she discovered the landlord had reported to the state agency DHCR that she was paying \$643.50, and noticed that the prior tenant was paying \$588.89.

She learned that she can request an investigation with the State to determine the legal rent amount.

The owner claimed the \$1500-a-month rent increase was due to an individual apartment improvement.

Compared to the other apartments,

Ms. Martinez's apartment had been renovated,

created an additional bedroom, got rid of the living room, and moved the location of the kitchen from the middle of the apartment to the entrance of the apartment, all of this construction without any DOB permits.

The State ruled in her favor, lowered her legal rent amount, from \$2,200, to \$750, a month, and ordered the landlord to refund her an overcharge of \$56,000.

The landlord challenged the State's ruling with the fancy expensive lawyer, claimed there was no requirements for permits when applying for an IAI, and the decision was overturned, and the legal rent was adjusted back to \$2,200 a month.

She is now appealing the decision in Supreme Court, and has to pay for a private attorney for assistance with the appeal, as none of the legal-service providers would take a case like this.

While she is waiting for the decision, she continues to have to pay \$2,200 a month for rent.

The landlord refuses to make repairs or maintenance to the apartment or the building.

And as this testimony is being provided, he continues to renovate the vacant apartments, and continues ignoring the long-term tenants' requests

1 for repairs and basic needs. I'd like to provide my testimony now if 2 3 that's possible? SENATOR KAVANAGH: 4 Sure. 5 Again, just for the people keeping track, if you can identify yourself and then go ahead. 6 Can we reset the clock? 7 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Reset it? 8 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes. 9 10 MARCELA MITAYNES: Thank you. 11 So, good afternoon, Senators, and welcome to 12 Brooklyn. 13 I am Marcela Mitaynes. I'm a tenant advocate 14 and organizer for Neighbors Helping Neighbors 15 located in Sunset Park on the other side of 16 Senator Myrie's district. 17 I used to live in Hell's Kitchen when I was a 18 little girl. And then, at the age of 5, my dad moved us to Sunset Park --19 20 Thank you. 21 -- to a rent-stabilized apartment. 22 We were living there for about 30 years. 23 And then we got a new landlord that purchased 24 the building, and within six months was able to

empty out half of the apartments.

25

A lot of us just didn't understand what was happening, and a lot of what was happening was also happening because tenants tend to not be informed of their rights.

There was a lot of rampant harassment, and I ended up losing my rent-stabilized apartment in 2008.

I then moved two blocks down.

So, I was displaced from my rent-stabilized apartment that I've known for my whole life, where we were paying \$625, to move two blocks away to a two-bedroom apartment, paying \$1400 a month.

And I share this because this is a common thing that we see with tenants. Once they lose their rent-stabilized affordable apartment and are put back out into the market rate, they're only market-rate tenants for so long.

I was only able to be in that apartment for the first two years. And when it was time to renew it, we're talking about, going from \$1400, to almost \$1700 a month.

That is not affordable to someone who's been in the community for a really long time.

And so now I'm living in an unregulated unit, with no lease, no right to a lease, and can easily

be evicted within 30 days.

I share this because this is the type of issues and problems that we're seeing in the community.

As an advocate, I've been working in my community for 10 years, advocating and fighting for tenants to stay in their homes.

We've seen all kind of abuses with the bills and the legislation that we're trying to pass, which is why we're here trying to support it.

And there's three buildings that were in the news a lot in Sunset Park: 545, 553, and 557 46th Street.

Each are 17-unit, rent-stabilized buildings. They've been hit with five MCIs, totaling \$400 a month additional rent for the MCIs.

Now, the tenants are fighting it, but this, again, would require a private attorney.

If they're not able to fight it, this will cause displacement.

When we're talking about eviction and the eviction numbers, they do not reflect all the evictions. They do not reflect the evictions that happen as a result of tenants being priced out.

Avigail Martinez is an example of the abuse

of the individual apartment increases.

The vacancy decontrol acts as an incentive for landlords.

If they can raise the rents high enough to get the tenants out, then they are no longer dealing with legislation or rules.

The four-year rollback, again, like you've heard, in the past, unless a tenant is aware or knows that there's a way of trying to find out if their legal rent is correct, they only have a short four windows -- a four-year window to do it. And if they can't, then they're stuck with the higher rent.

Again, the rapid harassment that's happening in these communities, particularly to the working-class immigrant population that is located in Sunset Park, is very detrimental.

We're going through gentrification.

Most of the work, most of the counseling, most of the advocacy, most of the tenant workshops, tenant meetings, that we have are done predominantly in Spanish because that is the main language that they speak, that is what they understand.

For a working-class immigrant community like Sunset Park, the fact that they are undocumented brings additional harassment pressures.

They are being told to their face that they're going to call immigration.

They're being told that they're gonna -their children are going to come home and not
find -- and not find their parents.

This is an easy way for these landlords to vacate these apartments, renovate them, and then convert them into market rate.

What is happening has been happening over years. This is not something that's sudden.

These laws that have been passed, with the help of the real estate industry, is really to make the real estate industry richer.

They are not complicit in making money.

They want to be millionaires at the expense of the working-class.

We are at a unique opportunity to make history, and I hope that history will show that you guys all are on the right side of history by passing these laws.

We cannot accept just one or two bills being passed.

It's really the package of bills that's going to make a difference in the homelessness that's being experienced in the whole state of New York.

1 And one last thing, I implore to you make 2 sure that you're able to pass these bills in the 3 Senate; work with the Assembly, make sure that they 4 pass it. 5 Do not give the Governor an opportunity to water down these bills. 6 7 SENATOR RIVERA: I didn't hear you. (Inaudible.) 8 9 MARCELA MITAYNES: Do not give the Governor the opportunity to water down these bills. 10 11 SENATOR RIVERA: Oh, got you. 12 MARCELA MITAYNES: Pass these bills, put them 13 on his desk, and let's see what he does. 14 [Applause.] 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Again, I appreciate the 16 enthusiasm, but let's try to keep the reactions. 17 Any questions from senators? 18 SENATOR RIVERA: One thing I wanted to -- if 19 I may? 20 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Rivera. 21 SENATOR RIVERA: Thank you. 22 That last part, I'm sorry, maybe my hearing's 23 a little (indiscernible), could that last part --24 what did you -- what did you mean exactly about 25 this -- what is that last thing you said?

I kind of missed it, I'm sorry. 1 2 MARCELA MITAYNES: I mean, the last time we had an opportunity to pass and renew these laws --3 SENATOR RIVERA: Yes. 4 5 MARCELA MITAYNES: -- there were three men in a room doing the negotiations. 6 7 SENATOR RIVERA: Got you. MARCELA MITAYNES: And there were two 8 9 Republicans and only one Democrat there. SENATOR RIVERA: Got you. 10 11 Who was that again? 12 MARCELA MITAYNES: The Governor cannot be 13 allowed to water down these bills. 14 SENATOR RIVERA: Oh, okay, got you. 15 The hearing was terrible. 16 Thank you for that, ma'am. 17 I did -- I did -- one thing that I wanted 18 to -- one thing that I actually -- as you were -- as 19 you were telling the stories that you were telling, 20 my -- one of my staffers, who's actually somewhere 21 in the room, she might be charging her phone right 22 now, remembered a situation in our -- in -- in our district that -- that had similarities. 23 24 And I just wanted to, really quickly, for the

25

record:

There's a -- there's a tenant in my district that was overcharged by just under \$800.

They were owed close to \$40,000 over the whole time that the -- that the overcharge happened.

The landlord challenged, sued for eviction for non-payment, because they were deducting their rent for the amount they owed, about three to four times a year. Filed three rent overcharges.

The landlord has refused to:

Number one, pay them;

Number two, correct the bills, and continued to overcharge them;

Three, give them the correct leases.

And it's been going on since 2012, so much so, that they recently moved to Florida because they could no longer afford the private attorney and they just gave up.

So the -- it's a -- and one thing that

I wanted to just -- if you could underline for us --

Because it has been a repeating pattern a couple of times we're talking, not only about some of the weaknesses in the law, but, sadly, some of the weaknesses, some of the agencies, and the actions or inactions of those agencies.

So it seems to me, just in this case alone,

and we've seen many of them, sadly, in my district, 1 where they're just incredibly passive. 2 -- so if you had -- in your experience, being 3 an organizer, and talking to many tenants that are 4 having situations and are interacting with some 5 state agencies, mainly, DHCR, if you had, it is your 6 7 sense, what would you think, what would you like to tell them on the record, about some of the actions 8 9 that they need to take, particularly if we strengthen the laws the way that we want to 10 11 strengthen them? 12 13 implement them.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Obviously, they're still going to have to

So, if you want to just tell as a little bit about what you think their role should be in this, and whether it should be more active, that -- this is the opportunity.

MARCELA MITAYNES: Their role should be to look at all the facts, and act accordingly.

And if they can't, they should be replaced with people that can.

[Applause.]

SENATOR RIVERA: All right.

Thank you, Miss.

Mr. Chairman, I'm good.

1 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Senator Rivera. Thank you for breaking it down. 2 Sometimes, Senator Rivera, it takes it a 3 little longer for him. 4 5 SENATOR RIVERA: Because I'm slower, I'm 6 slow. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. Next up, we have Delsenia Glover of Tenants 8 9 and Neighbors, if you're ready. And then we are going to have a couple of 10 11 tenant -- we're going to have a panel of tenants, 12 various folks. 13 We're going to have Diamond Harding. We're 14 going to have -- forgive me -- Ona Burns, and Martin Kofman, will be the next panel. 15 16 DELSENIA GLOVER: Oh, good afternoon. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Good afternoon. 18 DELSENIA GLOVER: Thank you, Chair Kavanagh, 19 for this opportunity. 20 My name is Delsenia Glover, and I'm the 21 executive director of New York State Tenants and 22 Neighbors Information Service, and New York State 23 Tenants and Neighbors Coalition, which are two affiliate organizations whose mission is to build a 24

powerful and unified statewide organization that

25

empowers and strengthens tenant protections.

We organize in rent-regulated Mitchell-Lama and project-based Section 8 buildings, and the story is all the same.

(Unidentified person approaches witness table and takes a seat next to the witness.)

DELSENIA GLOVER: Low- and moderate-income tenants in New York City are regularly experiencing the pressures of displacement, escalating rents, and in many communities, particularly communities of color, are experiencing displacement and being priced out at a very rapid rate.

For decades, city, state, and federal laws and policies have put landlords' interests and profits above people's ability to stay in their homes.

I am also a rent-stabilized tenant who's been living in my apartment for decades, in a complex in Central Harlem called Lennox Terrace, and I have experienced MCIs since I've been there.

As a matter of fact, I remember, the year that we had an 8 point -- an 8.5 percent increase from the Rent Guidelines Board was the year that I got an MCI which was \$15 per room, which was \$60 in my apartment. And my rent was -- my rent went up

that year 14.5 percent.

So I'm not just an organizer or the leader of an organization, I am a tenant.

I have also been the president of my tenant association or vice president for the past 14 years, now immediate past president, thank the Lord.

So I wanted to come here today to testify before you.

And I'm really happy that, this year, the
Assembly and the Senate of New York State is holding
these hearings around the state.

It's really important to hear from tenants who are actually experiencing these issues.

I lead an organization that is a membership organization, and we have about -- we have over 4,000 dues-paying members.

And I get calls every day from tenants who are experiencing MCIs, and especially from seniors who are scared to death that they're going to be priced out of their homes with the next MCI and they may not be eligible for SCRIE.

So Tenants and Neighbors is calling for the passage of the full Housing Justice For All platform, and anything less is unacceptable, and here's why:

It's pretty common knowledge among the people who are here in this room that rent regulation is the largest source of affordable housing in New York City and across this state.

The laws were strong when they were enacted in 1969 and 1974, but they have been increasingly weakened with loopholes inserted into the laws at the behest of the real estate lobby.

We have lost over 291 units of rent-regulated housing, and including -- that's the wrong number -- in communities of color where income averages are typically half that of the statewide average of \$64,000 a year. This is an emergency.

It is as if it is okay for folks who do the hard work of keeping this city moving, like nurses and teachers and home health-care aides, bartenders, are disposable.

And it is unacceptable that folks are treated this way in this city, in this state.

It's unacceptable.

So my position, and the position of the Housing Justice For All campaign, is that we must pass good-cause eviction and expand ETPA.

Gentrification is not just a New York City issue. It is an issue that is running rampant

across the state.

And we are witnessing a relatively new phenomenon, which is the corporate takeover of small homes all across the state, particularly where there is no rent regulation, followed by tenant harassment, by neglect, and then tenant eviction.

This is greed and callousness.

We pride ourselves on being one of the most progressive, if not the most progressive, state in the country, except for housing.

Look at what the Legislature has done this session; passed piece after piece of progressive legislation, but rent appears to be the most difficult.

Why is that?

I suggest to you that we finally have in New York State three branches of government led by folks who say they are concerned about this issue.

Prove it, by passing these bills, and I'm going to name every one, just in case you haven't heard it.

[Laughter.]

DELSENIA GLOVER: S5040/A7046, to expand ETPA.

Snaps (motions with fingers).

1 S2891/A5030, for good-cause eviction 2 legislation. Snaps (motions with fingers). 3 S2591 and A1198 and S2591 -- oh, I did that 4 twice -- to end vacancy decontrol. 5 SENATOR KAVANAGH: (Inaudible) Rivera; right? 6 7 DELSENIA GLOVER: Yes, what? 8 SENATOR RIVERA: Because I'm not --SENATOR KAVANAGH: Twice for Senator Rivera? 9 10 SENATOR RIVERA: Twice, because I'm not a 11 good -- you know, I can't hear you. 12 DELSENIA GLOVER: Oh, I have no problem with 13 that. 14 [Laughter.] 15 DELSENIA GLOVER: S2591 and A1198, to end 16 vacancy decontrol. 17 S2845 and A4349, to make preferential rents 18 permanent. 19 S185 and A2351, to eliminate the eviction 20 bonus. 21 S3693 and A6322, to end major capital improvements, and, individual apartment 22 improvements, S3770 and A6465. 23 And S299A and A167, to fix rent control. 24 25 Thank you very much for the opportunity to

```
testify.
 1
 2
               Any questions, please?
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.
 3
               Oh, are you part of -- sorry.
 4
               ONA BURNS: No.
 5
 6
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, you --
 7
               ONA BURNS: But I -- it's right in line with
        everything that she just said.
 8
 9
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: But you're for the next
10
        panel, though, sorry?
11
               SENATOR RIVERA: She's just basically saying
12
        "ditto."
13
               MARCELA MITAYNES: She just took over.
14
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.
15
               Any questions, comments?
16
               Okay.
17
               Again, thank you for all your work, and thank
18
        you for coming today.
19
               MARCELA MITAYNES: Thank you.
20
                   [Applause.]
21
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: And so the next panel,
22
        we're going to have Martin Kofman and Ona Burns
23
        and -- forgive me -- Diamond Harding.
24
               And then immediately after that we're going
25
        to have Paimaan Lodhi, if I'm saying that properly,
```

as a separate panel. 1 ONA BURNS: Who's first? 2 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Whichever -- since you're 3 sitting there, you're first. 4 5 ONA BURNS: Okay. SENATOR KAVANAGH: If you could just identify 6 7 yourself for record, and then testify. DELSENIA GLOVER: Right. 8 9 My name is Ona Burns. 10 I'm a rent-stabilized tenant at 215 East 68th Street. 11 12 And I thank you, Committee Members, for so 13 graciously making the preservation of neighborhood 14 affordability and protecting New York's renters a 15 priority. 16 We appreciate your giving us this opportunity 17 to offer support to your efforts to that end. My husband has lived in this building that 18 I mentioned before for approximately 40 of his 19 20 81 years. 21 When we married 25 years ago, we had a brief 22 debate about, his place or mine. 23 I lived in Queens, and he said, "I'm not moving to Queens." 24 25 End of debate.

[Laughter.]

ONA BURNS: At 74, I'm not prepared to move again.

While the nature of the tenancy at the building has changed dramatically, there were few kids and few dogs 25 years ago.

Now the building is teeming with both.

This is a happy circumstance for the landlord.

We love kids and dogs too, but not at a cost of \$200-a-room increase for those of us who have no kids and dogs.

The landlord's using an MCI and a mere \$180,409 for asbestos removal couched under the term "environmental." This was in the computation of their permanent rent-increase justification to replace the exterior brick facade with a long-lasting, maintenance-free terracotta cosmetic ornamental facade.

The replacement of bricks originally used on the facade with terracotta saves the landlord a fortune in annual maintenance costs for the next 50 years, and has facilitated enhancements which help draw young families to the building; i.e., a playground, artificial grass for kids to play on, as

well as an indoor playroom.

With a total of 608 apartments, only

22 percent of the tenants are required to pay nearly

\$57 million outlined in an MCI submitted to the

division of housing and community renewal.

70 percent or more of these rent-stabilized tenants are 65 or older and living on fixed incomes.

This is a blatant form of age discrimination, and the landlord is using it to force undesirable, in guotes, older tenants out of buildings.

It is illegal to discriminate based on age in the workplace.

It should also be illegal to do so in determining where people may rent apartments as well.

In conclusion:

We believe, that while a landlord may reasonably charge tenants for improvements that may directly improve their health risks, such as asbestos removal required by New York State law, it is an outrage for a landlord to improve the facade of his building under the guise of an MCI, and charge only his oldest and most loyal tenants for what are, essentially, cosmetic and ornamental improvements.

1 The total environmental charge of \$180,000 and change would be a more reasonable cost the 2 landlord might seek coverage for than the nearly 3 \$57 million, that total noted as "owner's claim 4 cost" on the MCI rent-increase application. 5 6 A copy of the not -- I attached a copy of the notice to the form. 7 There's a small group of elder tenants that 8 9 stand ready to speak in defense of our appeal to the division of housing and community renewal. 10 11 Unfortunately, many of the others fear 12 reprisals by the landlord. 13 We appreciate your help. Please terminate MCIs. 14 15 [Applause.] 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 17 Sir. 18 MARTIN KOFMAN: Good evening, Senators. 19 SENATOR KRUEGER: Bring the microphone up a 20 little closer. 21 MARTIN KOFMAN: Oh, yes. 22 Good evening, Senators. 23 I would like to speak to you about a little

different subject than we have been discussing till

now, which is the loft law and the compliance

24

25

regulations of the loft law.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Can you just state your name for the record.

MARTIN KOFMAN: My name is Martin Kofman.

I'm the president of American Package

Company, the owner of an IMD building in Greenpoint.

I would like to speak to you about the legalization process under the loft law, and the unrealistic milestones as described in the law.

I registered my building with the loft board on June 1, 2012.

Upon registration, we hired an architect to begin to prepare the plans so that we could get a building permit and do the necessary construction to legalize the building.

We hoped to finally get our construction period -- a construction permit in the next few weeks.

It has taken us seven years to complete the first step in the legalization process for which the loft law provides a six-month compliance deadline.

The architects began the process by surveying the entire building, including all of the tenants' spaces.

In order to do that, we had to make

appointments with all of the 42 tenants, and many tenants made this as difficult as possible.

Tenants did not want us to complete the legalization process.

In many cases, the legalization requires us to reduce the number of rooms in their loft, and reduces the number of roommates or subtenants that can share the space and its cost.

Legalization also increases their rent and requires them to pay for a substantial part of these construction costs.

The tenants prefer to live in illegal and unsafe lofts if it saves them money.

In addition, the process of getting the appropriate approvals for the construction is very time-consuming.

Plans have to be submitted and approved by the DOB, the loft board, and the tenants.

It takes months just to get an appointment with the appropriate DOB examiner.

The law also requires the tenants' approval of the construction plans.

This involves serving the plans on the tenants, scheduling a conference with the tenants and the loft board, and, in some cases, two or

three conferences, and then allowing 45 additional days for additional tenants' comments.

And all of this work is supposed to be completed within six months.

All of this, preparing the plans, getting the approval of the DOB and the loft board, must be done in order for the building to be considered in compliance.

As you can see, we have been diligently pursuing our building permit, and are close to success, but we are not in compliance with the loft-law regulations which are impossible to comply with.

The next step in our process, after obtaining the permit, is to do the actual construction.

We have selected a contractor and prepared a construction schedule which will complete all the necessary reservations with a minimum of disruption to the tenants.

We hope to complete this process in four years.

Once again, in order to be in compliance with the loft law, we would need to complete this construction in 12 months.

The loft law was created to legalize illegal

1 living spaces and to make them safe for the people living in these spaces. 2 This is an admirable goal, but it has to be 3 done realistically. 4 There are many loft buildings that have not 5 6 completed the process in over 30 years. And I am not aware of even one building that 7 has completed the process within the time frame as 8 outlined in the regulations. 9 10 The law needs to be changed to revise the 11 definition of "compliance" so that diligent owners 12 who are trying to do the right thing are not 13 considered non-compliance because of unrealistic 14 expectations. 15 Thank you. 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 17 [Applause.] I just -- we had called earlier, 18 19 Diamond Harding. 20 Is Mr. Harding here? 21 If you want to come up. 22 You can stay, Mr. Kofman. 23 DIAMOND HARDING: Hi, Senators, how you

I'd just like to say, you know, speaking in

24

25

doing?

front of crowds freaks me out, so I may be looking down most of the time, you know.

You know, these are all my own words, but

I have to it write down, 'cause I will come up here

and just blank out and just sit here staring at you

guys, or staring at the floor, or something.

So, anyway, my name is Diamond Harding.

I am a member of the Fifth Avenue Committee, and Stabilizing NYC Citywide Tenant Union.

So I've lived in my apartment at 323 Lincoln Place in Brooklyn for over 30 years, so, since was 11, with my parents, actually.

Let's see.

My landlord right now and management company as related companies, and Simply Better Apartment Homes, they own 70 buildings throughout New York City.

They also are one of the main developers Hudson Yards.

I'm here to talk about why we need the Assembly to end harassment caused by the 20 percent vacancy bonus, and, well, along with most of these other policies that they need passed.

Okay, so like I've said, I've lived there for over 30 years, through some horrible conditions from

the previous landlord.

We -- I mean, from no heat in the wintertime, the family sitting at the dinner table with coats on through the winter. You know, using the bathroom with an open umbrella because the ceiling is leaking.

You know, pre-gentrification, I renovated my apartment myself. It was me, my dad, and my daughter.

My mom had passed away, and my dad took ill, and, you know, I took over and had to take care of him.

So I took out all the permits with the City, I paid for all the permits.

Let's see.

From the original landlord, I wouldn't let him spend a dime because, of course, he would raise the rent uncontrollably if he fixed anything.

So, I had to do it all myself.

So everything was good until he sold the buildings to this new company, and that's when the harassment began.

They tried to buy me out, scare me out, threaten me out, you know, harassing phone calls, letters.

They wouldn't cash my rent checks for sometimes a whole month. They would just -- I mean, like, four months, they would stack them up, and then cash them all together, I guess, you know,

But this went on for some time, until

I actually got an attorney to help me out and send
them letters.

maybe hoping to crash my accounts, I don't know.

So they did this to my neighbors, threatened the neighbors.

Some of my neighbors that I've known since

I was a kid, all my life, they moved out because

they couldn't stand the conditions that they were

living under, they couldn't deal with the harassment

by the new owners.

So when they successfully bullied out my neighbors, they started to renovate those apartments, made them look beautiful, and charged the new tenants thousands of dollars to move in.

They didn't make any repairs to the apartments where, you know, tenants that lived there for their whole entire lives, they didn't touch any of those.

But, of course, they made the other apartments beautiful, and charged them extravagant

amounts of money.

This hurts, because the landlord used these loopholes and lack of protection to raise their rents once they evicted the regulated tenants, which they did.

This gives landlords financial incentive to harasses and evict regulated tenants.

When those -- when the harassments tactics didn't work for the rest of us, the ones that stayed, they started to build around us.

For over a year we lived behind a net, with noise past the hours of the work permits; dust beyond breathable limits; anything they could get away with, until we called the City and had them shut down or forced them to make changes.

And then they would go right back to doing something else.

We had days without heat, without water, without electricity, one thing after the other, until the work was completed.

This work was an illegal addition of a penthouse spanning across four buildings, mine being one of them.

It was shocking to see, after all this time, they built a fifth floor on top of our ceilings.

They never told us what was going on or what they were doing, and we had no idea there was now a fifth floor, until the scaffolding came down.

So now we're still dealing with the effects from this construction, and because it was built without permits, it has major structural issues, which the affects most -- which affects most apartments in the four buildings now, now connected by this fifth-floor penthouse.

My building already has most of the original tenants gone due to the harassment.

We're living with things, like -- we're still -- we're having leaks because of the structural damage caused by this fifth floor; leaks, no water pressure, you know, things of that sort that's still going on now.

I don't want to see anyone else bullied out of their neighborhoods because they can't afford to live in it.

We need the universal rent control to stop the displacement of hard-working people and the elderly, whose families are becoming homeless or having to leave the state.

I myself could have been a victim of this.

I have a great job, but I've only just

returned to work a month now, after having an on-the-job injury that resulted in a bulging disk and a large herniated disk in my lower back.

I was on disability for a year, four months, and two weeks.

I count the time because disability pay is nothing, you know, and I watched my savings dwindle to a scary point. You know, I was afraid at times, because missing a rent at this time is like a death sentence.

I mean, I say it, it sounds harsh, but, you know, that's what it feels like.

You know --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask you to wrap up, and I think we do have a couple questions.

DIAMOND HARDING: -- okay.

So I'm telling you, if my apartment wasn't stabilized, me and my daughter would have been homeless right now, you know.

So, we look to you guys now for help, you know, the lawmakers, politicians, our leaders, that's what you guys are, you know, just please help us to make these changes, to change the system.

The system, it's rewarding landlords who are willing to play the game of harassment.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask you -- we really appreciate your testimony, but we have about 40 more people.

DIAMOND HARDING: Yes, that's good.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So, thank you so much for your testimony.

I'm going to go to the panel.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Krueger.

SENATOR KRUEGER: I just wanted to thank you, Ona, for coming from my district to Brooklyn to testify.

We're very aware of the problems with your building, and it's a disturbing example of how far out of control this MCI situation can get.

And, again, you also highlight what many of us from Manhattan always talk about, that we have large numbers of rent-regulated tenants in our districts.

Brian Kavanagh on the Manhattan side,
Brad Hoylman, myself, and farther north, and they
are, disproportionately, seniors living on fixed
incomes, trying to make sure that they can stay in
their homes and continue to live where they have
lived, as you just said, your husband has lived

there 40 years.

And the most horrible stories that we get in our office every day are seniors from my district being -- describing how they are being priced out or harassed out of the homes they have lived in for so long.

And so you are just another example, I think, representing the disproportionate impact on fixed-income seniors everywhere in the city for our not getting the right laws passed.

So, thank you.

And I have to say, I don't have a loft-tenant scenario in my district. I know some things about it.

But, we've got to be able to make it a system, that when you were trying to do the right thing, that you were actually capable of doing that.

We have to have a system in place that provides the kind of assistance and technical support, to make sure that a landlord who is trying to do the right things under our law can actually meet the time frames we have set up for them.

MARTIN KOFMAN: I agree with you completely.

I think the loft law has got a lot of value to it, but it has some serious faults.

And I am available, at any time, if anyone 1 wants to discuss this with me, I'll be glad to offer 2 my suggestions as to how we can make this law into 3 what it was intended to be. 4 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. 5 Thank you, Brian. 6 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Senator Krueger. 8 9 I would just note, you know, in the interest of time, I will -- you know, perhaps we'll take you 10 11 up on that at some future time. 12 And I also note that we do have -- I wasn't 13 actually expecting to get into this issue on this 14 panel, but we do have a number of people here to 15 testify on the issue of the loft law, and some --16 including many loft tenants, some of who have signed 17 up, and many of whom joined us when they got here, signed up when they got here. 18 So we will -- we will hear more about this 19 20 issue during the course of this hearing. 21 But, any other questions from senators? 22 Okay. 23 Thank you all very much for your testimony.

Thank you.

25 MARTIN KOFMAN: Thank you.

ONA BURNS:

1 [Applause.]
2 SENATOR KAVANAGH: So next up we have
3 Paimaan Lodhi, if I'm saying that properly.
4 A little sound effects.

Perhaps he stepped out of the room, so I'll ask my staff to see if we can determine what's going on.

Thank you for being with us.

If you'd begin by stating your name for the record, and proceed.

PAIMAAN LODHI: Sure.

Okay, got it.

Good afternoon, Senators.

My name is Paimaan Lodhi, senior vice president with the Real Estate Board of New York.

Thank you for taking this time to hear our testimony about the city's housing stock, and to provide our perspective regarding rent-regulated housing in the city of New York.

The stories you've heard today are undoubtedly and truly heartbreaking, and what is needed is responsible rent reform to root out the minority of bad actors in the system.

New York City is a city of renters.

The current rent-regulated system has allowed

for continued capital investment in buildings that have resulted in a historically low dilapidation rate of 0.2 percent citywide.

With 71 percent of the rent-stabilized housing stock built prior to 1947, maintenance and operational costs are expected to rise as these older buildings will require major system overhauls.

Recently, policy leaders and advocates have proposed drastic and sweeping changes to the rent-regulation system without a detailed analysis of the consequences or an appreciation for the interconnectedness of the system.

Changes that severely limit or eliminate necessary streams of revenue will lead to deteriorating housing conditions, discourage the creation of new stabilized housing needed to alleviate the housing crisis, and hurt the households most in need of help.

The real estate industry acknowledges that statutory changes are necessary to increase transparency and better protect tenants from a minority of unscrupulous landlords.

To be clear, we are not calling for the end of the rent-regulated system, as these units serve an important role in providing safe housing to many

New Yorkers.

What is needed is responsible rent reform that protects tenants while maintaining the quality of our housing stock.

Rent collected pays for expenses like taxes, insurance costs, fuel, labor, utilities, and maintenance.

The difference between revenue and expenses is known as "net operating income," and while some have confused NOI for profit, it is important to note that NOI is a measure of a building's ability to meet three criteria: repayment of mortgage or financing costs, reinvestment in the property, and profit.

Today the Rent Guidelines Board is a system ill-equipped to match appropriate rent increases with expense growth.

Over a 20-year period and across multiple mayoral administrations, RGB increases averaged 2 1/2 percent, while expenses for property owners increased more than twice that rate, at 5.5 percent.

This incongruence is a result of a highly-politicized process that relies on a flawed methodology that artificially inflates NOI and arbitrarily reduces expenses.

Data used by the RGB staff to calculate NOI is incomplete, inaccurate, and outdated.

A 27-year-old analysis is used as the basis for adjusting expenses downward 8 percent, and a 35-year-old price index does not account for the costs associated with government mandates, like building facade maintenance, increased elevator inspections, and lead-paint abatement, to name a few.

Additionally, while the RBG studies exclude smaller 1- to 10-unit buildings that account for half of the rent-stabilized buildings, they do include larger builds with at least one rent-stabilized unit.

This approach inevitably captures buildings created through programs like 421a, that include predominantly unregulated units and greatly inflates reported income for rent-stabilized buildings.

Proposed changes to the rent-regulation system contemplate the wholesale elimination of increases beyond those provided for by the Rent Guidelines Board, including MCIs, IAIs, vacancy allowance, preferential rents, and high-rent decontrol.

To better understand the impacts of any

changes to the rent-regulation system, REBNY commissioned the consulting group of HR&A Advisors to develop models based on publicly-available data that could analyze changes to various building typologies that collectively represent 84 percent of the city's housing stock.

The results were startling.

The legislative proposals would dramatically change the economic viability of the operations and maintenance assumptions for apartment buildings across the city.

Within 5 years, approximately 414,000 units could be financially distressed and won't be able to afford any investment beyond basic maintenance, taxes, and utilities.

As NOI decreases across these buildings, the department of finance's property assessments and related tax bills will be adjusted downward.

The potential policy changes to rent stabilization could reduce annual property-tax revenue by up to \$2 billion per year due to steep drops in real estate value, as calculated by an analysis.

Finally, if the proposed funding streams are eliminated, it will place greater pressure on the

Rent Guidelines Board to raise rents approximately 7 1/2 percent annually to make up the difference.

This is not the kind of rent reform that helps tenants or owners.

The New York State Senate has an opportunity to be responsible, to rely on the data presented, and to provide revenue streams that continue for the allowed maintenance of quality housing for millions of New Yorkers.

In terms of responsible reforms, within the construct of the rent stabilization law, the RGB process itself provides an opportunity for needed reform.

It is no secret that this process and historic results are ones that landlords and tenants alike find frustrating.

Serious consideration should be given to moving to a new standard model that inputs various indices for generating RGB increases that can operate independent of political machinations.

The board's determination should be the result of a consistent framework year to year to provide predictability in balancing tenant and owner needs.

There are merits to a formula system that

encompasses the following: CPI and wage growth,
property taxes, unfunded regulatory requirements,
labor, maintenance, insurance, administrative costs,
to name a few.

Public input is an important part of good government, and it should be used to provide data discrepancies, new methodologies, or to highlight sudden shifts in the market.

Regarding enforcement and transparency, REBNY unequivocally supports better enforcement and transparency, and it is critical that DHCR be adequately resourced so that they are equipped to improve data collection and more effectively target bad actors.

A modern computer system that can process digital collection and retention of receipts would dramatically improve recordkeeping.

Additionally, DHCR should release an annual public report on the number of MCIs granted and the number of AI -- IAIs filled --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask you to wrap up, and I think you will have quite a bit more time to talk as people ask some questions.

PAIMAAN LODHI: -- the average cost and type improvement, and the average amount of rent

increase. 1 The current process for self-reporting of 2 3 IAIs can only be improved. SENATOR KAVANAGH: I really do need -- I need 4 5 you to wrap up your testimony. 6 PAIMAAN LODHI: I got you. 7 I really think it's important that we get 8 to --9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I -- I'm sure -- lots of us want to hear from everybody, but we've got, you 10 11 know, another 30 people on the list. SENATOR KRUEGER: Do you have copies that you 12 13 can give to us? 14 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And, again, we'll take --15 PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes, I emailed them. 16 SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- okay, so we have your written testimony as a matter of record. We will be 18 19 reviewing it. 20 And I think -- again, I think this dialogue 21 will continue. 22 But thank you for your testimony. PAIMAAN LODHI: Sure. 23 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I do want to -- have 25 questions?

1 SENATOR RIVERA: Oh, yeah. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator Rivera to begin. 2 SENATOR RIVERA: First of all -- first of 3 all, for the record, and in all honesty, thank you 4 for being here. 5 It definitely takes some guts to come into 6 7 the lion's den, if you will. 8 PAIMAAN LODHI: It's an important issue. 9 SENATOR RIVERA: Now, number one, are MCIs 10 maintenance? 11 PAIMAAN LODHI: I'm sorry? 12 SENATOR RIVERA: "MCIs" are major capital 13 improvements. Are they maintenance? 14 15 Are they --16 PAIMAAN LODHI: No. 17 SENATOR RIVERA: -- no, they're not. PAIMAAN LODHI: I mean, it is important that 18 capital improvements are used in -- are done and --19 20 for buildings, so that buildings can be maintained 21 over the course of time. 22 But, in the context of the rent-regulation 23 system, maintenance itself is considered a separate 24 bucket. 25 SENATOR RIVERA: Okay, so, I just want to

make sure.

So if MCIs are not maintenance, would you acknowledge that -- you know, and we can all -- we can certainly have the conversation of responsible and not responsible landlords, as you made the -- one of the first points that you made was that, any responsible reform should take into account that there are bad actors. Right?

So I want to make sure that we don't attack the good actors.

But would you acknowledge, then, that there is -- there's all words that can be used -- let's just say, a lot of, either your members, good actors and bad actors, that kind of use MCIs for the purpose of maintenance?

PAIMAAN LODHI: Well, so -- so the data has stated that -- for DHCR, that the level of MCI use has been consistent. It's been about 1,000 applications a year.

SENATOR RIVERA: Okay, so I guess what you're saying is, that you wouldn't necessarily acknowledge that you put the responsibility in DHCR?

PAIMAAN LODHI: I'm sorry, I don't follow.

SENATOR RIVERA: Okay, so my question was, right, if MCIs are not maintenance, major capital

improvements are not supposed to be maintenance, you acknowledge that?

PAIMAAN LODHI: It is maintenance in terms of maintaining the quality and the safety of a building. Right?

SENATOR RIVERA: Perhaps I should be more clear.

Is the process of MCIs supposed to be for a building to be maintained to a level where people can live in it with basic things, like heat, hot water, you know, no holes in the walls or ceilings, a working door.

PAIMAAN LODHI: A lot of repair, yeah.

SENATOR RIVERA: Right, stuff like that.

So would you acknowledge, then, that there are many individuals -- there are many landlords, either mom-and-pop or big ones or bad ones, that --

that are using, as opposed to maintaining their buildings, and then having MCIs cover for other things that are not just straight-up maintenance,

Would you agree or disagree with that?

that they are being used for maintenance?

PAIMAAN LODHI: I think there's a disconnect here, because --

SENATOR RIVERA: Certainly there is.

1 All right, moving on, since I know that my 2 question --3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Senator, I'm going to ask people, you know, people have been very respectful 4 and disciplined. 5 I did notice an uptick of allergies and 6 coughing a little bit before. 7 But, if everybody could please allow us to 8 have this dialogue with this witness. 9 10 Proceed, Senator Rivera. 11 SENATOR RIVERA: Yeah, so I just have a 12 couple more. You talked about the dilapidated rate, this 13 14 is -- at the beginning of your testimony. 15 Could you tell me what the definition of 16 "dilapidated rate" is? 17 PAIMAAN LODHI: Sure. It's what the census uses in the Housing and 18 Vacancy Survey to determine whether or not a 19 20 building or a unit is dilapidated. 21 And over the course of the past 20-something 22 years, the city's private housing stock, it's 23 dilapidation rate is at an all-time low. SENATOR RIVERA: Got you. 24 25 So "dilapidation" means, the definition

that's used by the census, I was unaware of it.

So is the definition that's used in the census, I guess, totally unliveable, like a husk of a building, or something?

PAIMAAN LODHI: No.

I mean, it is in poor -- it is in a poor state, but, yeah, that people can live in there.

But it's just, you know, incredible high amount of violations. It is just not a good place to be living in. There could be mold. There could be -- SENATOR RIVERA: Got you.

So let's say, in the last year -- how long have you been working for these folks, for REBNY.

PAIMAAN LODHI: Several years.

SENATOR RIVERA: Several years.

So say, in the last year, the last 12 months, how many apartments have you been in physically that you would consider dilapidated?

I mean, just, actually, how many apartments have you been in that are either owned by your members or that you go to, you know, just to visit, not a social visit, but some, maybe, to kind of look at what the conditions in that building and in that particular apartment are?

PAIMAAN LODHI: You know, my members own and

```
1
        operate several buildings.
               SENATOR RIVERA: You personally, I'm sorry.
 2
               PAIMAAN LODHI: Yeah, and I've been and
 3
        visited several of them.
 4
               SENATOR RIVERA: "Several" of them.
 5
               "Several," dozen?
 6
               "Several," hundred?
7
               "Several," thousand?
 8
9
               PAIMAAN LODHI: You know, it is not --
               SENATOR RIVERA: A bunch.
10
               All right.
11
12
               PAIMAAN LODHI: -- yeah.
13
               SENATOR RIVERA: How many of them have you
14
        seen that would fit that category of "dilapidated"?
15
               PAIMAAN LODHI: None.
16
               SENATOR RIVERA: All right.
17
               I would invite you, by the way, you have an
        invitation to my district, anytime, where I will
18
        take you to five random buildings in my district,
19
20
        and I can guarantee you that I will show you many
21
        dilapidated buildings that -- that that
22
        percentage -- I'm just saying that percentage
23
        doesn't speak to the truth of what I've seen with my
24
        own eyes.
```

PAIMAAN LODHI: Well, no, I mean, so the data

should be clear, and I should be clear, that, in all likelihood, those are not our members whose buildings that you visit.

But there is certainly concentration in -- in areas throughout this city.

And your district could be one in which you have a higher rate of bad actors.

SENATOR RIVERA: Oh, I guarantee you that's the case, sir.

There's actually this -- there were some folks that testified earlier, the Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development, which have this handy table, which kind of shows all sorts of different categories that impact what makes, you know, certain districts unaffordable.

There are -- and there are 12 community boards in The Bronx. Seven of them are in the "red" category, as it relates to threats to affordable housing, and four of them are in my district.

So I can guarantee you that I definitely know that.

I know that my colleagues probably want to jump in in a couple of things.

I just will ask one more question.

The -- it is -- it is -- is it still your

contention, on the record, that should the process of major capital improvements go away, that if we do away with it, that, then, the -- this "dilapidated" score that we talked about is going to skyrocket because it will then become impossible for landlords to be able to maintain their buildings to a liveable state?

Is that still what you're saying on the record?

PAIMAAN LODHI: It's two things.

SENATOR RIVERA: Okay?

PAIMAAN LODHI: Not only would the dilapidation rate -- you can anticipate the dilapidation rate to go -- to increase, but, you know, as part of the entire rent-regulation system, Rent Guidelines Board sets their annual increases based on the fact that they understand that there are other tools out there for property owners to use; MCIs, IAIs.

If those tools go away -- so you have 1,000 MCI applications a year, which there are, just to put this in perspective, over 900,000 rent-regulated housing units throughout the city.

If those -- if those MCIs go away,

Rent Guidelines Board has to increase rents to make

up for that delta, to recognize the fact that the MCI -- MCI tool is no longer there.

Rent Guidelines Board increases impacts the entire universe of rent-stabilized housing stock.

So you're talking about rent increases on the entire housing stock versus the small percentage that apply for MCIs.

SENATOR RIVERA: Thank you for being here.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

And just before we get to the -- we'll have some additional questions, but just to mention the next panel, it will be Nakeeb Siddique and Esther Diaz and Gisela Matza.

But next up, I think Senator Krueger has some questions.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.

So I don't know if you were here earlier when ANHD was testifying, but the testimony involved the statement that, sort of historical documentation is, that if you buy your building for 10 or 11 times the annual rent rolls, that you can, in fact, you know, continue to operate, make a profit, leave your tenants in place.

But, that we have seen a skyrocketing over the last, I believe it was 20 years, maybe was it

just a decade, of people suddenly buying buildings 1 for 20 and 30 times the rent rolls. 2 3 Does REBNY keep data on the purchase price of buildings vis-a-vis a percentage of the rent rolls? 4 PAIMAAN LODHI: We don't. 5 SENATOR KRUEGER: You don't. 6 7 Do you agree that that has been happening, that the underlying price of buildings has been 8 skyrocketing far faster than the rent rolls could 9 possibly keep up with? 10 11 PAIMAAN LODHI: I agree that there are bad 12 actors in the system which, you know, take into --13 that do the predatory equity, and they have every 14 intention to game the system and do exactly what you 15 say, which is to purchase a building at 20, 30 times

But I think that they are the minority.

SENATOR KRUEGER: So when I am paying back an MCI or an IAI as a increase in my annual rent, inflation adjusted year after year, technically, I'm sort of becoming a partial owner of the building.

Should I get stock?

[Applause.]

the rent roll.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PAIMAAN LODHI: What was...

SENATOR KRUEGER: I'm sorry, I didn't hear

1 your answer. 2 PAIMAAN LODHI: No. SENATOR KRUEGER: No? 3 PAIMAAN LODHI: No. 4 SENATOR KRUEGER: Why? 5 6 I mean, it's not just -- I'm not just paying 7 the rent. I'm increasing the dollar value of the underlying building that will eventually be sold or 8 held by the landlord, based on their determination 9 that it's a great investment, or they could sell it 10 11 and move on and do something else with their money. 12 So, if this was -- if this was a company that 13 sold stock, I would get stock. 14 But in this case --15 PAIMAAN LODHI: No, you're also paying for 16 the continued maintenance of the building. That's 17 what you're paying for, that's what your rent goes 18 to. 19 SENATOR KRUEGER: So that sort of goes to --20 SENATOR RIVERA: So it is maintenance. 21 (Claps hands.) Thank you. 22 (Indiscernible cross-talking.) 23 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- so it's maintenance of 24 the --25 SENATOR RIVERA: It is maintenance.

1 Got you. 2 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- thank you. SENATOR RIVERA: You all think it's 3 maintenance. 4 5 Got you, got you, got you. 6 (Indiscernible.) 7 SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay, sorry. Do you -- you're familiar with weatherization 8 9 programs for redoing windows, and, actually, sometimes they do building -- you know, siding of 10 11 building, and other things, to keep -- to ensure 12 that the building is more energy-efficient. 13 Do you think that I should able to get an MCI 14 for the same work that I got weatherization funds 15 for? 16 PAIMAAN LODHI: I don't know to what extent 17 the weatherization program is being used, so I can't really answer that question. 18 19 SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay. 20 You know what the J-51 program is? PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes. 21 22 SENATOR KRUEGER: Do you think I should be 23 able to get MCIs and IAIs if I'm drawing down J-51s for the same the work in the same buildings? 24

PAIMAAN LODHI: Well, again, I think you need

to find ways in which, you know, an owner can 1 2 reinvest in the property. 3 SENATOR KRUEGER: But do you see those double-dipping on multiple programs to get --4 PAIMAAN LODHI: No. 5 6 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- my costs reimbursed? PAIMAAN LODHI: No. 7 SENATOR KRUEGER: Do you do any research on 8 that at REBNY to see how often that happens? 9 PAIMAAN LODHI: No. 10 11 SENATOR KRUEGER: Senator Zellnor. 12 Thank you. 13 SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you very much, 14 Senator Krueger. 15 The Chair has stepped out for a moment and 16 has asked me to temporarily chair, but I'm going to 17 ask the questions that I would have been recognized 18 for. 19 So, firstly, thank you for coming to -- to --20 to testify. 21 I know that it is not an easy thing, 22 particularly with some of the views that you guys hold. 23 24 So, I appreciate you coming. 25 I have a comment, and then a question.

1 I noticed during your testimony, I'm a fan of the English language, there were -- there was an 2 alliteration with words that begin with "D." 3 You used the words "drastic"; 4 You used the word "deterioration"; 5 6 You used the word "discouragement"; 7 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Dilapidated. 8 SENATOR MYRIE: You used the word "dilapidated"; 9 10 And you used the word "dramatic." 11 And I want to use those words to explain how 12 the tenants feel right now. 13 So you said we have -- we have --14 [Applause.] 15 SENATOR MYRIE: And if we could hold the 16 applause, thank you. 17 -- you said, "We are seeking to make drastic 18 and sweeping changes." 19 And of course we are, because we are facing a 20 drastic and sweeping affordability crisis. 21 You mentioned the deterioration of our 22 buildings. 23 And of course we're facing deterioration because there has been an increase in the violations 24 25 in those very buildings.

1 You said -- you used the word "dramatically."

Well, we are facing a dramatic increase in evictions.

Two decades ago --

PAIMAAN LODHI: That's not true.

SENATOR MYRIE: -- the eviction --

PAIMAAN LODHI: That's not true.

The citywide eviction rate is the lowest it's ever been.

SENATOR MYRIE: So if you could let me -- so if -- if you could -- if you could only respond when I ask a question.

You used the word "dramatically."

And we are facing a dramatic increase in evictions.

And you used the word "discouragement."

And of course people are discouraged, not only from living in their communities because they are priced out, but I'm going to add a fifth "D," that we are "displaced" because of this price increase.

So my question to you is: If the NOI has increased over the past 13 years straight, and you contend that not all of that goes to profit, and that some of it goes to paying the mortgage and some

of it goes to reinvestment, if we eliminate MCIs and we eliminate IAIs, and it's still going up, could you bring down the profit and bring up the reinvestment?

PAIMAAN LODHI: So, Senator, to your question, yes, New York City has an affordability crisis.

The biggest driver for rent is the increase in property taxes.

New York City has, quite possibly, the most inequitable and racist property-tax structure in the country.

A family renting an apartment in Crown Heights pays more in its property taxes than two townhouses in Park Slope.

Okay?

What most renters do not understand is that a third of your rent goes towards property taxes.

And over the -- and since 2009, property taxes have increased by more than double.

It's -- this is a tax policy that is not aligned with values that all New Yorkers should support, which is the production of rental housing.

The affordability crisis is also compounded by the fact that there is not enough housing

production going on citywide.

To meet population growth by 2030, the City needs to produce 400,000 units of housing, which is, roughly, the size of Staten Island, just to maintain what's needed for population growth.

That delta, that lack of production, is

the -- along with property taxes, is the biggest

driver in the affordability crisis for housing.

SENATOR MYRIE: So if I may, because I'm not sure my question was answered.

And I don't disagree that our property taxes need to be reformed, and that there are racist elements to it.

I represent both of those neighborhoods,
Crown Heights and Park Slope, and I'm very
empathetic to my constituents who are being
oppressed by this tax system.

But my question directly pertains to NOI and the increase over the past 13 years.

The response has always been, well, that increase doesn't always go to profit. We have to split that in three buckets.

My question is:

If you -- if we eliminate MCIs and IAIs, we are told that there will be no more investment.

I want to know, that is that because you 1 2 don't want to give up profit? That is the question. 3 PAIMAAN LODHI: So I think what you're 4 referencing, the 13-year increase as the NOI 5 6 increase, as reported by the Rent Guidelines Board. 7 Again, it's really important to state, NOI is not a substitute for profit. 8 9 So, NOI can increase without profit margins increasing. Right? 10 11 So --SENATOR MYRIE: So are you contending that 12 13 profits have not gone up over the past 13 years? 14 PAIMAAN LODHI: I would argue that they have 15 stayed consistent. 16 SENATOR MYRIE: Okay. 17 Do you have any data to back up that 18 assertion? 19 PAIMAAN LODHI: I mean, the fact that the 20 NOI, as reported by the Rent Guidelines Board, has, 21 actually, this past year, remained consistent, 22 states to me that it's not increasing. 23 SENATOR MYRIE: Okay, and so -- and I'm going 24 to -- after this question, I just want to make

REBNY's position clear, that over the past 13 years,

profits by property owners has remained stagnant?

PAIMAAN LODHI: I think, across the board, you can't paint a picture like that.

The city's housing stock is incredibly diverse, both by -- I mean, by age, geography, and size, and by owner.

SENATOR MYRIE: So I'm specifically referring to rent-regulated properties.

Is it REBNY's position that property owners that own rent-regulated properties have not seen their profits go up over the past 13 years?

PAIMAAN LODHI: I guess some have, but

I would say that it's stayed consistent throughout
the system, given the data that disputes it
otherwise.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

Next up we're going to have Senator Salazar.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Thank you.

I -- remarkably, I think that we may actually agree about something, based on one of your responses to Senator Myrie's question, that -- that the very wealthy need to pay their fair share of taxes, including higher property taxes than working-class New Yorkers.

But my question is: Is -- in your opinion,

why should tenants who -- tenants, who didn't have the capital or ability, nor make the decision in the first place, to buy a property, why should those tenants -- tenants need to bear the financial responsibility of repairing the property owner's building for the property owner?

PAIMAAN LODHI: The current rent-regulated system that's in place takes into account various factors, which include property taxes, maintenance costs, labor, fuel.

These are costs that are borne by the property owners, and, you know, property owners own and operate businesses. It's private housing stock.

In order to get financed, you have to prove to the banks that you can make a profit.

And unless a property owner -- I don't know how a property owner could go to a bank and say, I'm going to take \$200,000 out of my own pocket to pay for facade improvements.

It's, like, it's not a viable financing option.

SENATOR SALAZAR: It's your opinion that it should come from the pockets of the tenants instead?

PAIMAAN LODHI: No, it's a shared system.

[Laughter.]

Yes.

SENATOR SALAZAR:

Okay.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Let's get through -everybody will have an opportunity to express their
point of view, but let's let this dialogue continue.

SENATOR SALAZAR: So 20,000 tenants were evicted last year in 2018 in New York City alone.

Is it your opinion that tenants should have to face eviction if they cannot pay for a major capital improvement-induced represent increase?

PAIMAAN LODHI: No, I think that that's making the prime case as to why rent subsidy is critical.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Okay.

I mean, just my final question is: Is -- is it then your opinion that rent subsidies, presumably coming from the City or the State, or from tax subsidies, so, from the public, from taxpayers, that the burden of repairing property-owners' buildings should be from that source rather than the property owner?

PAIMAAN LODHI: I think keeping families off the street and out of homeless shelters is a public good that the public should bear the responsibility for.

1 Okay, but -- okay. 2 Thank you. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Again, please, let's continue. 4 I'm going to -- I have a few questions, but 5 6 I think Senator Krueger has a follow-up, first. 7 SENATOR KRUEGER: So you reference in a number of your answers, sort of on behalf of REBNY 8 9 owners, so -- but you don't have any data. So how many rent-regulated units are 10 11 represented by REBNY owners; do you know? 12 PAIMAAN LODHI: I'd have to get back to you 13 on that. 14 SENATOR KRUEGER: So you don't know that. 15 Because -- because I'll accept that maybe 16 there's one universe of people who are REBNY 17 members, and they run terrific buildings and follow all the rules, and don't, you know, overinflate all 18 19 their costs. 20 And then there's that other world that is not 21 REBNY owners, that -- where everything we're seeing 22 happening is happening. 23 But I sort of don't think that's probably 24 true.

But I actually think it's pretty important,

```
if REBNY's going to --
 1
               PAIMAAN LODHI: What part's not true?
 2
               SENATOR KRUEGER: -- if REBNY's going to
 3
        represent these things aren't true in REBNY members'
 4
        buildings --
 5
 6
               PAIMAAN LODHI: What part's not true?
 7
               SENATOR KRUEGER: -- I think you need to
        prove it.
 8
 9
               Dilapidation.
10
               PAIMAAN LODHI: Right.
11
               SENATOR KRUEGER: Abuse of --
12
               PAIMAAN LODHI: So they're not --
13
               SENATOR KRUEGER: -- MCIs that are
        double-dipping (indiscernible) --
14
15
               PAIMAAN LODHI: -- so there are over
16
        900,000 rent-stabilized units throughout the city.
17
               SENATOR KRUEGER: Yep.
               PAIMAAN LODHI: I wouldn't -- I would guess
18
19
        that REBNY members do not operate more than
20
        50 percent of those.
21
               I mean, it's an incredibly high number.
22
               SENATOR RIVERA: But you don't have the data,
23
        though?
24
               PAIMAAN LODHI: Right, no.
25
               SENATOR KRUEGER: Can you get it?
```

1 SENATOR RIVERA: Okay. 2 SENATOR KRUEGER: No, I mean, I'm 3 (indiscernible) being serious about, are -- I've asked a series of questions based on data. 4 5 Are you able to go back to REBNY and get that 6 data for us? 7 PAIMAAN LODHI: I could try -- yeah, I could 8 try. 9 SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay. 10 Thank you. 11 PAIMAAN LODHI: I mean, I will go back, 12 I will try to produce an answer for you. 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: You'll definitely go back 14 and try to get an answer. 15 Thank you. 16 Just -- so just a couple of my questions are 17 follow up with this dialogue we've already begun. 18 But you -- so in your dialogue with 19 Senator Myrie, I just want to make sure 20 I understood, and I think he seemed a little 21 perplexed, and I think I am as well. 22 You're -- so you have presented us quite a 23 bit of data, you know, during your testimony, and 24 also, you know, in your advocacy, in talking about

what you want to -- what you might want to see in

this rent-law renewal.

A lot of data about the net operating income of buildings, and then RGB increases, and how they vary -- how each of them has varied over time.

Can you just -- I mean, just, let's begin, can you just talk a little bit more about that analysis?

PAIMAAN LODHI: So the Rent Guidelines Board, when they're doing their calculations, they try to assess what the price index and the costs are for the rent-regulated housing stock throughout the city.

What they do not do is count those buildings that are under 10 units, which represent 50 percent of the rent-stabilized buildings throughout the city.

Those buildings that are under 10 units presumably have much lower NOIs as opposed to the larger, blended 80/20 buildings in Manhattan, net operating income.

And so what RGB data does, through its flawed methodology, is skew NOI much higher than what it actually is, and doesn't account for operating expenses and costs, and not net operating income, for the smaller buildings which are, predominantly,

251 completely rent-stabilized, and in the boroughs 1 outside of Manhattan, predominantly. 2 SENATOR KAVANAGH: So can you provide -- so 3 what you're suggesting is that, to the extent we 4 were to reform these laws, it would have a greater 5 impact on smaller buildings? 6 PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: But a greater adverse 8 9 impact on landlords of smaller buildings? 10 PAIMAAN LODHI: For sure. 11 Okay. 12 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And among your -- you say 13 you don't -- again, I'm -- I join other members of 14 this panel on being surprised that you don't have a 15 good sense of how many rent-regulated units your 16 members are managing and owning. 17 But is it fair to say that --PAIMAAN LODHI: Granted, it's the data point 18 19 that I just take from this, that we have to get 20 better at. 21 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- ah, we got it. 22 But is it fair to say that your members,

generally speaking, are owning larger buildings

PAIMAAN LODHI: Larger buildings?

rather than smaller buildings?

23

24

I mean, it's a mix, right, because their portfolios include ownership, partnerships in which they have a minority stake in, you know, another portfolio of buildings.

So I would say that they're impacted across the board.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Are most of the large owners of rent-stabilized real estate members of REBNY?

PAIMAAN LODHI: I'm sorry, repeat that?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Are most of the larger

owners of rent-stabilized real estate in New York

City members of REBNY?

PAIMAAN LODHI: I would say that -- I don't know. I don't know.

I would -- I know that our owners manage and build and operate large buildings which have a blend of stabilized units and market rate.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So to the extent that you are asserting to us today that it is the smaller buildings and the owners of the smaller buildings that will suffer more greatly were we to pass the many bills that people have been discussing today, are you suggesting that we ought to take greater pains to protect the income and the ability of

smaller landlords to cover their costs, compared to the larger owners that are your -- that tend to be your members?

PAIMAAN LODHI: The smaller-building property own -- the smaller property owners will undoubtedly be hurt worse by these changes.

But I think it's also important to note that it's not just going to be the rent-stabilized housing stock that's impacted.

The potential \$2 billion annual property-tax loss that would result from these changes, if all these changes were to go through, would shift the share of \$2 billion onto co-ops and condos throughout the city as well.

So, in effect --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: How would it do that?

PAIMAAN LODHI: Because of our city's property-tax system, in which co-ops and condos are in the same class as rentals.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: How would it shift the tax --

PAIMAAN LODHI: Because if NOI goes down for property taxes, property-tax value goes down.

And unless the City decides that it's going to collect \$2 billion less in revenue a year --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Right, so that's --1 PAIMAAN LODHI: -- it would shift the burden 2 3 onto co-ops and condos --4 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- so your point -- your 5 point is that the City might choose to shift this tax burden to some other folks. 6 7 There's nothing --PAIMAAN LODHI: No, it's two choices. 8 Either you collect \$2 billion less in revenue 9 and have 20,000 less teachers and police officers, 10 11 or you shift the burden --12 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Forgive me, please. 13 Or you raise the income tax, or you have a 14 personal income tax surcharge --15 PAIMAAN LODHI: -- no, because the tax 16 levies -- the levy would stay the same, so that you would then -- you would shift it over --17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Right, I just -- let me --18 I don't want to -- I don't want to be argumentive 19 20 here. I just want to understand. 21 What you're saying is, that if the value of 22 residential real estate does not go up as rapidly as 23 it has in recent years, that --24 PAIMAAN LODHI: No, I'm saying, if property

25

values go down.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- if property values go down or fail to go up as rapidly as they have in 2 recent years, that that has a negative impact on the 3 City's ability to collect taxes from those 4 5 properties because property -- because taxes are 6 related to property values? PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 8 9 You're not -- there's nothing about that scenario that somehow automatically shifts that tax 10 11 burden to co-op and condos. Right? 12 That would be a -- if the City were to lose 13 revenue, that would be a policy choice of the state 14 Legislature and the city council, and others, what 15 to do about that. 16 Is that -- I mean, that's a fair statement; 17 right? 18 PAIMAAN LODHI: I mean -- yes. 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 20 SENATOR KRUEGER: I have to jump in 21 (inaudible). 22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Apparently, 23 Senator Krueger can't wait to ask a question. But if --24 25 SENATOR RIVERA: She's the Finance Chair.

1

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- and she is the Chair of the Finance, which means she knows more about finance that I.

So do you want to jump in now? Or -
SENATOR KRUEGER: Well, I just want to point

out that, because we've already actually agreed,

I think, the panel in front of you and you, and most

of the people in the audience, that New York City's

assessment system for property taxes is so

fundamentally flawed and messed up, I don't even

think you can, with a straight a face, make the

argument, if a value of some given building goes

down because landlords --

PAIMAAN LODHI: No, 'cause --

SENATOR KRUEGER: -- don't invest as much in their buildings, because of something we change about rent regulation, that that will lose us \$2 billion in property taxes.

PAIMAAN LODHI: No, so the -- what our analysis shows is that the net operating income for the rent-regulated housing stock would go down across the board, about, like, 20 percent.

Income -- properties are assessed based on
income and expense.

And so, when NOI goes down, values of these

buildings go down, and, therefore, the property tax 1 2 generated goes down. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Do --3 SENATOR KRUEGER: No, I have a follow-up. 4 5 Sorry. I'm -- I know, he's going to kill me. 6 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: I think I had the floor, but I'll yield it again. 8 9 SENATOR KRUEGER: I find it really interesting that you could do that analysis, when 10 11 you can't answer questions about the rent-regulated 12 housing stock. 13 So, at Assembly hearings we learned from the 14 City and the State, that 80 percent-plus of 15 rent-regulated units are in buildings of eleven or 16 larger. 17 So it's not a 50/50 story. And, actually, the DHCR commissioner at the 18 19 same Assembly hearing testified that the median size 20 of a building with rent-regulated units is fifteen, 21 radically larger than what you're projecting. 22 So I don't --23 PAIMAAN LODHI: There's --24 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- I don't think you 25 have --

PAIMAAN LODHI: -- there are 16,000 buildings that are not accounted for in Rent Guidelines Board methodology. 50 percent of the buildings are not accounted for.

That's not a valid method to value income and expense.

SENATOR KRUEGER: But you're not even prepared to offer legitimate data about what universe we're talking about.

I don't think it's acceptable to say, you did analysis and you have the numbers, that we would lose this much in property taxes, which, of course, that would be a City decision, whether they change their assessment formula, whether they went to other tax realities, whether they increased the taxes on the higher-rent buildings.

PAIMAAN LODHI: That might be a City decision, but that is a State -- that is a State change that would impact the city's properties.

SENATOR KRUEGER: You're right, these are State changes that impact city properties.

And, again, I don't want to speak for the City --

PAIMAAN LODHI: And City's property-tax revenue.

And so, you know --1 2 SENATOR KRUEGER: -- but the city leadership --3 PAIMAAN LODHI: -- this idea that the 4 5 changes --6 SENATOR RIVERA: You want to not interrupt, 7 bro. SENATOR KRUEGER: No, no, it's okay. 8 9 City leadership has come to Albany and said, We need to make these changes. 10 11 So I'm actually not sure that we're in 12 conflict with what the City of New York wants for itself either. 13 14 Now I'll stop being rude. 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And not rude at all. 16 And thank you, Senator Krueger. 17 Just -- so -- I mean, I would just note that 18 the rent-regulation system is a -- is subject to home rule, so it is the City of New York that adopts 19 20 rent-regulation, pursuant to authorization by the 21 State. 22 So, you know, this is not -- this is not what 23 sometimes people like to call an "unfunded mandate." 24 Just a few more questions. 25 Just -- since we got into this question of,

you know, forgone tax revenue being a big problem, in your view, with reforming the rent laws, do you have any sense of how much revenue the City forgoes through the 421a program and other programs that give tax exemptions to developers?

PAIMAAN LODHI: Yeah, so I think what you're getting at is the -- the need for 421a.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm just asking a question, actually.

PAIMAAN LODHI: No --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Do you have a sense of the amount of revenue the City forgoes for -- in 421a?

And, again, perhaps you're not prepared to answer that today.

But, do you have -- do you have --

PAIMAAN LODHI: So I think the last estimate was \$1 billion.

But I think it's most important to note that 421a now is currently constructed with the Affordable New York Program, is an affordable housing program, and it is -- it is a direct result -- the need for the 421a program is the direct result of our inequitable property-tax system in which, you know, it's impossible to build rental housing without a property-tax abatement.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So these are -- and just so we understand, I think some people in the room may, and some may not, but this is a -- this is a full decades-long abatement of taxes for new developers of buildings that are largely market rate, and, often, very high-end buildings.

Is that a fair summary?

PAIMAAN LODHI: So 421a is a tool in which it allows for affordable units, lower-income units, to be built in higher-income neighborhoods.

It is one of the biggest tools for economic integration, and it can produce affordable housing at scale like no other program can.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: But just the same -- the same analysis applies, if we were to think that it were beneficial to change the rent laws, as we're talking about today, and that we were to forgo some tax revenues, that we might also think that it would be beneficial to stop forgoing so much tax revenue through 421a, and similar programs, and offset a lot of the lost revenue that you assert we will have in repealing the rent law?

PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes, except, you know, rent-regulated housing is not affordable. By it's definition, it is not income-restricted. Affordable

1 New York is. SENATOR KAVANAGH: What's the median rent in 2 3 rent-stabilized apartments in New York? SENATOR RIVERA: I'm sure these folks could 4 5 tell you. 6 (Indiscernible.) 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Just one senator and one witness at a time, please. 8 9 Thank you. PAIMAAN LODHI: I can get you the data, but, 10 I mean, I think it includes -- it still includes 11 12 rents that are over 2700. 13 And I can tell you that there are units that 14 are in rent stabilization that are in excess of 15 \$5,000 a unit. 16 Those are not affordable. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And those are mostly because of some illegal deregulations that were then 18 19 undone --20 PAIMAAN LODHI: No --21 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- by -- by -- by 22 a -- by a large -- by a large company that was a member of REBNY at the time. 23 24 PAIMAAN LODHI: That's not true. 25 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Forgive me, but

Tishman Speyer was a member of REBNY when they 1 2 purchased --PAIMAAN LODHI: Tishman Speyer is a member of 3 4 REBNY. 5 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- yes, and they purchased 6 Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village? PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes. 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And they purchased it with 8 9 the explicit intention, stated publicly, of creating 10 an iconic market-rate luxury community in the middle 11 of Manhattan? 12 PAIMAAN LODHI: Okay. 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And they -- the way one would do that would be to remove the 14 15 28,000 residents of Staten -- of Stuy Town and 16 Peter Cooper from their homes, the great majority 17 whom were not --18 PAIMAAN LODHI: But you said illegally 19 deregulate? 20 SENATOR RIVERA: Yeah, which is what he is 21 describing --SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, (indiscernible) --22 23 okay, so I think we -- sounds like we have a general understanding of the same facts. 24 25 -- illegally, because the court -- the

highest court in the state ruled that those deregulations were a violation of black letter law, and, nonetheless, the landlord continues to benefit from the multiple rent increases that were took while they were deregulated, contrary to law.

I don't want to -- that's not a question, so
I -- forgive me.

Just back to the question of profit and loss:

So you have data on -- that you have presented on the net operating income, and the Rent Guidelines Board increases and how those compare.

Is it your testimony that you do not have an ability to estimate the profits of rent-stabilized landlords in recent years, if somebody were to come to you --

PAIMAAN LODHI: Across the board, correct.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- if somebody were to come to you, say, a large developer or a large landlord, or somebody who wanted to get into the rent-stabilized housing market in New York, and they were to ask you, "How do I know that it is profitable to be a rent-stabilized landlord in New York?" REBNY's answer would be that sort of thing, just can't be estimated?

PAIMAAN LODHI: No, I think that, you know, it's a case-by-case basis in which, you know, someone -- a perspective buyer would go to a bank, look at rent-roll information, and assume a proforma that's based on what the industry standard is.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, but, again, you're -- you -- net operating income, and many other things, are also on a case-by-case basis.

Obviously, buildings vary, profits vary, operating income varies, maintenance expenses vary; but yet, you know, again, you are making assertions about the house -- the rent-regulated housing stock as a whole, with respect to net operating income, and a very specific assertion that the rent increases are not keeping up with net operating income.

But you can't make any assert -- you can't -- we -- we can't conclude anything, and your organization can't conclude anything, about profit.

It's just perplexing to us, I think.

The -- let's talk about net operating income versus RGB increases.

The -- the full rent of an apartment, and you certainly understand real estate finance better than we -- perhaps, our Finance Chair understands it

1 better that I do, but, the -- if I'm paying rent on an apartment, the full rent, every dollar of my 2 3 rent, is going to cover the net operating income of the building? 4 PAIMAAN LODHI: It should, for that unit, 5 right, if you take it per-unit basis. 6 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. So -- and in a building as a whole --8 PAIMAAN LODHI: No, it should cover expenses. 9 Net operating income is the delta between 10 11 income and expense. SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm sorry, forgive me. 12 13 Right. 14 It goes -- it -- it -- it goes 15 toward -- so you're -- you're looking at the overall 16 expenses of a building, including -- when you talk 17 about net operating income, it is the amount of 18 money above the expenses of the building, is that 19 right, that's why it's "net"? 20 PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes, the delta between the 21 revenue collected and the expenses. 22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And I'm going to suggest 23 to you, and a "delta" is a --PAIMAAN LODHI: The difference. 24

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- it's the difference

25

```
between one number and another number?
 1
 2
               PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes, correct.
 3
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.
               So the net operating income includes, what?
 4
               PAIMAAN LODHI: I'm sorry?
 5
 6
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: What ele -- what are the
        elements of -- it includes --
 7
 8
               PAIMAAN LODHI: So net operating income is
 9
        generally used for three purposes, which is,
10
        repayment of debt --
11
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Just -- just -- yeah,
12
        okay, sorry. Go ahead.
13
               PAIMAAN LODHI: -- reinvestment in the
14
        property, and profit.
15
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm asking -- I'm
16
        asking -- I'm asking, before we get to that, the
17
        elements of net op.
               So it is the amount of -- it is -- it is the
18
        amount of -- the total amount of income received
19
20
        from the rent roll, minus certain things that are
21
        expenditures?
22
               PAIMAAN LODHI: Roughly speaking, yes.
23
               Yeah.
24
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, so -- and it is
25
        minus taxes?
```

1 PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes. SENATOR KAVANAGH: And minus maintenance 2 expenses of the building? 3 PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes. 4 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And minus any staff costs? 5 PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes. 6 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And minus any debt service on the building? 8 PAIMAAN LODHI: No. 9 10 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, so it does not include debt service? 11 12 PAIMAAN LODHI: It does not. 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: It's just the basic cost of running the building irrespective of any money 14 15 that may have been borrowed? 16 PAIMAAN LODHI: Correct. 17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. And we've had some opportunities to have 18 19 these conversations, but I just want to make sure, 20 for the record, we're clear. 21 If -- so now I'm trying to understand the 22 comparison. 23 When you were comparing increases in -- the RGB increases, which are increases in the total 24 25 amount of rent that gets collected; right?

1 Like -- sorry.

In the -- it is the -- the RGB increase is an increase in the total amount of rent that may be collected, the legal amount of rent that may be collected, on that building?

PAIMAAN LODHI: The RGB increases annually?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes.

PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes, it's the baseline rent increases for the entire rent-stabilized housing stock.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Right.

So, whereas net operating income is the amount of money that is left over after all the incomes have been -- after all of the expenditures have been made?

PAIMAAN LODHI: Minus --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: So, effectively --

PAIMAAN LODHI: -- not including debt.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- so it's sort of what we would think of as profit, except, that we understand that there may be some other things, like debt service, that are impeding the profit on the building?

PAIMAAN LODHI: Profit is one of three components of NOI.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Right.

So why should NOI go up -- why is it a problem -- sorry, let me ask it differently.

At what point does it become a problem if the rent -- the legal rent increase doesn't go up as rapidly as NOI, as you assert?

I mean, isn't -- isn't part of NOI going up, the profit on buildings increasing over time?

PAIMAAN LODHI: No.

So, NOI is -- there can -- there are various factors as to why NOI can increase over time.

If you purchase a building, or if -- if the purchase price is high, land-acquisition cost is high, like, that mortgage and that financing cost is not accounted for in your NOI.

But, the total rent, which might be high in that case, reflect -- and the expenses, though, remain relatively modest, right, regardless of acquisition costs, that NOI can increase, but profit margin can stay the same, if not go down, go up.

There is no correlation there.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: But the profit is -- the profit mar -- the NOI has three components. It's profit, debt service, and --

PAIMAAN LODHI: It's primarily debt service.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- payment to prin --1 payment to principal, interest, and profit? 2 PAIMAAN LODHI: And reinvestment in the 3 4 property. SENATOR KAVANAGH: And reinvestment in the 5 6 property, okay, including what we might think of as 7 capital improvements? PAIMAAN LODHI: Correct. 8 9 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 10 And I appreciate people's patience with our 11 economics seminar up here. 12 I want to shift gears a little bit, and then 13 I have -- may have a couple more senator questions. 14 Just -- you asserted in your testimony that 15 there are certain changes that would be acceptable, 16 you recognize there's a crisis, you recognize that 17 some, you know, tightening up of the enforcement. 18 I would note your organization has lobbied 19 against recognizing the tenant-protection unit in 20 prior years. 21 And for the first time, this year, the tenant-protection unit is included in the state 22 23 budget, because the Senate changed and was willing

And we talked about this before, but we added

24

25

to permit that.

money to HCR, to the office of rent administration and the tenant-protection unit, so they can hire 94 new people to administer the laws.

And that is -- those are things that REBNY has formally opposed in the past.

But it's good to hear that, you know, we want to look at regulation this year, at sort of reform and enforcing the rules this year.

And we've had conversations about that, and we appreciate that, and sincerely.

My question is: Are there aspects of this system that relate to the dollars and cents of this program that REBNY would be willing to accept reforming?

PAIMAAN LODHI: Yes.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, can you -- can you talk -- can you talk a little bit about those?

PAIMAAN LODHI: I can't expand on that because I don't know what framework we're dealing with.

So, you know, the system is incredibly interconnected.

So if -- you know, if Rent Guidelines Board goes to a formula-based system that is more consistent and transparent, you would have less

impact on the other levers. Right?

But if -- if one of the other levers are changed, right, it impacts one of the others.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And I just, with great respect, I respect that you're in a difficult position here.

But I'm just asking, as of today, which is 29 days before these laws expire and need to be renewed, and as your organization has acknowledged, there are likely to be very substantial change in this, talking about changes in the levers, are there changes -- are there particular ways we might reform the "levers," as you call them, that relate to the incentives of landlords to engage in some of the behavior we've heard about today, that REBNY would be willing to discuss?

Because we've heard a great deal about the problem from REBNY's perspective, and the difficulty that reform or repeal of these provisions will, you know, inflict upon our landlords.

We have not, at this point, heard much by way of what REBNY might be willing to accept.

And I know, you know, there will be other opportunities to do that, perhaps, but time is getting short.

1 PAIMAAN LODHI: Yeah, we understand time is 2 getting short. 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, but you're not prepared today, in your testimony --4 PAIMAAN LODHI: No. 5 6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- to discuss this. 7 Okay, thank you. Again, we do appreciate your testimony, and 8 we appreciate everybody's patience. 9 But, we also do have additional questions 10 11 on -- perhaps, a couple follow-up questions from 12 Senator Rivera. 13 SENATOR RIVERA: Are you familiar with the 14 con -- with the debate -- well, not debate, but some 15 of the criticism from some folks related to the 16 elimin -- the potential elimination of MCIs, and the 17 apparent loss of jobs that there might be? There's a -- there was -- there was a -- I'm 18 19 not sure if you were here earlier. There was a 20 protest in front, et cetera. 21 PAIMAAN LODHI: I heard about it. 22 SENATOR RIVERA: You heard about it. Okay. 23 Are you familiar -- and I'm -- I'm about to perform a magic trick, by the way. 24

Are you familiar with the Alliance for Rental

25

```
Excellence in New York?
 1
               PAIMAAN LODHI: No.
 2
 3
               SENATOR RIVERA: Ta-dah (holds up piece of
 4
        paper.)
                  [Laughter.]
 5
               SENATOR RIVERA: So, if I was to look for --
 6
 7
        this is ARENYC, which is putting out a lot of ads,
        I'm looking at one online right now: Tell New York
 8
        lawmakers, don't kill our jobs.
 9
10
               So if I was to look in your -- that you know
11
        of, the Alliance for Rental Excellence in New York,
12
        if we looked at some of the money that went into
13
        that particular organization, would we see your
14
        organization's funding it?
15
               PAIMAAN LODHI: I'm the policy guy, I can't
16
        speak to that.
17
               SENATOR RIVERA: Which is I figure precisely
        the reason why you're here.
18
19
                  [Laughter.]
20
               SENATOR RIVERA: I would say, sir -- well,
21
        to -- but --
22
                  (Indiscernible cross-talking.)
23
               PAIMAAN LODHI: (Indiscernible.)
24
               SENATOR RIVERA: -- but -- but -- but let me
25
        ask you just this one thing --
```

1 I got two more --SENATOR KAVANAGH: (Indiscernible.) 2 SENATOR RIVERA: -- two more. 3 4 Would you agree with the -- with the argument 5 being made in these series of ads, that, if we indeed get rid of MCIs and IAIs, that we would then 6 7 kill a bunch of jobs for people that are performing maintenance in -- as you yourself put it earlier 8 when you were speaking to Senator Krueger --9 PAIMAAN LODHI: It's as though --10 11 SENATOR RIVERA: -- would you agree --12 PAIMAAN LODHI: -- "maintenance" is a dirty 13 word. I don't understand where this is coming from. 14 Maintenance of housing is necessary. 15 SENATOR RIVERA: Absolutely, which is 16 precisely the reason why you shouldn't get a bonus 17 for doing such maintenance. But, anyway, that's not the question. 18 19 [Applause.] 20 SENATOR RIVERA: Hold on, hold on, I got one 21 more. So -- and so the -- so would you agree -- so 22 23 the question is: Would you agree with the argument 24 that is being made by these folks, who, obviously,

you do not know anything about, that, if we get rid

25

of MCIs and IAIs, that we will indeed be impacting 1 a bunch of jobs in the city and the state? 2 PAIMAAN LODHI: Yeah, construction industry 3 is really important in New York City. It provides 4 5 good-paying jobs. 6 And the work that's being done in these apartments are paid -- you know, are good-paying 7 construction jobs. 8 9 SENATOR RIVERA: Ground to a halt, 10 apparently. 11 Okay, last, but not least, I'm just -- I --12 I -- I hope that you're making a mint, my brother, 13 because you have been sent somewhere with very 14 little information --15 PAIMAAN LODHI: That's not true. 16 SENATOR RIVERA: -- (indiscernible) -- oh, it 17 is true, because the fact is, if we're talking about, some of the questions that we've asked --18 some of the questions that we've asked --19 20 (Indiscernible cross-talking.) 21 PAIMAAN LODHI: The testimony that you've 22 heard today --23 SENATOR RIVERA: Hold on. 24 PAIMAAN LODHI: -- has been mostly anecdotal. 25 I've come here with data --

SENATOR RIVERA: No, but I got you. 1 Let me ask the question, though --2 PAIMAAN LODHI: -- I've come here with facts. 3 SENATOR RIVERA: -- sir, let me ask the 4 5 question. The -- this is -- this is -- we asked 6 7 questions about membership of revenue --PAIMAAN LODHI: And I told you --8 SENATOR RIVERA: -- which you could not 9 actually provide. 10 11 You gave us some estimations, but you don't 12 have data. 13 And you talked about the breakdown, when you 14 were talking to the Senator -- with Senator Krueger, 15 about some of the breakdown of how much is 16 50 percent, or what have you, we just got some data 17 that tells us that that's not accurate. 18 PAIMAAN LODHI: I would say --19 SENATOR RIVERA: I've asked you questions --20 PAIMAAN LODHI: -- I'd be surprised if it was 21 more than 50 percent. 22 SENATOR RIVERA: -- I'm not done with the 23 question. 24 The question is, very simply -- the question 25 is very simply: Do you think it is fair to you that

```
you're put in this situation with, basically, no
1
        information for us?
 2
               (Indiscernible.)
 3
               PAIMAAN LODHI: I reject that narrative.
 4
               I came here with a lot of information, and
 5
6
        I came here to present facts --
7
               SENATOR RIVERA: Yeah, just not the --
               PAIMAAN LODHI: -- on the implications that
 8
9
        are going to impact the law.
               SENATOR RIVERA: -- not the ones that we're
10
11
        asking for.
12
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: I thank -- I thank --
13
               SENATOR RIVERA: Thank you so much, Senator.
14
               Thank you Mr. Chairman, thank you,
15
        Mr. Chairman.
16
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Any other questions for
17
        the witness?
               Any further -- any further questions or
18
        comments of this witness?
19
20
               SENATOR SALAZAR: Yes.
21
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: (Indiscernible.)
               I think you have one more question from
22
        Senator Salazar.
23
24
               SENATOR SALAZAR: Hello, again.
25
               So there was a ProPublica report in 2016 that
```

showed that the requirements of the 421a program have consistently been ignored by property owners who take advantage of the program; that nearly two-thirds of the, roughly, 6400 rental properties in the city, whose owners pay reduced taxes through the 421a program, do not even have an approved application on file, the most basic requirement to be eligible for the program.

Two-thirds.

Some landlords -- some of those landlords, therefore, have been pocketing the tax break for the program for more than two decades now, without even actually being approved for the program.

We're talking about over \$300 million in tax subsidies at this point.

What do you think the consequences should be for those property owners?

PAIMAAN LODHI: Should be punished to the highest extent of the law.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Could you -- could you maybe specify, like, what you think the consequences should be?

Are they -- should they -- should their properties be expropriated? Should they be -- should they, you know, have to pay a penalty for --

you know, for taking hundreds of millions of dollars in tax subsidies, without even demonstrating they should be eligible for them?

PAIMAAN LODHI: I think it's pretty clear, highest -- punished to the highest extent of the law.

I don't know what the law is, but, punish to the highest extent.

I'm not here to defend bad behavior.

I come here with the full backing of my entire membership to say that we have to root out bad behavior in the system.

And the way to do that is to get rid of bad actors, and stricter enforcement, stiffer fines, treble damages.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Okay.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And I will just -- I will just conclude again by -- I do want to thank this gentleman who has come here to speak on behalf of an industry in a room that there may be some scepticism of his perspective.

And I do want to note that, your industry, to the extent -- and on a serious point, to the extent that you are serious about eliminating incentives to engage in this market badly, I think your

association knows a great deal about what incentivizes landlords to operate one way or to operate a different way.

And to the extent that you have practical proposals for that, you know, I think that -- and it's not -- this wasn't -- isn't your personal decision.

I think your association has decided not to come forward with particular proposals.

But I think -- again, I think the time is near when it might be useful -- it might be constructive for REBNY to come forth with those.

PAIMAAN LODHI: We'll be in touch.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: But, again, thank you for your testimony today.

PAIMAAN LODHI: Thank you.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Paimaan, thank you.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: That's for you (indicating to the witness.)

Next up we have somebody who's been here for a very long time, Amshula, I'm not sure how to say it, Jayaram, of Demos, which is a place I had the privilege of working at when it was a much smaller but very impactful organization.

1 But if you can come up.

And then after that, we are going to have a panel of New York City loft tenants.

Oh, forgive me.

No.

I -- actually, sorry, you're -- you're -forgive me, you're part -- your actually part of
this panel.

Forgive me.

I'm dealing with a very -- since many people have added themselves upon arrival, we're dealing with a complicated list.

But, both of these folks have been waiting a very long time, and we appreciate your testimony.

And as I said, the next panel will be some loft tenants.

AMSHULA JAYARAM: Good afternoon, and -- or, good evening, and thank you to Chairman Kavanagh and members of the Committee for the opportunity to testify here today in support of all nine bills on the Housing Justice For All platform.

My name is Amshula Jayaram, senior campaign strategist at Demos, a public-policy organization that is dedicated to racial and economic justice.

I am also a resident of the 20th District,

which, like too many neighborhoods throughout

New York City, is visibly buckling under the housing

crisis.

We are in full support of the reforms today, and ask the Committee to pass this strong and urgent package of rent laws.

Just last month Demos issued a report on the affordable housing crisis in the U.S.

Unsurprisingly, the factors that have contributed to these crises are consistent across the country, as are the solutions.

And the report concludes with a series of recommendations, including establishing national rent control and good-cause eviction, two powerful policy mechanisms that can stem the bleeding of affordable units and the dissolution of communities.

So I just wanted to say at the outset, that I hope that the remarks are helpful and relevant to the discussion. It's a little bit of a broader look.

But, we wanted to be here, both to kind of share the findings with the Committee, but also to show solidarity with our brothers and sisters in the room.

So with that disclaimer said:

The U.S. already spends enough money to solve the housing crisis.

The problem is that this money goes towards subsidizing the rich rather than the poor.

Robert Friedman, in his book "A Few Thousand Dollars: Sparking Prosperity for Everyone," notes that, "The wealthiest 5 percent of taxpayers get more than \$200 billion in annual home-ownership tax breaks, more than the bottom 80 percent combined."

He also notes that the "upper-income tax subsidies are four times the entire annual budget of the federal department of housing and urban development," the agency that's supposed to provide housing for the poor.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities found that a larger share of federal spending on housing went to the 7 million households with incomes of \$200,000 or more, than to the more than 50 million households with incomes of 50,000 or less.

In New York -- in the 2019 session, in

New York State, the proposal for a pied-a-terre tax

was one attempt to push back against a system that

favors rich homeowners, in this case, homeowners

with multiple homes, over poor renters.

The failure of this legislation to pass at a time when the lack of affordable housing has reached an apex speaks volumes about the power of private interests who have blocked meaningful reform for so long.

The second finding, and the second point

I want to lift up, is the lack of affordable housing

not only creates a daily struggle to survive for

many families, but it also prevents families from

building wealth.

According to the Joint Center for Housing Studies, the New York/New Jersey metro area ranks 41 out of the 101 most cost-burdened metropolitan areas in America.

Just over 85 percent of families here are cost-burdened, meaning, they spend more than 30 percent of their income on rent, and 71.5 percent are severely cost-burdened, meaning, they spend over half of household income on rent.

Under either of these scenarios, families not only struggle to pay for necessities, like food and clothing, but they also are unable to save or invest.

A Demos analysis of data from the federal reserve's Survey of Consumer Finances found, that

while the median value of financial assets of homeowners, not including homes and other property, was about \$68,000, the median value of assets for renters was just \$2,000.

This is a critical point because it underscores how policy choices made by powerful decision-makers can set generational poverty in motion.

Children of parents with \$2,000 in the bank will have a very different set of choices and opportunities than children of wealthier families, to say the least.

The data on housing costs also shows that there are real barriers to building wealth in this country for the vast majority of people.

On the other hand, regulation, like rent control, can help people to start saving.

An analysis of rent control in San Francisco showed that regulation saved tenants between 2300 and 6600 per year.

And to speak, actually, just to reference the point made by the REBNY representative, I mean, we, I think, would agree that there's not enough affordable housing being built, and, you know, that says two things. Right?

Like, one, they're not incentivized to build those units, and, you know, surprise, surprise, the market is not going to solve everything.

And, two, that it's all the more reason why we need to pass really strong tenant protections, to stop the existing units from -- you know, from being converted or tenants from being kicked out.

Nationally, we've lost about 400,000 subsidized-housing units through demolition and conversion to market-rate units since the late '80s.

And the Joint Center for Housing Studies estimates that we will lose over one million more subsidized rental units over the next decade.

These problems are not intractable; each of them have known solutions.

Development of affordable housing; regulations to control the rate of rent increases; establishing strong tenant protections, like good-cause eviction, are just some of the proven solutions to keep families in their homes.

For example, the department of veterans

affairs and the department of housing and urban

development cut homelessness amongst veterans by

half in just eight years because there was an actual

commitment from the government to do so.

In closing, I would like to add that this emergency is a result of choices made by policy-makers over decades, and by the persistent and toxic impact of money in politics.

The fact that 89,000 people don't have shelter in this state is not an accident.

There is a direct line between homelessness and housing insecurity and the power of the real estate lobby to block meaningful housing reform.

I applaud the Legislature's commitment to preserving affordable housing and protecting tenants, but this is just another symptom of a larger problem. Lax campaign-finance laws allowed monied-interests to drown out the voices of people in need, with shameful consequences.

Fairness and equality demand that we not only deal with the symptoms, but we ultimately attack the root.

So thank you for your time today, and take any questions if you have them.

[Applause.]

NAKEEB SIDDIQUE: Thank you, Chair Kavanagh, Senator Myrie, Senator Krueger, and to the Committee.

My name is Nakeeb Siddique, and I am the director of housing for the Brooklyn neighborhood office of The Legal Aid Society.

And I'm proud to be here to urge passage of the good-cause eviction bill that's pending before the Legislature.

We've heard a lot here -- I've provided the testimony here to the Committee.

And I know we've heard here a lot about rent-regulated tenants, and, certainly, I would be preaching to the choir, to some degree, and I certainly believe, of course, that strengthening rent regulation is a good thing, is a very necessary thing.

I'm here today to speak about another huge category of tenants who don't even have the basic protections that rent-stabilized tenants or other rent-regulated tenants have.

You know, those are the tenants who live in the smaller buildings that are now currently, relatively, unregulated.

These are five-family -- or, five-unit buildings, four-unit, three-unit, two-unit buildings.

The legislation that's before the -- the

proposed legislation that would allow for eviction -- evictions based on good cause only would make a tremendous difference, I think, not only throughout the city of New York, but here, especially, in Brooklyn.

Here we have a good third of the units -rental units in the borough here are unregulated
currently.

And as a housing attorney, I -- I -- me and my colleagues, we have about 48 attorneys and several more paralegal social workers.

Every day we're in Brooklyn Housing Court, and a great majority of our clients certainly are the rent-regulated tenants.

But we also have this other category of tenants who -- who we really struggle to defend. You know, there's not a faint heart among my staff, and they fight like lions, you know, for their clients; they love their clients.

But these kinds of cases where we have holdover eviction proceedings, where a lease is expired, for example, and the landlord no longer wants the tenant.

Right now, under current law, the landlord has to give no reason. And often the reason is

retaliatory. The tenant might have complained about repairs, or lack of repairs. It may be that the landlord simply wants to raise the rent to something that's unaffordable.

This has a tremendous impact on our communities throughout the borough, throughout the city.

And I want to share just a couple of stories of a couple of clients that I've worked with recently.

You know, one is a tenant who lives in Bushwick in a four-family house. She's lived there for 41 years, back when Bushwick was not known throughout the world. It was known in Brooklyn, and that's about it.

And this is somebody who, you know, plowed the -- plowed the sidewalk when it was snowing.

Took care of the building.

She, and her husband who has since passed, they were, effectively, the maintenance people for the building.

The building was owned by a family friend.

This is somebody who drove a -- who drove a subway car, she worked for the MTA, until she retired. Raised three children, sent them to

college. Is now taking care of two disabled grandchildren in the house.

Well, the building was sold earlier this year.

The new landlord, who has really no -- no issue with her at all. The new landlord and his attorneys acknowledge that our -- that our client is -- is a good tenant. Has never missed any rent payments, has been continuing to pay rent.

But, the landlord has been quite -- quite candid about his goal, which is that, you know, the neighborhood is hot, and our client is not, I guess.

You know, and the goal is to -- for this person is -- the landlord is to redevelop the building and rent it for much higher prices.

So this is somebody who has put her life into this neighborhood, into this building. And under current law, you know, my office, we're fighting with one arm tied behind our back.

We'll do what we can, but, you know, these kinds of cases are some of the most challenging in terms of the emotions involved, for the attorneys, certainly, obviously, the client.

No matter what we do, the outcome sometimes is preordained.

If we can get -- bat this case away on some
technicality, or -- or -- you know, all we're really
doing is forestalling the -- the inevitable.

Another case will follow right behind this one.

I have another client who -- whose case recently ended.

This is a gentleman who was partially blind, who has a Section 8 voucher, lives in a three-family house. He's lived there for 10 years. Also, no issue with rent. You know, the landlord doesn't seem to have any sort of personal issue with him.

But, you know, in the winter of 2017, which was not like this past winter, it was cold, it was very brutally cold.

He made a complaint to the city's -- to the city agency HPD, because it was bitterly cold in his apartment, and he didn't know what else to do.

So we think that that's what precipitated the landlord bringing him to court.

We managed to get the first case thrown out.

The landlord brought another one, and he was compelled, ultimately, to do an agreement to move out of the apartment.

This is somebody who's also reliant on an oxygen tank.

And it really -- you know, it pains me deeply 1 to say that, you know, he was not able to find 2 3 another apartment, because he has no income. He's a senior, he's, you know, fixed income. 4 5 So he is living in a homeless shelter right 6 now. 7 You know, and if -- if we had this good-cause eviction bill, things would be very, very different 8 for both of these clients, and for thousands of 9 other New Yorkers, tens of thousands, in fact, and 10 11 many of whom live here in Brooklyn. 12 And so I implore you and your colleagues, 13 please, pass this bill. 14 Take off the restraints, give me and my 15 colleagues the tools that we need, and I promise you 16 we'll come out swinging with both fists. 17 I thank you. [Applause.] 18 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 20 We're going to continue, we'll begin by 21 letting our colleagues speak. 22 So Senator Myrie first. 23 SENATOR MYRIE: Thank you.

And thank you for the work that you're doing.

Opponents of this legislation have suggested

24

25

that this is too -- of the good-cause bill, have suggested that this is too broad a piece of legislation, that this would have too-far reach of an impact, and that it would drastically change tenant-landlord law.

And so, if you could, explain to the good landlord who is trying to --

OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: What good landlord?
[Laughter.]

SENATOR MYRIE: -- to -- the.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm glad we got to this far into this without, but, please, please do -- you know, let's let the dialogue continue.

SENATOR MYRIE: -- to the landlord that has not violated the law, what this bill would mean to them, if anything.

NAKEEB SIDDIQUE: I mean, I -- I -- one thing I'll point out about this bill, from my understanding, it applies to buildings -- all apartments, other than those that are in four- or -- three- or four-family unit -- uh -- I'm sorry, yes, smaller buildings where the landlord actually lives there.

So to me, you know, I grew up here in Brooklyn myself. I -- you know, these are buildings

that are investment properties, in effect, that this legislation would affect.

Being able to displace tenants at will with a 30-day notice, yes, I mean, it would certainly be convenient for most landlords.

And, you know, I've seen many landlords who say -- you know, tell a tenant, Oh, it's fine, you can stay here. Let's just keep it month-to-month.

But, of course, that -- you know, that gives -- it's -- there's a bargaining-power issue right there.

There's nothing really for landlords who are good landlords to fear from this.

I mean, these are not tenants who -- if the tenant is not paying rent, the landlord still has a cause of action. They can always bring the tenant to court.

If the tenant is, allegedly, creating a nuisance or breaching the lease or doing something that they ought not to be doing, there's still remedies.

The -- this legislation, what I see it doing, is giving not just the tenant some protections, but the landlord also a sense of kind of certainty, or, you know, a -- a -- a kind of sense that they --

they -- they can rely on the tenant -- they can keep this tenant in -- so long as the tenant is paying the rent and is otherwise complying with the lease.

It doesn't really -- it doesn't really -- it shouldn't really affect them in any way, other than, I suppose, obviously, in terms of the marketability of the building, perhaps, or the units.

But I -- I submit that, you know, this is a city of renters, this is a state of renters, and it is certainly within the rights of the people to ask for this kind of protection.

And, historically, I understand we used to have these kinds of protections.

The neighborhood I grew up in, the old Sicilian and Puerto Rican ladies who I grew up around, you know, they lived in small -- you know, these sort of smaller buildings.

Many of them had these kinds of protections, that no longer exist. They were the glue that held the neighborhood together, and there's a kind of intangible value to that.

Again, the client that I just mentioned, who -- who not just took care of the building, but really took care of the block and the neighborhood.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Senator Myrie.

Just to follow up, as you note, I mean, in earlier generation, I mean, there were at least

1.6 million rent-regulated units in -- in New York.

So it -- it -- you know, what we're talking about today is -- is getting back to a broader protection, but certainly not unprecedented that -- that we would protect tenants more broadly.

And just to -- we had our first hearing of this Housing Committee, it was in a neighborhood in Syracuse, where there was a great deal of attention to this, in housing in neighborhoods where the issue was not that the neighborhoods were becoming "hot" neighborhoods, that, you know, where there was gentrification and a lot -- a big -- a big influx of people, people living in very tough circumstances, and at the mercy of their landlords, particularly when, you know, they might complain about bad conditions.

But just -- I want to focus, in a New York context, where we have many neighborhoods that undergo that change, where, all of a sudden, it is just plain more desirable for certain people to move into that neighborhood, who hadn't previously considered moving in, and rents go up very rapidly.

This bill has a standard that says that

the -- that upon -- you can't be pushed out for paying a rent -- for failing to pay a rent increase that is unconscionable.

In your view, if we pass this bill, does -is a landlord -- would a landlord be free to argue
that the neighborhood has become more fashionable,
more desirable, people are willing to pay a lot more
in this neighborhood, and that makes my large rent
increase not unconscionable?

NAKEEB SIDDIQUE: I mean, I think that's certainly something that would probably be litigated in the courts.

I -- I don't -- yeah, I imagine that we probably would encounter some kind argument like that, or any kind of argument. I mean, just as our side adapts, so does the other.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Do you think that we should write a statute that intends for that kind of -- for that kind of change, to be something that somebody can -- you know, somebody can raise rent a lot and say, look, this is a neighborhood where people are raising rents a lot, so I'm going to raise rents a lot too?

NAKEEB SIDDIQUE: I mean, I think in New York City that would be a disaster.

I mean, that's sort of -- we -- we don't have that kind of legislative guidance now, and it is a full-on disaster.

I do think the more specific guidance that we can get from the Legislature, I think it would protect tenants.

But something that allows for, what you just mentioned as a hypothetical, I think really would just codify gentrification.

I don't think that's -- that's -- I don't think that's something that, really, any of us here support.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

Well, we appreciate your testimony today.

And I also do want to say that, you know, we have tremendous respect for Legal Aid. And when we -- we have very tough housing cases, when we can get somebody at Legal Aid to take on the case, it's a huge benefit for our constituents and for us.

And so we have great appreciation for the work your attorneys do.

And, to Demos, as I mentioned earlier, I had the great privilege of working there in 2004 when it was a bit more of a rag-tag, relatively new organization.

But it has really become an institution that, 1 nationally -- here in New York, and nationally, 2 really is carrying a lot of tremendously important 3 issues that bring about economic and racial justice. 4 So thank you for the context you've provided 5 6 today. 7 And thank you both for testifying. NAKEEB SIDDIQUE: Thank you. 8 9 [Applause.] SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, next up, I had --10 11 I had mentioned -- sorry, there were two folks that 12 were supposed to be part of this panel, and 13 I mentioned them before, but didn't call them up. 14 So with great respect to the -- and then 15 we -- we have many -- we'll have many loft tenants, 16 but I did -- since I did call them earlier, if Esther Diaz and Gisela Matza are still here? 17 18 They are, okay. 19 JULIAN GOMEZ: So, everyone, Senators, it is 20 going to be in Spanish, but we're translating. 21 And Gisela had to leave because of family 22 commitments, but I have her testimony. 23 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 24 ESTHER DIAZ: (Speaking Spanish.) 25 (Translated to English by a translator.)

1 So, good afternoon.

2 My name is Esther Diaz.

I am a member of Make the Road New York, and I live in Queens.

I am a tenant of a small house without regulation, and, therefore, I do not have a contract, and I cannot demand, with good confidence, good conditions of availability, safety, and services.

And it is because of this need of a place to live that I have to keep quiet, and adapt myself to what I have for now, until I look for something better.

(Speaking Spanish.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

So over 5 million tenants in your state, like me, do not have any legal protections in terms of rent increases and stability in their apartments because there is no right to a contract or a contract renewal/a lease renewal.

(Speaking Spanish.)

(Translated to English by a translator.)

If the good-cause eviction bill that will be place, which is what we're asking for today, millions of tenants like me would have a contract

that would provide security, and we could also plan 1 for future increases, and not be worried about 2 exorbitant increases that will eventually lead to 3 eviction. 4 5 (Speaking Spanish.) 6 (Translated to English by a translator.) Planned increases a reasonable rates will 7 relieve the stress of not knowing what increase will 8 gonna hit us and how much will be. 9 (Speaking Spanish.) 10 11 (Translated to English by a translator.) 12 So if we had this -- the good-cause eviction 13 law in place, I will feel comfortable to face my 14 landlord and demand better conditions, saftiness (sic) (ph.), and services without any fear 15 16 of being evicted. 17 (Speaking Spanish.) 18 (Translated to English by a translator.) 19 It is so frustrating to know that, for a very 20 long time, we have a rent-control -- a 21 rent-stabilized system in the state, but that that 22 system doesn't apply for all the tenants. 23 Now, it's very difficult to find houses --24 rent-stabilized houses or apartments unprotected by

law, as neighborhoods are getting gentrified.

25

```
1
               (Speaking Spanish.)
               (Translated to English by a translator.)
 2
               Dear Senators, this is a great opportunity to
 3
        represent your constituencies and protect millions
 4
        of families, passing the good-cause eviction.
 5
               This will also help to address the fact that,
6
7
        every day, 100 families are evicted from their
8
        homes.
9
               (Speaking Spanish.)
10
               (Translated to English by a translator.)
               So this opportunity that we have to
11
12
        (indiscernible).
13
               She is saying, thank you, all, for open this
14
        hearing.
15
               And -- yeah, I think that will be -- that
16
        will be -- yeah.
17
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.
18
               Any questions?
19
               Thank you so much for your testimony.
20
                   [Applause.]
21
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. Next up we're going
22
        have a panel of --
23
               JULIAN GOMEZ: Hold on.
24
               Yeah, so I have Gisela testimony, and --
25
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Oh, (indiscernible) --
```

1 I misunderstood. Okay, so you want to also --2 JULIAN GOMEZ: Yeah. 3 4 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- you're going to read 5 that. 6 I got it. 7 JULIAN GOMEZ: And my name is Julian Gomez. I work at Make the Road as a tenant 8 organizer. We are located in Bushwick. 9 I want to thank Senator Julia Salazar for 10 11 just bringing the good-cause eviction bill. 12 So Gisela Matza testimony, it's pretty 13 straightforward. Her name is Gisela Matza. 14 15 She lives in Bushwick, 1132 Jefferson Avenue. 16 She is an unregulated tenant, a 17 three-building -- three-units building, with her husband and her children. 18 19 She's been there a tenant for five years, and 20 has spent those years suffering negligence and harassment from the landlord. 21 22 Repeatedly they have called -- they have had 23 bad conditions and lack of repairs in their 24 apartment: leaks, holes, plaster and paint that

peels off the walls and ceiling.

25

In order to get some minor repairs made, they had to repeatedly call 311 to file complaints.

Even though they have been good tenants, who have always paid rent on time, they received a 30-day notice of eviction.

(Holding up paper.)

This is the 30-day notice that they received, just for being good tenants.

"And the landlord states, that he needs the apartment vacated for a family member, but I know my landlord is targeting me because I have demanded repairs."

And Gisela also told me, we were chatting, that she thinks that he wants to kick them out because he want to renovate the apartments because of what he's done with the other two units already, just to, you know, rent it out for a higher price, and -- yeah.

"My vacate order is set for June 30th, but have I nowhere to go with my family.

"I am going to look for our new apartment, but it will be impossible to find something affordable.

"I don't want to end up in a shelter, but I fear that I might.

"If we had real tenant protections, like the 1 good-cause eviction bill, tenants like me will have 2 protection against bad-actor landlords who neglect 3 their tenants. 4 "With protections, more tenants could face 5 6 their landlords to demand safe and dignified homes without the fear of not getting a lease renewal. 7 "Calling 311 for lack of repairs shouldn't be 8 the reason my landlord tries to evict, but it is. 9 10 "The situation that I'm living is lived by millions of tenants in the state of New York. 11 12 "Without real protection, we will continue to 13 grow the homeless crisis we face in our state. 14 "As legislators, you must decide, which side 15 are you on? 16 "As tenants, we need stronger and fair and 17 better rental rules that protect all renters. 18 "As the representatives with a 19 (indiscernible) majority in both Houses, you have 20 the power to give us just that. 21 "Remember, the majority of New Yorkers, 22 millions of us, are renters, not owners. 23 "Maybe before my family eviction you will

"Tenants need your help.

24

25

act.

```
"We need good-cause eviction legislation now.
1
 2
               "Thank you."
 3
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: What are you all here
        for?
 4
 5
                  [Applause.]
6
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.
7
               OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: Okay, that's what I want
        to know, what are you all here for?
8
9
                  [Applause.]
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you very much.
10
11
               Questions?
12
               Okay, thank you again.
13
               JULIAN GOMEZ: Thank you.
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, next -- next up
14
15
        we're going have, from New York City Lost Tenants,
16
        Christine Malden (ph.), and, forgive me,
        Ximena Garnica, and Allison Dell.
17
18
               I think we'll do it in groups of three, so,
        we'll start there.
19
20
               And let me just thank you all for being here,
21
        and for your patience, and for the patience of
22
        everybody else who's been here for much of the day;
23
        we appreciate it.
24
               XIMENA GARNICA: (Speaking Spanish.)
25
               Good evening, members of the Senate, and,
```

fellow tenants, good evening.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my testimony with you all.

My name is Ximena Garnica.

I am a multi-disciplinary artist. I am a Colombian immigrant.

I am an unprotected live-work tenant. I am at risk of eviction, I am at risk of losing my job, and my home.

I am not a trust-fund Latino artist.

I came here at age 17 by myself to pursue my passion because I believe in the power of art to spark curiosity and to question our world and society.

I am here today to stand in solidarity with all tenants of New York State seeking protection.

Loft tenants urge the Senate to pass all nine bills, plus one more bill, S3655B, the loft (indiscernible) bill, which has full support from the city, has been a sponsor and negotiated by Senator Salazar and Assembly Member Glick, and which will create rent-regulated units and protect live-work tenants like me from eviction.

My partner, who is here, Shige, moved to our live-work space in Williamsburg in 1996, 23 years

ago. I have been there 15 years.

We are part of a handful of buildings of artists that have survived New York City cultural displacement.

Those few buildings with artists that still exist in our neighborhood are covered by the loft law, or, are impending litigation because they were able to (indiscernible) to reconsidered it for coverage.

Many others didn't know about the loft law and never applied, and many were ineligible to register their units due to loopholes added to the loft law in 2010 by Bloomberg.

Those less lucky were eventually kicked out; not only kicked out, but replaced by corporate tenants, luxury office, and luxury housings.

Those who were able to be covered by the loft law is still in the neighborhood and are now rent-regulated.

I am personally affected by the Bloomberg exclusions that were inserted into the law in 2010.

Shige, can you just pass them this photo, please?

(Audience member hands photograph to dias members.)

XIMENA GARNICA: One of them is the requirement, that in order to be eligible to apply for coverage, the unit must have a window that opens to a street or a legal courtyard.

In my case, I have a window, not just one, but three windows.

But since landlord lawyers are very resourceful and extremely litigious, they argued that my windows are interior windows, opening to a few inches of space in between a non-existent roll-up gate, and used to be there, and the windows.

But as you see, I am on the ground floor.

I have a door.

I can poke my head out of those windows that you see in the picture.

And, in addition, I have several skylights and back egress.

But, for five years I have been fighting to be allowed coverage under the loft law.

The loft law is a remedial law that give landlords an amnesty to legalize their buildings that they were illegally rented to live-work tenants, and give tenants like me the opportunity to come out of the shadows and contribute to the legalization process.

Even if I didn't have a window, but in my unit has the condition to style one, or to comply with light-and-air code requirements through various means, then I should be granted coverage, and I should be allowed to start the legalization process that, at the end will, bring my unit up to code and to rent regulation.

Also, it is important to note that all the legalization costs are split between tenants and landlords.

However, some landlords like mine, who, in my case, had a live-work tenant for 23 years, opt not to register the building, and engaging in long-lasting legal battles with burden on tenants to effectuate the law.

In my case, I believe my landlord is a small-medium landlord. He died three years ago, and his wife took over and refused to register the building.

She hired one of the most litigious law firms in the city that specializes in emptying buildings and getting rid of loft tenants.

This firm has been milking my landlord packet, and had been successfully feeding absurd arguments in court, such as the one of my invisible

windows.

They also advised my landlord not to cash my checks so they could take us to court and start an eviction case.

They have been able to do that -- they haven't been able to evict me because I'm pending loft-law litigation, but, guess what? The same legal firms and architects that are now milking my landlord to keep us all in endless litigation, using the 2010 Bloomberg exclusions, wait for the right time to bring a solution to these landlords: a buyer.

Two weeks ago my landlord told me, that after five years of paying fees, she fired her lawyer and architect because, not only once, but threes times, they had brought her developers with offers to buy her building.

Mine, I live one block from the luxury Domino development, and many greedy developers are hunting for any crumbs left in our neighborhood so they can develop and rent to high-pay tenants.

So, these legal loopholes attract these legal firms who are organizing landlords coalition, and using the small landlords as poster childs, milking them to the point so they can accept to sell their

buildings to luxury developers, larger corporations, and multinationals.

The same landlord-lawyers organizers are also hiring lobbyists and consultants to go to Albany, and to feed you all with misinformation regarding the process of the loft law, blaming the City and using the Bloomberg exclusions to keep us all in limbo and in long litigations while our buildings remain without a certificate of occupation, without protection, and without City oversight.

I urge you to allow all loft tenants who are suffering from the 2010 Bloomberg exclusions, such as incompatible uses, basement and window exclusions, which did not existed almost 30 years prior to 2010, to pursue the opportunity to register their buildings and enter into remedial legalization process which restore the initial intents of the loft law, and has full oversights from the City and its agencies.

And the only way do this is to pass S3655B.

I have been in Albany for three legislative sessions for the past three years, but, as you all know, the Senate was Republican-controlled.

And although loft (indiscernible) bill passed the Assembly each session, our bill was killed and

it's never reached the Senate floor.

During this year we have lost hundreds of loft tenants who couldn't hold any longer for the loft (indiscernible) bill to pass. Mark here behind me.

I myself don't know how long more I can hold.

I had to limit and stop many of the community programs that I once hosted in my live-work space through my non-profit organization.

I have spent all my income in legal fees.

I came out of the shadows because I thought

I had a chance to live and work without fear, to

keep employing dancers and artists, and to keep

contributing to our communities.

Some landlords complaints regarding legalization timelines, but they forget they have been renting their buildings illegally, in my case for 23 years. And now they're being held accountable to comply with the process.

However, we must hold the City accountable so that all these agencies understand the loft law, so that good landlords who are actually trying to legalize their buildings can do so.

But the first step is to pass S3655B.

Without that, displacements of artists out of

New York will continue. 1 Live-work tenants will continue to live in 2 the shadows and landlords will continue to rent 3 4 illegally. 5 Thank you all, Senators, that have supported 6 us so far. 7 [Applause.] SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 8 9 I'm going to --XIMENA GARNICA: The Assembly bill negotiated 10 11 between Senator Salazar and Assembly Member Glick 12 passed the Assembly House yesterday. 13 Now, I ask, again, on behalf of hundreds of 14 loft tenants, Senator Kavanagh, as the Chair of the 15 Housing Committee, to stand behind Senator Salazar 16 to advance the bill, 3655B --17 (Indiscernible cross-talking.) SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- okay, we're well over 18 19 time, and we're going to hear from many --20 XIMENA GARNICA: -- and to put up for votes 21 next week so that we can be safe for evictions, and 22 so that we can be safe from unscrupulous

23 litigations.

24 (Indiscernible cross-talking continues.)

25 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And, again, I have --

```
I have 40 -- I have 40 people --
1
               XIMENA GARNICA: Here are 300
 2
        (indiscernible) --
3
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- I have --
 4
        I appreciate --
5
               XIMENA GARNICA: -- for 300 members of our
6
7
        community that ask you to do so.
8
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- I have 40 people who --
9
               XIMENA GARNICA: And I also would like to ask
10
        Senator --
11
                  (Indiscernible cross-talking continues.)
12
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- who have been waiting
13
        hours to testify.
14
               I'm going to ask to get the next the --
15
               XIMENA GARNICA: Thank you.
16
               And I ask --
17
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask the next
        person to speak.
18
               XIMENA GARNICA: Thank you so much, but
19
20
        I want to just say (indiscernible) --
21
                  (Indiscernible cross-talking continues.)
22
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: I have one hour left and
23
        40 people who have signed up speak, and I am going
24
        to ask you to respect --
25
               XIMENA GARNICA: -- and universal rent
```

1 control. Gracias. 2 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- the rules that 3 everybody has been respecting for many hours. 4 Thank you. 5 6 Can we have the next testimony. CHRISTINE MALDEN (ph.): Okay. 7 Hi, everybody. 8 9 My name is Christine, and I'm a loft tenant. 10 10 years ago I answered a Craigslist ad for a 11 live-work space, advertised for \$1 a square foot. SENATOR KAVANAGH: Can you say your full name 12 13 for the record? CHRISTINE MALDEN (ph.): Pardon me. 14 Christine Malden. 15 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 17 CHRISTINE MALDEN (ph.): 10 years ago I answered a Craigslist ad for a live-work space, 18 advertised for \$1 a square foot. 19 20 When I got there, I understood why. 21 The space I visited had broken windows, 22 pigeons flying in them; no plumbing, no electric, no The facade flooded every time it rained, it 23 walls. still does. 24

But for me it was love at first sight.

25

I couldn't afford a normal apartment, and as a self-employed artist and designer, I needed a place to work where no one would complain if the floors got dirty.

I had never heard of the loft law, I knew nothing about zoning.

As a layperson, why would I?

All I knew was, that I answered an ad for housing and saw apartments across the street and all around me.

My building was the exception, not the rule.

When I first moved in, the building was empty, which was scary and pretty intimidating.

There were a few tenants like me and a manufacturing business on the ground floor.

The people who worked there were kind, welcoming, and protective. I was grateful for them and their presence.

I continued to build up my space, making it into a home, one which an architect recently told me is closer to being up to code than many of the new buildings he inspects.

I also took care of the rest of the building too because there were no amenities; mopping hallways, replacing light bulbs, shoveling snow in

winter so that I could clear the drift that prevented me from opening my front door. Even snaking my neighbor's toilets.

In one year my rent was raised 18 percent.

The same year, the manufacturer that worked on the ground floor was replaced by a fancy co-working facility.

Almost overnight my building was transformed, from a few dozen friendly and familiar faces, to a couple of hundred new and unfamiliar ones, but these tenants were different.

They were paying a premium for a tiny desk space, beer on tap, and 24-hour access, and, by God, they intended to use it with little regard for the rest of us.

I felt like a stranger in my own home, and I thought to myself, if one floor of office space could destroy our little community, what would converting the whole building do to this neighborhood, my neighborhood?

And, yet, this is the likely plan for my building.

A few years later I was called into the management office and told my time was up, I had to leave.

I reached out to my neighbors. I called,

I texted, I left notes under their doors, but nobody
answered.

It took me a while to realize they were all gone. From a building of 60 tenants, only a handful remained.

We've been fighting eviction ever since, living in a state of non-stop, high-alert, waiting for the final decision to come.

It has been the most expensive, stressful two years of my life.

I jump when someone knocks at the door or buzzes, and I don't think I've slept through the night since.

The building conditions have become difficult again as in the beginning.

Our movement is restricted, access to basic services have been cut off, repairs have not made.

My door was broken for weeks and left flapping in the wind until, recently, before video cameras were installed everywhere to track my every movement.

It became the preferred place in the neighborhood for drug deals and drug consummation to take place.

1 Also, we had no heat or gas for the coldest days this past winter. 2 One of my few remaining neighbors finally 3 gave up. She was pregnant and couldn't cope. 4 When they asked us to leave, we said, No. 5 6 You brought us here. We paid our rent. There is 7 our home now. But you don't say no if you're pregnant; 8 You don't say no if you have small children; 9 You can't say no if you're living paycheck to 10 11 paycheck; 12 And you won't say no if you're worried about 13 immigration status. 14 All of these are examples of tenants who were 15 forced to leave my building. 16 Without protection, you just say, yes, okay. 17 I have watched an entire building of my most vulnerable friends and neighbors picked off one by 18 19 one. 20 I'm supposed to be the strong one. 21 Now there's just a few of us who remain, 22 living day to day, waiting for the Court's final decision. 23

The only thing that can save us is the

It can, and will, come any day now.

24

25

immediate passage of Senator Salazar's bill protecting loft tenants.

Senator Kavanagh, you've called us stubborn, and, yes, I guarantee, that if a marshal comes before this decision on the bill comes, my fellow tenants will stand stubbornly before my front door, preventing them access so that they cannot execute this eviction.

We lost enough people this year because of the delay.

We lost people last year too, and the year before that, and the year before that.

Enough.

Last year was unconscionable, but understandable, given the political climate.

This year there is no excuse.

It is within your power to stop the bleeding.

To Senator Salazar, thank you for your support and for fighting for us, and for all tenants.

To Senator Kavanagh, respectfully, please do not stall this bill any longer.

I and others will be the collateral damage.

It's finally time to pass this bill we've been fighting for for three years, not in June, not

the last day of session -- today, now. 1 Thank you. 2 [Applause.] 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 4 Third on this panel. 5 ALLISON DELL: Hi. 6 7 My name is Allison Dell. I'm a loft tenant at 475 Kent Avenue on the 8 south side of Williamsburg. 9 10 I want to thank you for the opportunity to 11 speak today, for organizing the hearing. 12 So many people I see today were here in 13 Albany yesterday. 14 Nobody becomes a housing advocate by choice. 15 Everybody is here because they need to be 16 here, they're fighting for their homes. 17 And, I'm going to tell you guys my story, part of it's a familiar story. 18 19 I'm a rent-regulated tenant. 20 A new building owner, a multinational 21 conglomerate, with no connection to the 22 neighborhood, bought our building about a year ago 23 for 5 1/2 times the value, using the calculator 24 that's been given today. 25 Since then, there's been non-stop

construction and dust, uncontained asbestos abatement.

Most recently, they have removed the enclosed gas lines that were in the hallway, and then claimed that the lack of enclosure constituted an unsafe system.

Many people in this room know the feeling of coming home and not knowing if you will find a notice of termination of lease on your door.

Our previous landlord, if people did not register under the 2010 loft law, registered the units, our building of more than 104 units is now more than half empty.

That is 50 rent-regulated units that are gone.

So, we have also heard our landlord's attorneys say at a city meeting, "I empty buildings for a living."

That means, that for every rent-regulated tenant here who is struggling, that their landlord has this staff, people whose job it is, to make sure they're displaced from their homes.

We are struggling as hard as we can to make our rent every month.

You know, we have jobs. And, now, fighting

for our homes is part of that job.

Coming home and finding a notice of termination of lease on your door, if you're not a protected tenant, that means you're choosing between fighting a lengthy and expensive legal battle, which you might lose; become on the tenants' blacklist; or just leave.

I am one of the lucky ones because I am protected under the loft law.

This is why I'm speaking up today.

It's actually hard for me to speak up for myself, but I'm here to speak up for the people who are not protected.

We know that rent regulation is broken, and we need to pass all nine bills, but not having protection is worse.

For this reason, Senator Salazar,

Senator Kavanagh, thank you for pushing forward with

\$3665.

So pass all nine bills, plus loft law.

[Applause.]

ALLISON DELL: Since 1998 I have called 475 Kent Avenue, my live-work space there, my home and my workspace.

I moved there to take a job at the Brooklyn

Children's Museum.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, biking here today down Franklin, which was the bike route I took in 1998 every day to get to the job, I can see that gentrification and displacement are undeniable, and something that we need to fight with more affordable housing, not less affordable housing.

I spend most of my volunteer efforts and energies on local environmental outreach, science outreach, and education.

I worked with La (indiscernible), La Fuentes, to fight the rezoning along the waterfront in 2005, to work on power-plant sightings. I worked as the PD delegate to bring the Brooklyn Story Voyager, which is a literacy program.

And I'm very proud of being in my community. But if I lose my home that I can afford to

My husband is an artist who uses our space

pay for, I will not be able to remain in New York City.

full-time as a studio, and we had our business there, fine-art print-making business, in 2008.

There was a brief vacate of 475 Kent for three months, and we lost our home and our business at the same time; both home and job gone in one day. We were not able to fill contracts because we could not access the manufacturing space that we needed to do that.

And if the loft law had been enacted in 2008, our business would still be on the south side.

But, we were recently -- we were forced to relocate our print shop to Long Island City.

And we understand and embrace the need for affordable manufacturing and commercial spaces, as we share our space with a manufacturer -- furniture manufacturer that has been there for four decades.

40 years.

And the landlord for that commercial space is not renewing the lease for the furniture space, and the rent is going up and up and up.

And, if you're a small-business owner, you are running the numbers: The cost of moving. The deposit of a new place. The cost of missed contracts during the move.

And, this new landlord is looking at converting the space to WeWork.

Quite honestly, I don't know what we'll do if we can't afford to keep it anymore.

And, so, I just want to push back on the equivalence of loft tenants and the destruction of

manufacturing, since I have seen so many loft tenants lose their homes when landlords talk about industry.

And then, as soon as the buildings are emptied, they get flipped to another owner and just, immediately, developed as luxury.

So, since this new developer purchased our place last year, it has been nearly emptied, using all the same leverage points that displaced so many of New York affordable-housing communities.

And the only reason that the building is not luxury right now, the only building -- the only reason it's not fully empty, is because of the loft law.

The only reason I can still live and work in Brooklyn is because of the tenant protections

I receive through the loft law.

And so --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, I'm going to ask you to wrap up, just because --

CHRISTINE MALDEN (ph.): I would like to say thank you.

The Bloomberg exclusions -- passing the loft law as it is now, and removing the Bloomberg exclusions, would remove a barrier that pits tenants

and industry against each other. 1 And I thank you for listening. 2 I will submit my testimony. 3 And then, also, I would be happy to talk to 4 you guys with questions and (indiscernible). 5 6 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay, and we appreciate 7 the testimony. And we note that there are many other loft 8 9 tenants who signed up -- who arrived at the beginning and signed up. 10 11 We are going to -- we will get back to 12 additional panels on this topic, and -- but I'm 13 going to hold questions and comments until we've heard from a few more of the loft tenants, if that's 14 15 okay, at least my own. 16 But, obviously, if my panel mates want to? 17 SENATOR SALAZAR: No, that's fine. 18 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 19 So we'll -- thank you all for your testimony. 20 CHRISTINE MALDEN (ph.): Thank you. 21 ALLISON DELL: Thank you. 22 [Applause.] 23 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next up, is Anthony Drummond here? 24 25 In the back.

1 Come on down.

And then after -- next up after that, we're going to have Laura Mascuch.

ANTHONY DRUMMOND: Thank you very much.

Senator, my name is Anthony Drummond.

I am Brooklyn Borough President Eric Adams' housing policy analyst.

In addition, I co-chair the Mitchell-Lama
Task Force on his behalf.

So I'll be reading the prepared remarks on his behalf, so I'll begin.

"My name is Eric L. Adams, and I am Brooklyn borough president -- and I am Brooklyn's borough president, representing more than 2.6 million residents who call this borough "home."

"I would like to thank State

Senator Brian Kavanagh, Chair of the Standing

Committee on Housing, Construction, and Community

Development, for holding this hearing on rent

regulations and tenant protection in Brooklyn, the

epicenter of an affordable-housing crisis that

threatens our families' future.

"Also -- I also thank State
Senator Zellnor Myrie for hosting us here in his
district at Medgar Evers College.

"The provision and protection of affordable housing continues to be the most important issue facing New Yorkers all across the city and within the borough of Brooklyn.

"Brooklyn is one of the fastest-growing communities in the New York City metropolitan area, and the ongoing Brooklyn renaissance has ushered in extraordinary changes and land-use pressures that continue to manifest today.

"Unfortunately, Brooklyn's success has led to the displacements of longtime residents who can no longer afford to live in the neighborhoods where they grew up or raised families.

"According to a recent Kiplinger study, Brooklyn has the fourth most-expensive cost of living in the nation, at 82 percent above the average cost.

"Our borough is home to neighborhoods experiencing the highest rates of rent increases over the last decade, and every community is now considered desirable.

"We have a crisis of affordability at a wide range of levels, from extremely low, to middle income, and we have a responsibility to solve the crisis for every level.

"As borough president, I have committed 2 myself to addressing the borough's 3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

affordable-housing crisis, due to creation and preservation of much-needed affordable-housing units for low- to middle-income Brooklynites.

"To date, I have allocated more than \$20 million in capital funding to preserve or build thousands of units since 2014.

"In addition, I launched the Faith-Based Development Initiative which connects houses of worship with capital funding and technical support that is used to help construct affordable housing.

"This policy initiative has been replicated, even by Mayor Bill de Blasio, across our city.

"It is imperative that we maintain and strengthen our rent-regulation laws so we do not lose the millions of existing affordable-housing units, which would further extend the loss of families being displaced.

"Advance in legislation and policies being heard today are integral in ensuring that families can remain in their affordable housing, and also make certain that more affordable housing is added to our growing city.

"There are a number of worthy policies that

are currently up for discussion in our public discourse, and I would like to speak on a few of them in this testimony.

"For example, I have been supportive of the House Our Future NY campaign's recommendation to build 24,000 new apartments, and preserve at least 6,000 more, for homeless families and individuals.

"We need to fully fund and create
20,000 units of supportive housing, and, by doing
so, help break the cycle of homelessness, by pairing
permanent housing with on-site services for people
with a history of substance abuse and/or who have
mental and physical health needs.

"We cannot turn our backs on our most vulnerable citizens just because they may be down on their luck.

"I fully support the home stability support
(HSS) legislation, which will provide a new
statewide rent supplement for low-income families
and individuals who are facing eviction,
homelessness, or loss of housing due to domestic
violence or hazardous conditions.

"Our homelessness crisis did not appear overnight, and it will not disappear without an all-in innovative strategy that introduces stability

into a highly-unstable situation for hundreds of thousands of New York's childrens and families.

"One of our strongest tools for preventing homelessness is to make sure that people and families are able to stay in their homes.

"HSS will help accomplish this by simplifying our opaque subsidy structure, to ensure those in greatest needs have the easiest path to safe and secure affordable housing.

"I fully support legislation to end vacant" -- "vacancy decontrol, which allows landlords to permanently deregulate apartments once the rent reaches \$2,733 a month and the current occupant leaves the unit.

"We have lost far too many units of affordable housing because of this legal loophole.

"In addition, let's repeal preferential rents and align rents to New York City's Rent Skyline's Board policies.

"Some 266,000 families in New York City have preferential rent, meaning, that they may be one lease away from eviction if preferential rent is revoked.

"We need to do away with this policy, as this is a quick way to force longtime tenants out of

their homes.

"I also support, and ask the state

Legislature, to pass good-cause eviction legislation
in order to bring renter rights to tenants in

smaller buildings and in manufactured-home
communities.

"Additionally, we should reform the four-year look-back rule for investigating rent-overcharge complaints, by changing the look-back period to six years, and providing exceptions to the rule, so that tenants can hold landlords accountable to following the rent-regulation law.

"There is much more for us to do together.

"In addition to the measures I just referenced, I ask this Committee to continue to examine how we can encumber rent-burdened households in the lottery process.

"There are too many New Yorkers who are paying higher rent than what they would pay if they were awarded units through the lottery process, yet tens of thousands of potential applicants are disqualified because they do not earn enough income to apply.

"This challenge obstructs our ability to reduce rent burden.

"It also" -- "it is also long overdue that the state Legislature repeals the Urstadt Law.

"New York City should have control of its own rent-regulated housing stock.

"Finally, perhaps most importantly, I urge my colleagues in Albany to work with my administration and housing-right advocates to get the State's full cooperation and collaboration on a realtime, transparency, tracking mechanism of our rent-regulated housing stock.

"You cannot begin to combat a crisis without fully visualizing its magnitude and analyzing the various factors that help or hinder.

"Our housing regulatory apparatus is disjointed and passive in combating this crisis.

"There is limited interagency collaboration, minimal proactive intervention, and outdated technology infrastructure to keep track of it all.

"For years I have been advocating for a CompStat for affordable housing, what I have termed "housing stat," that could visualize, in realtime, all the available data impacting the potential for eviction and vacancies, which could then guide investigators and lawyers and triage in buildings at risk.

"We need to be able to highlight at-risk 1 affordable units in bright red, if necessary, and do 2 whatever we can to save them. 3 "We have received support from the New York 4 5 City Department of Housing, Preservation, and 6 Development (HPD), and our New York State Unified 7 Court System, but, the New York State Department of Housing and Community Renewal (DHCR) continues to be 8 a roadblock in our efforts. 9 "I want to thank the Chair and members of 10 11 this Committee for hosting this hearing in Brooklyn, 12 and allowing me to address you on this important 13 issue. 14 "I know this year has been an active and busy 15 one for the body. 16 "It is my hope that these actions make it 17 through this legislative session. 18 "Thank you for your time." 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you for your 20 testimony --21 ANTHONY DRUMMOND: Thank you. 22 SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- and thank you to the 23 borough president.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Any questions?

ANTHONY DRUMMOND: All right. Thank you.

24

25

Thank you so much for being here. 1 ANTHONY DRUMMOND: Thank you. 2 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next up we're going to 3 have Laura Mascuch and Jackie Del Valle and 4 Emily Mock, if they're all still here. 5 Following that we will have Matthew Berman 6 7 and Nancy Sher and Phara Souffrant, if I'm saying that properly. 8 9 LAURA MASCUCH: Good evening. My name is Laura Mascuch. 10 11 I'm the executive director of the Supportive 12 Housing Network of New York. 13 We are a 30-year-old membership organization 14 of over 200 non-profits that own and operate 15 52,000 units of supportive housing through New York 16 State, 32,000 of which are in the city. 17 And I'm here tonight to talk about 18 legislation particular to supportive housing. 19 As you know, supportive housing is permanent 20 housing with on-site support services to help 21 individuals and families and youth and veterans that 22 are experiencing chronic homelessness, return to the 23 community with on-site support services. There are two models: 24 25 One where, a single site, where services are

provided on-site;

And then there's a second model called the "scattered-site model," where non-profits rent apartments in the community, and the services are brought into the apartment to help the individual or family really reintegrate and stabilize.

And I want to thank Senator Kavanagh for sponsoring and advancing a bill, 03703, this session, that would provide rent stabilization for non-profit housing providers for new scattered-site apartments.

Currently, non-profits lease rent-stabilized apartments on behalf of vulnerable tenants, and these scattered-site apartments are temporarily -- temporarily lose their rent-stabilization status.

Landlords are able to charge significantly higher rents to the non-profits, and are able to effectively displace tenants through non-renewal of leases after sometimes as little as one year.

This loophole results in significantly higher costs to provide housing for the most vulnerable, and significant trauma to an already fragile tenant when they need to move apartments on a continuous basis.

The 14,000 existing scattered-site apartments

in the city are in grave danger due to unregulated rent increases and frequent non-renewal of leases, which are, effectively, evictions of vulnerable tenants without cause.

Further, these apartments are in danger of being lost permanently to rent stabilization, because it is in the landlord's realm for them to go back and register the apartment once a non-profit is no longer renting it.

The system for ensuring that that happens, as you can imagine, is very -- not very robust, and landlords, really, it's the responsibility of them to do it. And once they're incentivized to rent higher rents, they're not going to really go back into rent stabilization.

So the best safeguard against this risk would be to ensure units do not exit rent stabilization in the first place.

While the current proposed legislation will ensure future non-profit scatter-site contracts remain under rent stabilization, we offer two friendly amendments, which we have attached.

One is, to extend it to existing units upon lease renewal;

And the second, for it to apply to supportive

1 housing scattered-site providers, providing permanent housing with services to formerly homeless 2 or vulnerable residents with disabilities. 3 Thank you for this opportunity to testify. 4 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 5 6 [Applause.] EMILY MOCK: Good afternoon -- or, good 7 evening. 8 9 My name is Emily Mock. I'm a tenant organizer with CAAAV, organizing 10 11 Asian communities. 12 I'm speaking today on behalf of the Chinatown 13 Tenants Union, which is a member of the Housing Justice for All Coalition. 14 15 CAAAV has been working since 1986 to build 16 grassroots community power across diverse poor and 17 working-class Asian immigrant and refugee communities in New York City. 18 19 I'm here today, with many allies, to call for 20 passage of all nine tenant bills. 21 Secure housing is an economic issue, a 22 physical and mental-health issue, a family issue, an 23 education issue, a language-justice issue, a

As a working-class immigrant community

racial-equity issue.

24

25

limited by language access, Chinatown has faced tremendous gentrification and displacement.

Tenants in our neighborhood are being harassed and forced from their homes.

Every day our members face the stress of landlord harassment, rising rents, unsafe construction, frivolous lawsuits, and the loss of our community.

Chinatown Tenants have always fought, and we always will, because our community, our culture, our elders, our youth, are being attacked by the drive for profit.

Your constituents cannot wait another month, another year, or another election cycle to secure rights and protections.

The Chinatown Tenants Union works with tenants to organize associations in their buildings and partner with legal services to fight bad landlords.

In Chinatown, it is obvious that forcing out rent-stabilized tenants is not an unusual occurrence. It is, in fact, a well-documented business practice.

Predatory equity landlords buy rent-stabilized buildings in our neighborhood and

strategically make changes to force old tenants to leave and deregulate units.

Then they make enormous profits by renting those apartments to young professionals who can afford rents of 3,000 a month and up.

The REBNY representative, I heard him say something, like, that all New Yorkers should support values such as the production of rental units.

The production of rental units, I think you agree with me, is not a value, but it is something that REBNY values and landlords value.

The 20 percent vacancy bonus incentivizes landlords to kick out longtime tenants so that they can increase the legal rent for rent-stabilized units.

This past winter, while door-knocking in over a dozen Chinatown tenements, we visited over -- or, I'm sorry, in Chinatown tenements, we visited over a dozen buildings without adequate heat and hot water, sometimes for as long as 20 months.

In many of these buildings we heard a similar story.

Landlords were bringing in new tenants, signing them on to leases, and not telling them that the building doesn't have heat and hot water.

So these new tenants who expect functioning utilities get frustrated in a month, three months, they move out.

The landlord has another opportunity to increase the rent by 20 percent.

This is a business practice that we see all over Chinatown and in many other neighborhoods.

The 20 percent increase, of course, brings the unit closer and closer to deregulation.

The vacancy decontrol rule incentivizes landlords to increase rents past the 2,733 cap so they can make more money at market rate.

I want to talk very specifically about how MCI rent-increase applications have impacted our neighborhood.

Motivated by the opportunity to increase legal rents, landlords conduct unnecessary major construction, like roofing, facade work, facial-recognition intercoms, and ignore the basic repair needs of tenants. Then the cost of major construction are directed back at tenants.

A few case studies.

At 135 Eldridge Street, one of our tenant leaders, Ms. Chen, you heard from her earlier, the landlord, Ari Cohen & Associates has claimed

\$667,639 in costs for two separate MCI applications.

If approved by DHCR in full, this would mean a rent increase of approximately \$227.92 per apartment per month.

For context, rent-stabilized tenants in this building are paying between, approximately, 500 and 1500 dollars a month.

This means the tenants face an increase of anywhere from 45 to 15 percent of their current rent.

At 123 Madison Street, the same landlord, Ari Cohen & Associates, filed four separate MCI applications.

In total, these applications claimed \$207,425.62 of construction costs, and if approved in full, would have rent-stabilized rents increased by \$235.85 a month.

In each of these buildings, the process of opposing MCI applications is very challenging for tenants to navigate, even with support from lawyers and organizers.

There is a whole industry built around real estate, from lawyers, to property management, to lobbies, that mechanizes landlords' MCI applications.

We often say in the Chinatown Tenants Union that landlords have all kinds of tactics. They gain more experience at how to be landlords.

But tenants consistently want safe and secure housing.

This landlord, Ari Cohen & Associates, owns 94 buildings, and has initiated similar construction in MCI rent-increase applications in buildings across the neighborhood.

This demonstrates that MCI rent increases are a tactic used strategically by predatory equity landlords.

The MCI program is not being used by small landlords to maintain old and dilapidated buildings. It is used by the predatory equity landlords as a tactic to deregulate rent-stabilized apartments and increase the profit value of residential buildings.

The real estate lobby parades supposed mom-and-pop landlords to have you believe that those who own capital for the sake of profit are working-class New Yorkers, but that's not true.

The average portfolio size is 21 buildings, and according to the RPIE statements, 95 percent of landlords make money from their rent-stabilized buildings; meanwhile, tenants are rent-burdened to

an extreme degree. 1 The MCI rent-increase program is deeply, 2 structurally flawed and cannot be reformed. 3 Reform would cause displacement because the 4 5 MCI program is fundamentally ripe for abuse. I want to be very clear that the MCIs 6 function as an incentive to not maintain buildings. 7 In Chinatown we know that MCI and IAI 8 9 construction is shoddy. 10 We know that landlords misreport and 11 exaggerate the cost of these so-called 12 "improvements." 13 We know that getting an MCI means many low-income households who don't qualify for DRIE and 14 SCRIE are forced out of their homes. 15 16 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Reluctantly, I'm going to 17 ask you to wrap up. EMILY MOCK: Okay. 18 19 How do we know that landlords can't afford to 20 maintain their property if they don't open their 21 books? 22 Why aren't small and struggling landlords using J-15 tax -- -51 tax abatements and HPD's Green 23 24 Housing Preservation Program?

By continuing to incentivize MCI rent

25

1 increases, and allow predatory equity landlords to abuse this loophole, the State is actually 2 compromising the efficacy of J-51 and JHPP? 3 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Again, just in fairness, 4 I'm going to ask you to (indiscernible). 5 6 EMILY MOCK: Okay. 7 I'm going to have --SENATOR KAVANAGH: You can submit the rest of 8 9 your testimony, if you would. 10 EMILY MOCK: Okay. 11 Thank you. 12 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you very much. 13 JACKIIE DEL VALLE: Can you hear me? 14 Yes. 15 Good evening. 16 My name is Jackie Del Valle, and I work at 17 the community development project of the Urban Justice Center as the stabilizing NYC coordinator. 18 The community development project (CDP) at 19 20 the Urban Justice Center was formed in 21 September 2001 to strengthen the impact of 22 grassroots organizations in New York City's 23 low-income and other excluded communities by winning

legal cases, publishing community-driven research

reports, assisting with the formation of new

24

25

community organizations, and providing technical and transactional assistance in support of their work towards social justice.

Stabilizing the NYC is a New York City-wide coalition formed in 2013 to fight the depletion of affordable housing in New York City at the hand of predatory landlords.

Alongside CDP, the Stabilizing (indiscernible) Coalition is made up of 16 community-based organizations and housing-advocacy organizations.

UHAB, our work combines organizing and legal resources into a citywide network to help tenants take their predatory equity landlords to task for patch-up repairs, bogus eviction cases, unfair illegal rent increases, and affirmative action.

Many of our members are here now or were here earlier.

It's been a long day, which -- yeah, was started out very excitingly at a press conference at Ebbets Field. And we marched through the, I guess, (indiscernible) folks, and are here now.

So I want to say that CDP and Stabilizing (indiscernible) support the entire universal rent-control platform.

New York State's homeless population, I don't need to tell you, but it's, you know, soaring above 89,000 people.

And our service budget is -- nears \$2 billion.

And we really urge the Senate to pass all nine bills, and these bills will strengthen tenant protections, stem sharp rent hikes, and meaningfully address many of abuses that our clients and partners face.

Our weak rent laws have been the blood in the water for big investment for too long.

When private-equity companies began buying up large portfolios all over the five boroughs in the mid-2000s, their promotional brochures boasted the ease in which long-term tenants could get evicted in order to bring in new tenants, paying two, three, and four times as much rent.

This uber speculation created a huge housing bubble, which crashed, and left hundreds of tenants in foreclosed and deteriorating buildings with no one taking responsibility for their upkeep.

Steve Croman, Moshe Piller, R.A. Cohen, Pinnacle, Blackstone, Vantage, Trump.

The New York City real estate industry is

fueled by hedge fund and private equity, and is led by very nasty developers and speculators.

Lessons were not learned with the crash of 2008, and foreign and dark money continues to pour into our housing market, and, well, to New York State Legislature.

We all know in this room that the reason that the rent laws have been weakened, and continue to have been weakened --

I've been doing this work for almost 20 years, and every four years it gets worse and worse.

-- it's because of all the real estate money that's gone into Albany.

And I actually applaud our senators up here now, and I'm real excited for the new change that's coming.

[Applause.]

JACKIIE DEL VALLE: You know, I walked in and I was, like, wow, this really may be a new day.

Like, our time is here.

There's, like -- and it's long overdue.

It's time to protect tenants, stop the loss of affordable housing, and the destabilization of our communities.

Tenants are mobilizing in huge numbers, and we need to listen to them.

Walking in here, and somebody I hadn't seen in a few years, was, like, Oh, so -- so what's the ask now? You're going to index it higher?

And, we're, like, no, that is off the table.

We're repealing vacancy control, we're eliminating MCIs, we're eliminating IAIs.

So there's major reforms on the table that we're really excited about.

And, in particular, I want to take a couple of minutes to talk about MCI increases.

The current way that they are, they allow corporate landlords and predatory equity firms, anyone to apply for rent increases, even though many of these landlords are in a sound financial position and could afford necessary capital improvements without the MCI increases.

It's still a very valuable and lucrative business to own rent-regulated properties in New York City, and they do not need the MCIs.

And all it's doing is fueling speculation, leading to this neglect and harassment.

The reason that these buildings get to the place where they need the MCIs is because the

landlords deliberately choose to neglect their properties, so that they can create this situation, and keep passing on the costs to tenants, who, as was stated I think by Senator Krueger, it's not like they're getting stock in these companies.

The landlords are still keeping all the profits from there.

Like I said, I've been an organizer close to 20 years.

I remember when Senator Krueger was first elected, and it was the first kind of feeling that maybe there's going to be some pro-tenant people up in Albany.

I was there, and I even took time off my job to campaign, to make sure that the Senate flipped that first time, what was it, eight or nine years ago, and then there was a coup.

That was crazy.

We had the IDC, which you guys put an end to.

[Applause.]

JACKIIE DEL VALLE: So I'm really -- it's a sign that Albany is evolving into the progressive government, committed to its constituents, and not just the lobbyists for the rich and powerful.

And I thank you.

1 SENATOR KAVANAGH: For the record, it was 11 years ago. 2 3 Thank you. [Applause.] 4 5 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Any questions for this 6 panel? 7 Okay. Again, we really appreciate your patience, 8 9 and thank you for your testimony. 10 And we'll follow up about the amendments to 11 the bill, but we appreciate your support. 12 Next, as I mentioned, we have Matthew Berman 13 and Nancy Sher. And I understand that Sarah Souffrant has 14 15 left. 16 So, I'm going to add to -- I'm going to ask, 17 Alicia Boyd, if you're here? OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: No. 18 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay. 20 And let me get another. 21 Is Frederick Johnson here? 22 Okay. So, Frederick Johnson, you're up as 23 well. 24 MATTHEW BERMAN: This is Ms. Sher. She's 25 going to go first.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Welcome.

NANCY SHER: Hi.

Thanks again for convening this really important forum.

My name is Nancy Sher.

I live at 125 Court Street, which is a Two Trees, 421a, 8020, development, that requires all the apartments should be rent-stabilized for the duration of their -- of their tax exemption. They have a 25-year tax exemption.

But you've heard my story before.

You know, it's -- it has many faces, many voices; it comes in different sizes and different colors; and you've heard it over and over and over again.

I know that you haven't done much with 421a, but it, you know, intersects with rent stabilization.

So I'm just going to give you some highlights and facts of 125 Court Street, and everything I say is -- has evidence to back it up. Nothing is just an allegation.

As of December 2015, 10 years after the building opened, they had not qualified for the 421a tax exemption, yet received \$10 million.

The first lease is not a rent-stabilized lease.

They came up with a fraud scheme, using the preferential rent, and they came up with this absurd legal rent.

And so whenever you want to renew, they could charge you anywhere from 3,000 to 10,000.

My first legal rent was 9,175.

And it drove a lot of people out, you know, involuntarily.

And, in 2001 and '12, HPD sent them a memo each year, telling them that their DHCR registrations were non-compliant, that their rents were above the HPD-approved, and that 256 units were listed as exempt.

Did they change them? No.

But they did change them in September of 2003.

I suspect a crony of theirs at DHCR gave them a heads-up, because their intention was to change 2,568 rent registrations for 321 units over an 8-year period.

That's the period they did their fraud scheme.

According to the New York State Public

Service Commission, they -- the way they metered for electricity is illegal.

They collect 100 percent of tax benefits on non-residential space when the law limits them to 12 1/2 percent.

At the time they were built, they were the largest non-union construction in the history of New York.

They've never submitted a notarized construction cost.

And we want to know, really, how much it cost.

And the main contractor on it was 30 Main Street, which is just Two Trees; so you had the developer and the contractor.

Let's see.

Oh, and I'm just going to go over this briefly.

The building, on first look, appears -- makes a good first impression, it really does. But the truth of the matter is, the construction and fixtures are quite substandard.

I lived in an apartment with my children, where the floors buckled up like this. There was mold -- an assortment of mold underneath, some of it

toxic. And it stayed that way for five years. They never fixed it.

And HPD came and gave it four C violations.

C violations are emergency, correct in 24 hours.

Of course they didn't.

Now I'm in my eighth year of litigation with Two Trees. And I got -- the appellate -- I appealed the housing court's decision with their \$100,000 judgment, and went to the appellate term.

The appellate term reversed housing court and held Two Trees in noncompliance with the rent-registration law, that they had submitted falsified registrations.

I've not been able to find a lawyer who will represent me.

They feel the case is so soiled by Two Trees, by, you know, a cascade of mediocre lawyers; nobody wants to touch it.

So when I went to the judge to ask him for additional time, he said, No. You'll go pro se.

So, there I am, I'm going to go pro se against Rosenberg & Estis representing Two Trees.

I said to the judge, Do you have any concern that my due-process rights are in jeopardy?

1 "Nope." And -- but I invite you all to come because 2 3 you haven't seen this match-up since the glory day of the coliseum. 4 It's on --5 [Laughter.] 6 7 NANCY SHER: -- it's on -- it's on Tuesday, Room 403, at 9:30, is when my trial starts. 8 9 So my recommendations are: To impose significant and meaningful monetary 10 11 penalties to the extent that a developer and landlord might think twice before degrading the law. 12 13 It must be enforceable and carry the message, we are all equal under the law. 14 15 Huge fines, the kind that say "ouch." 16 Enforce the law, because there is -- it's 17 MIA. 18 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And I'm going to ask 19 you -- just, in fairness to everybody, I'm going to 20 ask you to wrap. 21 I appreciate (indiscernible). 22 And we will -- I see you have a document. We will also take it for the record. 23 NANCY SHER: Well, you know -- okay. 24 It's -- it's, the enforcement is MIA. 25

```
1
               So I really encourage to you think about
        making triple damages, apply to class-action suits,
 2
        because there's just no way.
 3
               Everybody can't go like me up against, you
 4
        know, this (indiscernible) -- (indiscernible), you
 5
        know.
 6
 7
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: We appreciate it.
               I'm going to ask --
 8
 9
               NANCY SHER: So is that a possibility you'd
        ever think about?
10
11
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask the next
12
        person to testify --
13
               NANCY SHER: Oh, okay.
14
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- and then people on
15
        the --
16
               NANCY SHER: Okay.
17
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- I don't want to
18
        comment.
19
               Appreciate it.
20
               Sir.
21
                  [Applause.]
22
               MATTHEW BERMAN: Thank you, Senator Kavanagh.
               My name is -- and members of the Committee.
23
24
               My name is Matthew Berman. I'm a civil
25
        rights class-action lawyer.
```

My job is remediating racial discrimination, disability discrimination, and now, unfortunately, housing discrimination and displacements.

The game is rigged against tenants, but the good news is, you guys make the rules and they have to play by it, and you have the power to change to the rules.

I'd like to engage Senator Salazar because she mentioned the ProPublica piece.

That's the genesis of a lot of the reason why I'm here today, because ProPublica exposed the fact that many of the city's most prominent realty companies are flouting the rules. Many of them have not registered their units as they are required to do.

Ms. Sher was featured in the ProPublica series of articles because she lived in the Two Trees building, which is a 421a building.

That means that building was made with your money, with the people's money.

In fact, Two Trees got the property from the $\mbox{\footnote{TDC}}\,.$

Okay?

They built -- they built up the property and constructed the property using public funds that

were obtained through public bond offerings.

Then they collected fees from constructing the property, from managing the property as the managing agent, and from their equity interest in owning the property, and all of this is unremediable by the tenants because there's no teeth in the law.

The landlord can get away with not registering, and there's nothing anyone can do about it.

The political bodies that are in charge of enforcement of the laws are unable or unwilling to do so.

DHCR has custody of the registrations. They keep them secret, no one can get them. There's no transparency.

A tenant has to apply for their own individual rent history, and even then they have to fight for it. They sometimes have to submit a FOIL request. They can't get information about the rest of the buildings.

Therefore, what lawyer is going to take their case?

Okay?

Like, there's no -- there's no ability for these tenants to get representation to fight against

the well-heeled, well-represented landlords.

We've got to even the field.

So you have a number of bills that are presently before the Committee, many of them have substantial merit and will go a certain degree towards fixing the problem.

But you've also got existing laws that you can improve, and I'm here to tell you how I think you can do it.

A lot of the comments that I'm making today are echoed in the statements you've heard previously from the Legal Aid attorneys and from the borough president's office.

Would I say the number-one and number-two things are:

Change the look-back period.

Okay?

That four-year period is not enough.

In New York State, a breach-of-contract action can be brought within six years.

Leases are contracts. Why not have the same statutes of limitations?

Don't leave it to DHR.

An overcharge brought before DHR, there's very little they can do.

Tenants can go to the court system if they're empowered to do so, and if they can get representation.

Another issue that's been raised is the vacancy increase.

That is what is providing the incentive for the landlords because, they know, that if they can get away with -- you know, you've heard about money laundering?

They're apartment laundering, because if they can get away with faking the registrations for four years, they are home-free.

Okay?

They have effectively deregulated behind your back, without your permission, without your approval; without anyone's approval.

It's unlawful, it needs to be stopped.

So you've got to end the vacancy increase of 20 percent.

You're got to change the look-back period.

And there's something else very important that you can do to equalize the playing field, and that's to allow class-action lawyers to sue under New York law, without waiving their tenants' rights to treble damages under overcharge law.

Right now, an individual tenant can bring a suit, if they can find a lawyer, to bring an overcharge claim, but it's almost impossible for them to gather the information to prove their case because there's no transparency.

Even if they can get a law, they have to go one unit at a time. They have to fight their way through the Supreme Court, which could take eight years for one case.

Let us bring class-actions.

We can't do it.

Why?

Because New York State's class-action law prohibits a class-action seeking penalties.

They have to waive their right to triple damages, which means there's no incentive for the lawyers to step in and to try to remediate building-wide.

There's a -- it's impossible for us to do that.

So please empower the lawyers to help the tenants to fix it.

And if you empower some of us, believe me, it's going to be monkey see, monkey do, there's going to be a legion of attorneys jumping in to fix

it.

And the landlords are not afraid of DHR, but they're afraid of us if you give us the power to fix it.

[Applause.]

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

MATTHEW BERMAN: So --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I am going -- every clap is somebody else not testifying.

So we would appreciate (indiscernible) --

MATTHEW BERMAN: So I'm going make it quick.

You know, I've submitted my testimony in writing for the benefit the Committee.

I'd encourage you to provide the tenants with the private right of action, to be able to sue, to force the landlord to file the registrations correctly.

Right now, they can't do that.

And there's no damages (making air-quotes motion) under the law for having a wrong registration.

So I would suggest a statutory award to a tenant who prevails in the case, along with legal fees if they're successful, to even the playing field.

And, importantly, I think you've heard a number of stories where tenants are afraid come forward.

We have to change the law to protect them.

You know, you've got a whole body of law. It covers the topics of race discrimination, sexual harassment, hostile work environments.

There's a well-developed body of law which provides a means to protect people who are fearful of coming forward.

Let's use those same provisions as part of tenant-protection law, and enshrine it in

New York State law, so that tenants cannot be retaliated against, they can't be singled out for a non-renewal of a lease, they can't be blacklisted in a private database used by landlords, that if you sue to assert your rights, even if you win, sorry, we won't rent to you, you're a troublemaker.

We have to end that process.

So I would suggest we incorporate, by reference, the provisions in the New York State

Human Rights Law, to put it into the tenant-protection law that you guys are working on, and to declare tenants are a protected class, they are protected from retaliation.

370 1 The same way someone complaining that their boss sexually harassed them, let them be protected. 2 3 Thank you all for your diligence, commitment, to this issue. 4 5 I appreciate your time today. 6 [Applause.] 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you very much. ALICIA BOYD: Hello. 8 My name is Alicia Boyd, and I represent the 9 Movement to Protect the People, Ban Brooklyn 10 11 Anti-Gentrification Network, and FLAC (Flower Lovers 12 against Corruption). We are a grassroots organization that's 13 14 located right here in this community. 15 And I just want to start out by saying that, 16 I'm a homeowner, and yet I fight for tenants, and 17 the reason why I fight for tenants is for two 18 reasons. 19 Once, I was too a tenant, and I believe the 20 tenants are like a tree; they are the roots of a 21 tree. 22 Without them, we crumble. 23 95 percent of the people in my community are

tenants, and so when my organization fights, we fight for everyone.

24

25

1 0

Now, back in the 1990s, I was a rent-stabilized tenant, and I saw the legislation, I saw our elected officials start to deregulate and destroy rent stabilization, and all the way back

And so I said, Oh, my God, they are destroying rent stabilization. They're telling us that it's really to make it even, but I know what was being done.

then I knew that this day was going to come.

Now, you did it.

You did it in the 1990s, and you kept on doing it.

So now we're here.

Now, every elected official comes to us and tells us the same thing: Oh, we know how you're being displaced. We know gentrification is hurting us. We know the apartments are affordable and not affordable to you.

But we can't do anything about it, as if you don't create the laws, as if you did not create the scenario that we currently exist in.

You created this scenario.

You decided that the rent-stabilization laws that were intact in the 1990s, which I lived under, which were very strong, needed to breakdown because

1 of all the money that you get; all the money that you get behind closed doors from all the real estate 2 3 industry, as they sit there and put their little fingers all over you and put money in your pockets. 4 And then you come up here with a -- this 5 parade in front of us, "Oh, let me hear what you 6 7 have to say, " as if you don't know what's going on. You know what's going on. 8 9 I know what's going on. They know what's going on. 10 11 We all know what's going on. 12 You are the fault of why we're sitting here. 13 You are the reason why there are, now, 14 90,000 people homeless, because you have chosen to 15 turn your back on the people that you are supposed 16 to be representing.

Now, all of a sudden, you have to this opportunity.

Oh, yes, we have this opportunity, and we're going to change something.

But you know something?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't have a lot of faith in you.

Now, other people do, but I don't, because I've been seeing the dirt.

I can't even get my representative, who sits

right there (indicating), to even meet with me.

We called him up, Hey, Zellnor Myrie, where have you been? You haven't been to a community board yet. We haven't seen you. Why haven't you come? When we call up and ask to meet with you, you don't even respond.

Senator, why can't we speak to our senators?

Senator Parker, why can't we meet with him?

Can't get him.

Why can't we meet with our Assembly person?

Can't get them.

You call him up, Oh, no, I'm not going to speak with you. I'm not going to meet with you.

Here we are, representing the community, and they won't even meet with.

So then we ask, Well, how can we get Senator Myrie to sit down and meet with us?

You can't.

You can't.

So ask him, so I have a question for you, Senator Myrie: Why haven't you sat down and met with us?

We called your office, we asked for an appointment, because we got issues right here.

We've got rent-stabilization buildings that

are about to be deregulated, and it's your
responsibility to address the issue, but you have
not.

But you'll stand up here on a platform and

But you'll stand up here on a platform and act like you're representing us.

But when it comes down to fighting the nitty-gritty where we're at, you don't do anything.

So why haven't you met with us, Senator Zellnor Myrie?

Here it is: silence.

That's what we get from our elected officials: We get silence. And we get talk about how you're going to protect us.

And at the same time, the reason why we're in the shelter system and why our children are in the shelter system, and why genocide is going on, because this is genocide.

When you sit there and take our children and put them inside of these shelter systems, when they have to suffer, that's genocide. That's violence to us.

You create violence on us.

And then you won't even have the decency to meet with us.

But you're coming here and parade, put your

1 names all out, let people clap for you, as if you don't know what's really going on, as if you don't 2 3 know the laws that will protect us, as if you don't know that all the laws that are in place you don't 4 even enforce. 5 6 You got tons of laws that would bring these 7 real estate developers in, but you don't even enforce them. 8 You just want to create a couple of more 9 10 laws. 11 Oh, yeah, let's just create a couple of more 12 laws. 13 Oh, yeah, let's appease the masses. 14 Well, why don't you start enforcing the ones 15 that you've got? 16 Why don't you put in legislation to put some teeth into them, make them accountable? 17 18 Make all of these -- you heard the testimony. 19 This is not the first time you've heard 20 everybody talk about how these landlords just do 21 what the [censor bleep-out] they want to do, but you 22 don't put any teeth to them, do you? 23 You just pass the law.

That's it, pass the law.

But they can violate the law, and you don't

24

25

do anything.

You kn
Becaus
money.

You ge
say, Oh, I do
Oh, ye
You ta
associates.

Zellno
from out of c

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know why?

Because their money is dependent upon your oney.

You get their money, as you are proud and say, Oh, I don't take any developer's money.

Oh, yes, you do.

You take it through all your little associates. They funnel the money in, it comes in.

Zellnor Myrie, 90 percent of his money came from out of community.

You wonder why he does not sit here and meet with us?

You wonder why he does not seat and meet with us?

He doesn't meet with us because 90 percent of his income, 90 percent of his money, came from out of the community, so he doesn't feel like, his community, he has to represent us. He doesn't have to meet with us.

No, you don't.

You can just sit here and parade yourself, and send out your literature that you're doing something for us.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Okay.

```
1
               ALICIA BOYD: Well, let's see what you wind
 2
        up doing.
               My 13 seconds, I've still got 12 seconds.
 3
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: You do indeed.
 4
 5
               ALICIA BOYD: So I'm watching the clock.
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: You do indeed.
 6
 7
               ALICIA BOYD: Okay?
 8
               I've got six now.
               I got five now.
 9
10
               Four.
11
               Now my question has to be asked: When is
12
        Zellnor Myrie going to meet with his constituent
13
        group?
14
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.
15
               Next.
16
               ALICIA BOYD: I'm asking a question.
17
               When is he going to meet with us?
18
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: Excuse me, but we have a
19
        hearing here. And we have another --
20
               ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
21
        us?
22
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- we have another
23
        witness --
24
               ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
25
        us?
```

1	SENATOR KAVANAGH: we have another
2	witness
3	ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
4	us?
5	SENATOR KAVANAGH: We have
6	ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
7	us?
8	I am a resident in this community.
9	He is a representative.
10	I'm asking a very direct question.
11	When is this man going to sit there and meet
12	with his constituents?
13	SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask you to
14	respect the many people who have been sitting here
15	for six hours.
16	ALICIA BOYD: Right, and I'm asking him to
17	respect
18	SENATOR KAVANAGH: You have
19	ALICIA BOYD: the people who have elected
20	him.
21	SENATOR KAVANAGH: You have had an
22	opportunity to speak.
23	We've got
24	ALICIA BOYD: Again, when is he going to meet
25	with us?

1	SENATOR KAVANAGH: dozens of people
2	ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
3	us?
4	SENATOR KAVANAGH: who have been waiting
5	for hours to speak.
6	You have
7	ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
8	us?
9	SENATOR KAVANAGH: You have asked your
10	question.
11	ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
12	us?
13	When is he going to meet with us?
14	SENATOR KAVANAGH: I don't
15	ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
16	us?
17	SENATOR KAVANAGH: I don't want to have to
18	ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
19	us?
20	SENATOR KAVANAGH: I don't want to have to
21	ask you to leave.
22	ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
23	us?
24	SENATOR KAVANAGH: I don't want to have to
2.5	ask you to leave.

```
ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
 1
 2
        us?
 3
               When is he going meet with us?
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask the next
 4
 5
        person to speak.
               ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
 6
 7
        us?
 8
               When is he going to meet with us?
 9
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask -- I'm
        going to have you speak.
10
11
               ALICIA BOYD: (Microphone turned off.)
12
               When is he going to meet with us?
13
               When is he going to meet with us.
14
               FREDERICK JOHNSON: Can you hear me okay?
15
               ALICIA BOYD: When is he going to meet with
16
        us?
17
               When is he going to meet with us?
               FREDERICK JOHNSON: It is on?
18
19
               Okay.
20
               ALICIA BOYD: That's right.
21
               SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask the next
22
        person to speak.
23
               Thank you.
24
               FREDERICK JOHNSON: My name is
        Frederick Johnson.
25
```

Thank you. 1 Dear Senators and Committee members: 2 Today is my birthday. 3 My name is Frederick Johnson. 4 5 I am 55 years young. 6 My wife and I live on Rutland Road between 7 Nostrand and Rogers. My wife's name is on the deed. 8 Jesus owns our home. 9 10 Please vote immediately for S3693, that 11 eliminates rent increases based on major capital 12 improvements. 13 And if this language is not included, please 14 eliminate a landlord's ability to receive payments 15 for an MCI from tenants in perpetuity. 16 This practice is criminal and must stop now. 17 Please vote immediately for S2845, that prohibits a landlord from adjusting the amount of 18 19 preferential rent upon the renewal of a lease. 20 Preferential rents are deceptive, which is 21 also criminal. 22 Please vote immediately for S185, that

Please vote immediately for S185, that eliminates the 20 percent bonus a landlord may add to the cost of rent for an apartment once a renter moves.

23

24

25

There are certain landlords who are motivated
by greed, who have, and are, evicting people only to
get more money.

The 20 percent bonus pays the landlords to

The 20 percent bonus pays the landlords to remove tenants.

For these three bills, whether the Governor says yes or no, if he vetoes, you have the authority, and the responsibility, to override a governor's veto and enact these bills into law.

In closing:

God has a vision for this community.

When I arrived in Brooklyn in 2003, I was homeless.

I'm not homeless now for one reason:

The Constitution of the state of New York opens with these words, "We, the people of the state of New York, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure its blessings, do establish this Constitution."

The only Almighty God is the God of heaven.

He is the God I serve.

He also is the God of the earth.

He is Lord.

He owns everything.

His vision for our community is contained in

1 his word, the Bible. The Bible is about government. It's about 2 God's kingdom. 3 And God's vision is for earth to look like 4 5 heaven. 6 We must change the way that we think, and 7 seek, first, the kingdom of God. Do your part and pass these laws. 8 9 Thank you. Frederick Johnson. 10 11 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 12 [Applause.] 13 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. Questions for this panel? 14 15 Okay. 16 Again, we really appreciate your patience, 17 and the patience of everyone. 18 Thank you very much for your testimony. 19 SENATOR SALAZAR: Happy birthday. 20 SENATOR KAVANAGH: And happy birthday, and, 21 thank you. This is a wonderful way to spend your birthday, I'm sure. 22 23 [Laughter.] 24 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Let me thank you. 25 Next up -- so I'm going to read off folks,

1 and if you are here, please indicate, and the first three that are here that I read off are just going 2 3 to come up. So, first up, Estaban Giron; right? 4 And I'm just going to do these in, you're 5 6 going to notice a certain alphabetical order here. 7 Gretelle Phillips. Is Gretelle Phillips still here? 8 9 Okay, we have Gretelle Phillips. Great. And I'm Jen -- no, I'm to skip to a somewhat 10 11 different topic. 12 So I'm going to ask, Lisa Mathis. 13 Lisa is here. Great. 14 And then, Lynne Timko, who I know is --I believe still in the back. 15 16 Great. 17 Thank you. And I am going to very reluctantly, for 18 19 people who have been patient, I'm gonna -- we've 20 been doing a 6-minute window. 21 With your -- can we do -- can you do 4 1/2-minute increments? 22 23 Okay. 24 With apologies for the people who have been 25 here for a long time, we will take testimony.

I'm going to shorten the period, just to get, because we have many more people who have been waiting, and I want to make sure we get as many of them as we can.

So we're going to go with 4 1/2-minute

So we're going to go with 4 1/2-minute increments from here on in.

And we appreciate, again, your testimony and your patience.

So, why don't you begin.

ESTEBAN GIRON: Good afternoon.

My name is Esteban Giron.

I am a member of the organizing committee of the Crown Heights Tenant Union, and I serve on the board of Tenants PAC.

I'm also a rent-stabilized tenant, and I live less than a block and a half from this auditorium.

Welcome to our neighborhood.

Senator Kavanagh, thank you for your leadership and for bringing this fight to the people today.

You may or may not remember this, but, four years ago, the CHTU was one a handful of groups that spent the night on the lawn in front of the Capitol Building in Albany --

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I do.

ESTEBAN GIRON: -- in support of 1 strengthening the rent laws. 2 3 I remember very clearly that you were only -one of only two legislators who stopped by to greet 4 us that night. 5 6 One was our Assembly Member Walter Mosley, 7 and the other was you. 8 9 10 these years.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It meant so much to us to have that support.

So, again, thank you for sticking with us all

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you.

ESTEBAN GIRON: I would also I like to give a special shutout to our champion, Senator Zellnor Myrie.

Senator, we sent you to Albany to fight for us, and here you are, five months later, bringing us the Senate Housing Committee.

I could go on for hours about how proud we are of you, but since you live just a short walk from here, I will simply say, Welcome home, neighbor.

Crown Heights has been at the epicenter of this housing crisis for half a decade now.

Real estate speculation has doubled, and sometimes tripled, the value of the land that you're sitting on.

My landlord used to own half a dozen buildings within a few blocks radius of here, but now only owns my building, after selling each of those buildings for upwards of three to four times what he paid for them.

These aren't regular market forces at work as landlords would have you believe.

This has all been a carefully crafted plan to systemically empty our thriving neighbor of working-class folks of color.

With the help of our local council member and a mayor and governor who embody the spirit of Tammany Hall, destructive policies, such as mandatory inclusionary housing, have only further accelerated the threat of displacement.

When you leave here, I'd like for you to think about the fact that, upwards of 2500 new luxury units will have -- will be online in this area in the next two years.

That's our reality now.

The loopholes in the rent laws have proven way too tempting to ignore for our greedy landlords.

And along with our City and State, Crown Heights represents nothing less than an all-out

attempt to colonize and ethnically cleanse our community.

I've lived in my current apartment for six years. My rent is currently affordable and doesn't exceed 30 percent of mine and my husband's combined income. But it wasn't always this way.

We spent almost two years in housing court, fighting fraudulent rent overcharges for individual apartment improvements.

We ultimately won because my landlord was using materials from his own chain of hardware stores to make the renovations, but writing receipts as though he had paid retail prices for them.

Our rent was reduced by almost 400 a month, but it was an all-consuming process that up-ended our lives so completely that it resulted in us becoming dedicated volunteer tenant advocates and organizers.

Throughout the process I was appalled at how easy it was to engage in fraudulent renovations and inflate the cost of these improvements.

Earlier today, as I watched these independent contractors take marching orders from their landlord bosses outside, I was reminded that this is a well-developed racket that is not going to go

anywhere without a fight.

Folks often talk about the supposed number -small number of bad-actor landlords who are
defrauding their tenants and raking in profits that
they're not entitled to.

I don't know about the rest of the people in this audience, but I have yet to meet a landlord who could be described as "a good actor" in regards to IAIs.

Sure, there are laws on the books, and an agency, DHCR, that is tasked with oversight, but no amount of funding to that agency can possibly account for enough staffing to adequately oversee such widespread fraud.

The individual apartment improvement system is irreparably broken, and it was landlords, not tenants or legislators, who broke it through abuse and fraud.

They have proven that they don't have the self-control to be trusted with the right to IAIs, and I strongly urge you to revoke that right altogether.

To whom much is given, much is required, and landlords did not rise to meet the challenge of that requirement.

Cut them off before the situation gets worse.

Like a large number of my neighbors, I was once a non-regulated tenant living about a 5-minute walk from here. The conditions that I lived in were unsafe, and affected my health, both mental and physical.

After waking up at my wits' ends one night, surrounded by some very aggressive rodents, and calling 311 in a panic, I found myself wrapped up in close to a year of eviction proceedings that, ultimately, resulted in me losing my apartment.

The fear of retaliation for unregulated tenants is constant and debilitating.

I spoke with a member of the CHC earlier today who really wanted to be here to testify, but was afraid that his landlord would find out, and would retaliate with frivolous court proceedings as they have done before.

Think about that for a moment.

The state Legislature publically appeals to residents of the state to exercise their right to be heard in a public hearing.

And because of a system that, effectively,
makes unregulated tenants second-class citizens, you
won't even be hearing some of the worst stories that

you took the time to come here to listen to.

So if you believe in tenant protection,

I don't see how anyone, in good conscience, could
ignore the right of non-regulated tenants in

New York City.

I urge to you pass good-cause eviction protection.

Most renters in New York State will continue to be subject to the whims of a handful of greedy landlords, otherwise.

And as long as there are two classes of tenants, we are not a progressive state and should stop claiming that mantle altogether.

Until my neighbor can come to a hearing like this without being worried that he will end up being homeless for speaking truth to power, we are not all free and we should stop pretending to be.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

LISA MATHIS: Thank you for the privilege to represent and speak for the tenants throughout the beautiful state of New York.

My name is Lisa Mathis, and I have lived at 80 New York Avenue, an 8-family building in Crown Heights, on and off, for over 40 years.

I'm the child of a New York single mother and civil servant, a product of Brooklyn public school system, a graduate of a New York State private college.

Thomas DiNapoli signs my bi-weekly paycheck, as I'm a court clerk specialist in Kings County Surrogate's Court.

I'm the mother of two adult children who were well educated in the public school systems of Brooklyn, as well as CUNY and SUNY colleges.

My daughter is employed in Albany, New York, and my son is employed in New York -- by New York City.

I say all this to say explain that I am fully invested in this borough, this city, and this state.

I've been voting since 1978, and have trusted my elected officials to operate in the best interests of their constituents who put them in office.

I'm a tenant and an upstanding citizen.

I'm here to say that all nine bills need to be signed.

We need stronger tenant protection to put an end to evictions, to put an end to homelessness, in New York.

I'm especially advocating for the bills to 1 end vacancy decontrol, to end preferential rents, 2 IAIs, and to implement just-cause eviction. 3 GO Management purchased my building in 4 December 2014. 5 6 I grew up in this building. It is indeed my 7 home, my community, my neighborhood. My landlord started harassing the tenants 8 9 before the building was even purchased, and continues to do so nearly five years later. 10 11 GO has inflicted every type of housing 12 harassment. 13 They illegally removed five of the eight apartments from rent stabilization. 14 We went without heat for three winters 15 16 because GO illegally ripped out the boiler. 17 The two other long-term tenants who chose to remain and suffer were my 80-year-old aunt and a 18 65-year-old neighbor. 19 20 We have faced every type of construction 21 harassment: 22 Dust, debris. 23 Removal of staircases, walls, ceilings, mailboxes, and intercoms. 24

Demolition work during all hours of the day,

25

on weekends and even on holidays.

Days without electricity, cooking gas, or running water.

The DOB stop-work orders were issued and immediately ignored.

I showed up for ECV hearings where the landlord didn't show up.

I have met with tenant-harassment prevention task force.

I have attended hearings regarding the boiler at DHCR, as well as proceedings for contempt and housing court brought by HPD.

Why?

Because the current laws make it easy for landlords and developers to consider this as the cost of doing business.

It makes sense because, vacancy decontrol, preferential rents, and IAIs allow them to illegally and arbitrarily jack up the rents and remove the few affordable apartments available.

Pass these bills to stop bad-acting landlords.

I fully understand that the housing markets and demographic of communities change naturally over time.

This is not what is happening in our neighborhoods.

I have had the privilege to volunteer on Saturdays to tutor elementary school students in a Canarsie school.

I was appalled to see signs about busing them from homeless shelters so they would not have to change schools when their families were evicted from their current neighborhood.

I was also told that, in some schools, 40 percent of the students are coming in from homeless shelters.

There are too many working homeless families and individuals with little hope of finding affordable housing.

I would like for my children to be able to afford to live and raise their families in the neighborhood they grew up in.

These laws can help make that happen.

I am saddened to know that my two sister-in-laws, both New York State school teachers for over 25 years, was forced to move out of their Brooklyn apartments.

One sister-in-law, because the preferential rent the new landlord chose to enforce, after

15 years of residency in the building, made her apartment unaffordable.

The other because it was an apartment in a building with less than three tenants, and the landlord just wanted her gone to collect twice the amount of rent.

She was an excellent tenant for over 17 years. She needed the law for just-cause eviction.

Now she commutes three hours a day to come and teach in one of our Brooklyn elementary schools. Her commute used to be 30 minutes.

When one of my judges found out I was coming here tonight to speak, she wanted me to say that she could not afford to live in Brooklyn if she hadn't had a family home.

I was raised on the philosophy to trust, but verify.

Unfortunately, it is now foolhardy to do so because landlords, developers, and greedy investors will not only take advantage of loopholes, but will lie and break laws with impunity for greed and profit.

We, the tenants, need to have protections and viable recourse when they do.

1 Please do not sell your constituents out to these bad actors for their campaign contributions. 2 Now is the time you can get this done. 3 We did our part and elected you. 4 5 Now do your part. Let me trust and believe, not just trust and 6 7 verify. We need these protections to continue to have 8 9 stable, viable communities with great citizens like 10 myself and my family. 11 Therefore, on behalf of all tenants, these 12 bills are necessary, so stand with us and for us. 13 Pass all nine bills so our homes can again be 14 our sanctuaries. 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 16 LISA MATHIS: Thank you. 17 [Applause.] 18 GRETELLE PHILLIPS: Good evening, Senators. 19 My name is Gretelle Phillips. 20 I'm 72 years old. 21 I have lived in Apartment 3-B at 22 8 Rutland Road in the neighborhood of 23 Prospect Lefferts Gardens, Brooklyn, for 39 years. 24 I live there were my husband, 25 Densley Phillips. He is 83 years old.

My landlord is 611 Flatbush Avenue Realty, which is run by greedy landlords, Miriam and William Shasho.

I'm here to tell you about how my landlord has harassed me and my neighbors in effort to decontrol our apartments.

Once they have pushed long-term tenants out, the landlord turns the unit into Airbnbs and market-rate apartments.

They renovate the units and install separate heating and cooling systems for the Airbnb guests and market-rate tenants, which caused our electricity in our apartments to flicker and go out sometimes.

Meanwhile, Densley and I go without heat and hot water.

I had to buy an electric heater. The heater drives up my electric bills.

We also have rodent infestations. I had to get a cat.

Our electrical cords spark and burn due to electrical system shorting out. We worry about a fire.

We have notified the Shashos of these issues.

They often do not respond to our complaints,

and even when they do, their response is delayed or 1 (indiscernible). 2 3 When our stove stopped working, they provided us with a replacement stove, but the replacement 4 stove was infested with mice and roaches. 5 6 William Shasho has asked me many times, when I am moving back to Barbados --7 OFF-CAMERA SPEAKER: You already know what's 8 9 happening. What's the remedy? 10 GRETELLE PHILLIPS: -- and when I am moving 11 to Florida? 12 We have seen our neighbors get pushed out, 13 but this is our home. We have lived there for 14 almost 40 years. 15 We do not want to move. We do not want to be 16 homeless. 17 Thank you. 18 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you very much. 19 Okay. 20 And so I am going to -- it is 8:22. 21 We were supposed to be scheduled by 8:00. 22 There are many people who work in this 23 building that need to leave the building soon. 24 So (indiscernible) I'm going to -- we're 25 going to reduce the amount of time to two minutes

per person, with apologies, so that we can get as 1 2 many people in as we can. I think, Lynne, you're up next. 3 And then I would like to hear -- if -- if --4 5 if people could just come up. If Tyrone McDonald is here, still? 6 7 Perhaps not? Oh, Tyrone McDonald is here. 8 9 Great. And we're going to go back, and I mentioned 10 11 before, but, if Jennifer Weber is here, you will be 12 up next. Jennifer Weber is here. Okay. 13 14 Again, with apologies, we're going to do 15 two minutes, the speed-round. And we'll take any 16 written testimony people have. 17 Go ahead. 18 LYNNE TIMKO: All right. 19 Lynne Timko, 225 East 26th Street, Kips Bay, 20 Manhattan. 21 We've recently been taken over by 22 TriArch Management. 23 There's been a mass exodus from the building. 24 32 people have moved out since January. 25 The landlord is using the full arsenal of

deregulation tools.

The majority of those apartments vacated were already renovated with, like, cheap Home Depot sinks and, you know, like faux granite, and everything, but charging, you know, market rate.

They want now, 4,000 for a studio, 5,000 to 6,000 for a one-bedroom.

We've, literally, been declared luxury (making air-quotes with fingers) overnight.

We've had numerous MCIs.

I bought an elevator.

I bought a boiler.

I had asbestosing (sic).

I bought my own surveillance, where they watch us in the office all day long.

There's no -- it's not security because it doesn't cover any of the areas where something could happen that you would need security.

It spies on us.

And also, too, like, what does -- you know, what does your rent cover?

It should cover basic -- you know, a window, hot water.

And, also, when I moved in, I was charged for a refrigerator, stove, and air conditioner.

1 My air conditioner is from 1964, and, you know, you're still paying for that? 2 You can't even use it because of -- the 3 quality is so bad. 4 And the building really has zero amenities. 5 We've had a handicapped elevator put in that 6 7 goes up one foot, and nobody's allowed to use it unless you pay \$100. 8 9 But we bought it. 10 So it's stuff like that. 11 Everybody's in the same situation. 12 And then, again, to, like, make some 13 penalties for them, like, hit them in their 14 pocketbooks, because that's where their hearts are. 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 16 Next. 17 TYRONE McDONALD: How do you turn this on? It's on? 18 19 Okay, it's on. 20 Right on. 21 Thank you, Senators, for providing me the 22 opportunity to speak. 23 My name is Tyrone McDonald. 24 I'm the government and community relations 25 manager for Neighborhood Housing Services of

Brooklyn, a community-based not-for-profit, that envisions affordable, healthy, safe, and sustainable communities throughout Brooklyn and the city at-large.

We have an office in East Flatbush in Canarsie, and serve residents within Community Board 17 and 18 and surrounding neighborhoods.

Our focus is housing services. That includes home ownership, housing preservation, tenant-support services, foreclosure intervention, just to name a few.

Due to the issue of the lack of affordable housing and subsequent displacement, NHS Brooklyn added tenant-support services to its menu.

The pressing need to assist and guide tenants was overwhelming, which resulted in long waiting lists with many of our partner-based organizations.

During our journey of helping tenants better understand their lease agreements, explaining succession rights, assisting NY -- assisting them with NYC housing-connect applications, helping with rent-freeze applications for Senate -- for seniors and the disabled, preventing evictions, making referrals, we noticed that at least half of our clients needed -- who needed tenant-support services

were living in shelters and temporary housing, desperate for housing any kind.

In 2018, just -- with just one tenant councilor on staff, we served 230 tenants.

Many of these clients have Section 8 or CITYFEPS in our seniors, which point to another pervasive issue: discrimination due to source of income.

New York City is in the midst of a housing catastrophe, not only losing units, but the remaining tenants, many of whom are rent-burdened, spend more than half of their income on housing.

We simply can't build our way out this situation.

We must protect affordable housing by strengthening existing rent laws and closing loopholes responsible for the massive hemorrhaging of rent-stabilized apartments.

We owe it to our families and individuals across the city, and we owe it to ourselves.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you so much.

And thank you to the organizations you're representing, and all your work.

1 Next up. LYNNE TIMKO: I just have one quick sentence. 2 Recently, we were under a J-51 that's 3 expiring. 4 5 SENATOR KAVANAGH: While she's coming up, go ahead. 6 7 LYNNE TIMKO: And they've given the tenants that have been there over 40 years, saying now their 8 apartments will be deregulated. 9 10 SENATOR KAVANAGH: All right, thank you. 11 LYNNE TIMKO: That's it. That was the 12 latest. 13 Thank you. JENNIFER WEBER: Hi. 14 15 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Please begin. 16 We're under tremendous pressure to wrap this 17 up, so go ahead. JENNIFER WEBER: Okay. 18 19 Good evening. 20 I'm Jennifer Weber, and I'm thankful for this 21 opportunity to speak, particularly in this space, as 22 both a CUNY grad myself, and as a CUNY educator of 23 20 years. 24 I'm a New York City, native born, on the

island of Manhattan, and I've lived in lofts in

25

Williamsburg for the last 30 years.

I know and care for many of those who do so also.

I'm now the owner of the loft building where
I live and work, as well as a member of an
organization of loft-building owners, a few of which
might have been here today.

While I'm wearing many hats, I'm speaking today as a citizen, and I'm very concerned about what's going on with this loft-law bill in Albany, and I want to shed some light on the fact that it's not functional, and it matters to more people than meets the eye.

That's my purpose here.

A few months ago, when I was at a public meeting of the New York City Loft Board, I listened as a board member there, there to represent the public, said something that I've heard a number of times before: That the loft law was critical legislation being advanced because it's responsible for keeping the arts and culture and the creative economy alive in New York City.

And then that followed with something, like: Without it, we would lose the defining and vibrant aspects of our city.

And then this met with applause, as is done many times in front of me before, and maybe that same thing has transpired already here today.

That statement makes me very uncomfortable.

First of all, it renders all of my former CUNY art and design students, hundreds of talented and hard-working creatives, anything, but live-work loft beneficiaries, absolutely silent and invisible and irrelevant.

But even more far-reaching, it illustrates how inadvertently we can buy into narratives that validate our acknowledged history of preferential treatment.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm going to ask you to give me one more sentence, and then submit it -JENNIFER WEBER: Okay.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- and we're going to get the rest --

JENNIFER WEBER: We need to be careful not to justify efforts to carry that history forward; that's not progress to me.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: I'm assuming there was a semicolon in the middle of that.

And I $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$ -- with tre -- with tremendous appreciation --

1 JENNIFER WEBER: What I'm requesting here is that, there needs to be a leader in Albany that 2 takes on gathering some data, because the loft law 3 is in a data black hole. 4 5 And it's irresponsible for my party, the 6 Dems, to be advancing policy that isn't based on 7 fact. SENATOR KAVANAGH: We appreciate your 8 9 testimony. And, if you want to submit what you 10 have. 11 And, I'm going to -- so I'm going to read off 12 some names. 13 Is Mark --14 Thank you for your testimony. 15 JENNIFER WEBER: Okay. I'm going to send 16 that in, because it's --17 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yeah, that's fine. Is Mark Gerig here? 18 19 Mateo Cartegena? 20 Victoria Hillstrom -- Hillstom, I believe? 21 And, Sue Yellen. 22 If you could just come up, and we're --23 Sue, I'm told, is not here. 24 Okay. 25 Again, speed-round.

MARK GERIG: Hell. My name is Mark Gering. 1 2 Senators, you've all met me before. 3 I am a founding member of New York City Loft Tenants, since 2011. 4 And I am a former loft tenant, a recently 5 6 former loft tenant, because, although I fought a 7 January 31, 2019, eviction for 10 weeks --You know about my case, you know who I am. 8 My colleagues brought my case up many times 9 over the past few months. 10 11 -- although I fought for 10 weeks to buy 12 time, until the law bill passed, as was promised 13 in -- early in the session, January or February, it 14 hasn't happened. 15 Senator Kavanagh, you've stalled it. 16 Senator Salazar, you've stalled it. 17 And you both promised that you would pass it. 18 Well, I'm gone. I lost my space of 26 years. 19 I spent my last day on August -- on 20 April 14th -- Sunday, April 14th, a month ago, 21 I walked away. 22 I couldn't afford to carry on an appeal. 23 I would have had to pay a \$15,000 bond, and 24 on top of that, I was required to pay a 25 use-and-occupation fee of \$9,000 a month.

1 \$27,000 right up front, \$9,000 thereafter, every month after that. 2 I had to quit. 3 Please pass this bill for the people who are 4 about to be evicted. 5 6 I was in my space for 26 years. I am an artist and crafts person. 7 I will never be able to have a loft space 8 like that again. 9 10 I have been in loft spaces the vast majority 11 of my adult life, because I needed them for my work, 12 to live and work, and to be an artist, and to be a 13 creative contributor to this society. 14 Thank you. 15 Please, please, press ahead and pass this 16 bill. 17 I'm the person that got the axe because this 18 went so slow. 19 SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you. 20 [Applause.] 21 MATEO CARTEGENA: Hi. 22 My name is Mateo Cartegena. 23 I have a lot here. 24 Thank you for having me. 25 Glad I didn't dress up for nothing.

I just want to also urge the support -- urge the passing of all nine tenants' bills --

MARK GERIG: I do too. I was up in Albany on Tuesday.

MATEO CARTEGENA: -- to go to strengthen tenants' power throughout the state, in general.

And, also, I am a loft tenant, so I'm here to also support the passing of the loft-law bill as soon as possible.

We're part of communities of colors that are also being displaced in Brooklyn and elsewhere for the sake of high-rent res development, residential technology, expensive working and office spaces, and otherwise.

We are against communities of working artists and musicians and creators from being displaced from the city and state at an alarming rate because it's becoming too unaffordable to live and work.

(Indiscernible) from downtown Jersey City, which got completely gentrified, I grew up and saw my community completely decimated.

And I've seen that happen in communities here where my family and friends have lived, in New York City, in Brooklyn.

And, years ago I was lucky enough to find a

cheap loft situation with other creative people in District 18, which Senator Salazar proudly represents.

In that place we've been able to have a hub of creativity, but, also, with an ethic behind it, where we've raised money for things, such as Puerto Rico recovery efforts after "Maria," raised money for the Trans Lifeline, for the Correctional Association for New York, for sex-workers' rights and decriminalization efforts, for Make the Road New York, for Churches United for Fair Housing, for Planned Parenthood, and many others.

And without that space, we would not have been able to mobilize people to do any of that.

[Applause.]

MATEO CARTEGENA: Not to mention, that once it's gone, we're going to lose this nexus of creativity that is an important part of our community.

So I ask you to please pass the loft-law cleanup bill.

Thank you.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Next.

VICTORIA HILLSTROM: Good evening,

Senator Kavanagh.

I'm Victoria Hillstrom.

I am your constituent in Tribeca. We're at 385 Greenwich, a/k/a 71 North Moore, you may know us.

Justine Almada, chief of staff for Dan Goradnick, grew up in our lofts.

Her father, Carlos Alamda, Elizabeth (indiscernible) Guttman.

I am here, some of you know our story, some of you don't.

385 Greenwich, a/k/a 71 North Moore, our lofts, since 1982, that we brought up to code with 8 years of full-time workmen.

We own our 28 windows, both of our roofs.

Our lofts are magnificent.

They have been copied at Automat in London, Smith and Mills in our garage, Tinys.

Our landlord, Century 21, Century Realty
12 Cortland Street Corp, decided that they would
mask themselves as kids in a bar, doing
construction.

They masked as a tenant. They caused our ceilings to fall in from improperly installed air conditioning equipment on a roof with no drain.

They illegally subdivided our electrical on

100-year-old lines, so old, that we lost two-thirds of our power.

They cut out all five of our phone lines.

Obstructed our secondary means of egress with a partial petition that presents a known fire hazard. Never passed a full inspection, and started a fire.

Con Ed just found that they illegally subdivided our gas lines too.

They almost killed us and took the surrounding buildings with us.

This is the same tenant in 12 other buildings, Matabrimsic.

That is our story.

What I would like to say, only because I have never met the senator, what I would like to say to you is, our story is very much different than the struggles of the tenants in Brooklyn.

The artist understood the scale and light.

They understood 14-foot ceilings were relevant.

They understood 100-year-old buildings were beautiful, and embraced the industrial design elements that have impacted design and architecture around the world.

1 We have raised the property values in SoHo, Tribeca, and Dumbo through the roof. 2 SENATOR KAVANAGH: With -- with --3 VICTORIA HILLSTROM: And what I would like to 4 5 respectfully --Just a moment, Senator. 6 7 SENATOR KAVANAGH: With apologies, just give 8 me --VICTORIA HILLSTROM: I understand. 9 10 (Indiscernible cross-talking.) 11 SENATOR KAVANAGH: 15 more seconds, because 12 I've got 10 other people. 13 VICTORIA HILLSTROM: What I would like to 14 say, most of all, is that it's my understanding that 15 you are very concerned about the incompatible-use 16 groups. 17 What I would like to express is that, under the 1982 loft laws, many of the courts found that 18 these were de facto multiple dwellings --19 20 One more sentence. 21 -- where the artists became the de facto 22 developer. 23 And, Senator Kavanagh, if you have sincere 24 concerns over the use groups, the artists should be

given the same ability to pull permits to correct

25

violations.

But I would like you to understand that the artists invested in these buildings.

MARK GERIG: That is why I couldn't -VICTORIA HILLSTROM: And this is a very

important law.

MARK GERIG: That's why I could not be qualified for the loft law, and that's why I had to fight so hard, and lost.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And just --

MARK GERIG: That is why.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- okay, I -- again, this is going to be an ongoing conversation, and I do need to let lots of people who work in this building, who are on, overtime and we need to adjourn the hearing.

We are --

VICTORIA HILLSTROM: Yes, I would like to once again say, Senator Kavanagh, that there is no reason that the artists cannot file for permits to correct violations; otherwise, this is a discriminatory practice.

And we will file suit, as my neighbors have at the Tribeca Trust and Friends of the South Street Seaport.

We're afraid of no one.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: And, again, we appreciate everybody's testimony and your patience.

And with respect to the loft law, obviously, it is a conversation to be continued.

As you know, we have broad agreement on almost every element of this bill, and have had so since February.

And we are working -- we've been working on one fairly technical difference of opinion, and the fire department, and some others have some concern about the bill as written.

And we've been trying to address those with the loft tenants for some time now.

But we will continue that conversation.

And we have every person who contacted us, including people who didn't make it here today, we will follow up with you.

And, again, for everybody who has been here all day, I would happily go on further and hear from more of you, but we do really need to get out of this building.

So, thank you all.

We are adjourned.

But thank you very much.

		410
1	And if you have written testimony, we'll take	
2	it.	
3		
4	(Whereupon, the public hearing held before	
5	the New York State Senate Standing Committee on	
6	Housing, Construction, and Community Development	
7	concluded, and adjourned.)	
8		
9	00	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		