

FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 2019

10:46 A.M.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The House will come to order.

In the absence of clergy, let us pause for a moment of silence.

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was observed.)

Visitors are invited to join the members in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, Acting Speaker Aubry led visitors and members in the Pledge of Allegiance.)

A quorum being present, the Clerk will read the Journal of Thursday, June 13th.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, I move

that we dispense with the further reading of the Journal of Thursday, June the 13th and that the same stand approved.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Without objection, so ordered.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to share with my colleagues, the guests that are in the Chambers [sic], as well as our staff a quote that comes from our own Brian Haak this morning. He's given us this quote, it was one that was stated by... Harvey Milk -- I'm sorry, I'm reading here, Harvey Milk, who, as we all know, was assassinated some years ago. But he was a great American and, in fact, he's a New Yorker. He was born in New York, he went to school at UAlbany and he ended up being an elected official out in California. But Mr. Milk is sharing with us today in 2019 this quote, *I remember the lack of hope our friends can't fulfill. I can't forget the looks on faces of people who have lost hope, be they gay, be they seniors, be they blacks looking for an almost impossible job, or Latinos trying to explain their problems and aspirations in a tongue that's foreign to them. And the young gay people who are coming out. The only thing they have to look forward to is hope. And you have to give them hope. Hope for a better tomorrow, hope for a better today, hope for a better world and hope for a better place to come if the pressures at home are too great. I hope that all will be all right. And that you and you and you and you give people hope.* Again, Mr. Speaker, that one is from the late

Harvey Milk.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask you -- it makes me a little emotional because it's so real.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: All right.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, I will -- want to let folks know that we do have on our desk a main Calendar. This has been quite a bit of a rough week. We've had a lot of contention in our Chamber, a lot of noise in our Chambers [sic], but a lot of really good debate and we've, I believe, solved a lot of really great problems. And we look forward to that same sort of cooperation today because it is going to be another busy day. Members do have on their desk a main Calendar and a debate list. After introductions and housekeeping we will continue our consent on the main Calendar, beginning with Rules Report No. 139 on page 10, and we will also work off the debate list and take up Rules Report No. 275 by Mr. Heastie. Members of the following committees should be prepared to meet this morning, this afternoon, today, in the Speaker's Conference Room: That's Government Employees, Ways and Means and Rules. The Rules Committee will produce an A-Calendar. We will alert members as to any conference needs as we go along today. Among the privileged resolutions at the close of Session, there is one by Member Solages that honors and commemorates Flag Day, which we will take up at the conclusion of our Session.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's the general outline. If there's any introductions and housekeeping, now would be a great time.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: And we certainly do have introductions. And let me say, Mrs. Majority Leader, that by eliminating "tonight" in some of the statements you made, you have given all of us a bit of hope.

(Laughter)

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, sir. If I could interrupt you one more time and ask that you please call the Government Employees conference -- Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Government Employees, Speaker's Conference Room. Mr. Abbate will await you. Thank you.

For the purposes of an introduction, Mr. Hawley.

MR. HAWLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure today to introduce members of the greatest generation; those who have served our country with dignity and honor. Today we have with us a number of great individuals. And if we'd have them stand as I call - or wave your hand as I call your name - Allan Atwell. Thank you, Allan, for your service. John McCoy. Edward "Sonny" Claren. Leland Palitsch. Russ Reickert. Dominick Ercolano. Josephine Smith. Edward Girard. And last, but certainly not least, Thomas Sunkes. If you'd give these great World War II veterans all the honors and dignity of this House, and I'd ask all of you to stand in honor of the greatest generation for their service to not only our State, but our great nation. Thank you.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly.

(Applause)

On behalf of Mr. Hawley and numerous members who are standing with you, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly. We extend to you the privileges of the floor. This is the People's House, a House that you gave your lives, gave your service to protect. We honor that. We know that you have done more for us than we have done for you, but we'll try and make up for that. Thank you so very much. You are always welcome here.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Ms. Joyner.

MS. JOYNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to interrupt the proceedings. It is with great pride today that I take the opportunity to introduce a group of constituents who have traveled to the State Capitol to share a part of their day with us. If they can please rise at this time.

Here in Chambers [sic] we have members of the African community celebrating the first-ever African Diaspora Day. We have parents with us, mosque leaders and community leaders from the Bronx. I know firsthand how much of a vital role they play in my community, and along with my colleague Charles Fall, who is sponsoring today's resolution, I am happy to have these constituents here today in our Chamber, and ask you to welcome them to the People's House. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Certainly. On behalf of Ms. Joyner, Mr. Fall, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome these distinguished guests to the New York State Assembly, we extend to you the privileges of the floor. I hope you have a great day and enjoy the African Diaspora Day that these two members are doing. But more importantly, it's so nice to have a little piece of home from the Bronx here in the Chamber in these last days. So, thank you so very much for joining us.

(Applause)

Mr. McDonald.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today we have some guests here from the Van Rensselaer Elementary School, which is across the river here from the State Capitol, in the City of Rensselaer. They're here accompanied by their teacher, Ms. Amy Mooney. And these students here are -- are here not only to observe our proceedings, but also to take a tour of all the State campus facilities here. They're going to the Museum, they've visited the Senate, but, of course, they made a -- a stop in the People's House as well. They are members of the Student Council and the Community Service Team at the school district. Obviously, they are the leadership of Van Rensselaer Elementary School, and if you could please extend to them the cordiality of the House, we'd appreciate it.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. McDonald, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome these future leaders here to the New York State Assembly,

we extend to you the privileges of the floor. I can guarantee you, some of the members here served in their student councils when they were in elementary school, so it's not too far-fetched to believe in a few years you might be sitting in one of these seats. But we expect that you will do great things with your lives and continue to lead our State. Thank you so much for joining us here today, and welcome, as always.

(Applause)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. If we can begin our work with resolutions on page 3. We will certainly be hearing from Mr. Fall on Assembly No. 575, but we're going to begin with Assembly No. 569. Immediately following that, Mr. Speaker, we're going to go to page 10 and take up Rules Report No. 139.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: The Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 569, Mr. Bronson.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim June 15, 2019, as Elder Abuse Awareness Day in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: All those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 570, Mr.

Ra.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim July 15, 2019, as Pet Fire Safety Day in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: All those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 571, Mr. Zebrowski.

Legislative Resolution memorializing the Honorable Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim October 2019, as Polish-American Heritage Month in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: All those in favor of the resolution signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 572, Ms. Jaffee.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim November 2019, as Epilepsy Awareness Month in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Ms. Jaffee on the resolution.

MS. JAFFEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Epilepsy is a neurological disorder characterized by a wide range of seizure types that vary from person to person. These seizures may impact consciousness, movement with sensation and create long-term effects

on the lifestyles of individuals with epilepsy. Approximately one-third of the 3.4 million epilepsy patients in the United States live with uncontrolled seizures due to the lack of suitable clinically-available treatment. In the United States, epilepsy affects more than 300,000 children under the age of 15, and more than 90,000 of whom have seizures that cannot be adequately treated. And while medications and other treatments help many people of all ages who live with epilepsy, many people continue to have seizures that can severely limit their school achievements, employment prospects and participation in all life's experiences. Epilepsy continues to be one of the least understood major chronic medical conditions. We need to raise awareness, seek treatments and medical intervention.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 573, Mr. Manktelow.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim June 21, 2019, as ALS/MND Global Day in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Manktelow on the resolution.

MR. MANKTELOW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I brought this resolution forward just a few days ago, and this resolution

is so important to me because as I've -- as I've talked on the floor before -- as I've talked on the floor before, I have two adopted children, my oldest one being Erica. Come to find out, a young lady back in our home district is my daughter's biological aunt, and she came down with ALS just a few months ago. So that's why I'm bringing this resolution forward, memorializing it and making sure people know how important this is.

So, thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to do so.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 574, Mr. Cusick.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim September 8-14, 2019, as Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy Awareness Week in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 575, Mr. Fall.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim June 14, 2019 --

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. --

THE CLERK: -- as African Diaspora Day in the

State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Fall on the resolution.

MR. FALL: Thank -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I want to thank the cosponsor of this resolution, Member Joyner, and my fellow colleagues for sponsoring this resolution. You know, some may inquire what does diaspora mean. And diaspora is defined as a -- a scattering of population whose origin lies in separate geographical locations. Most notably, the expulsion of Jews from the Land of Israel, African Transatlantic slave trade, Irish during the Irish famine, and Greeks after the fall of Constantinople. One of the largest diasporas in modern times is that of the Sub-Sahara in Africa, which dates back several centuries. During the Atlantic slave trade, approximately 12 million people from West Africa survived transportation to arrive in the Americas as slaves. Many influenced not only modern-day America, but colonial Britain, France, Portugal and Spain. And I often talk about my family coming from West Africa. You know, they -- they immigrated here in the late 80's, looking for the American Dream. And one of the things that I -- I've learned from them, and it is the reason who I am today, is the value of hard work. You know, of being patient before assuming something. And being kind to your neighbors. You know, and those are the things that we amplify, you know, in our communities. I -- in passing the DREAM Act and the Green Light legislation, we should pause and reflect on this resolution as a statement of how important immigration

has been in building our country and the future success of generations to come.

We have honored guests here today that were introduced by Member Joyner that are perfect examples of how immigrants shape the success of our great State and our country, and I also think it's reflective of our Body here today. We have a reception that's going to be taking place in the LOB at 711. And also for those of you that would like to have a taste of Africa, please come by.

And thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Barron on the resolution.

MR. BARRON: Good morning.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Good morning.

MR. BARRON: I want to thank the sponsors of this resolution. Every person, so-called "black" person, I call us people of African ancestry, or African people, because we are all one people. The great Dr. John Henrik Clarke said, *We're not who we are based upon where the boats dropped us off, but we're who we are based upon where the boats picked us up from.* And they picked us all up from Africa. When we were dropped off in the Americas, we became American citizens and we became Brazilians and Caribbeans and Trinidadians. Those were identities that we adopted after being dropped off from Africa. We are an African people. We are a nation of African people. And when we speak of the diaspora, we're talking about the Africans, the 50 million African people in America that

might call yourself black. You know, black is a racial construct that Europeans created, the idea of color. There are no black people, there are no white people, there are no yellow people, there are no brown people, there are no red people. They are people connected to continents and nations. We are an African people with a history. If I were to ask a Chinese person, *Where do you come from*, you would say China. Vietnam person, Vietnamese. If you say black, you can't say Blackland, because there's no Blackland. You're African. And when you say African, it connects you to a history. It connects you to a culture. It connects you to a spirit. It connects you to a people who were the first person to inhabit the earth were African people. The first people to give the world mathematics and science and astrology and astronomy and the Pyramids and the mighty Sphinx and Egypt, were African people. Cleopatra wasn't Elizabeth Taylor, she was African. She was African. The Egyptians are called Kemet, they're black. The land of the so-called "burnt-face" people, as some of the historians called them, they were African people. So when you think of Africa, please don't think of Tarzan flying through the air and yelling some -- screaming some stuff and a bunch of people with bones in their noses and wearing diapers and having big pots to boil you in. That's not Africa. That's not Africa. Africa's rich. Africa still is rich. So I'm proud to say that I'm an African man born in America. And we should be proud of that heritage. So when we speak of the diaspora, we're not just talking about the Africans that are here immediately from Africa, but we're talking about all of us who

originated in Africa. And I know we call it the Transatlantic slave trade, I call it the Transatlantic raid. They raided Africa, stole us, kidnapped. Europe used African labor to build capitalism in Europe. America used African labor to build capitalism in America. And all over the diaspora, we gave economic life to a people who murdered, slaughtered us. And we say the greatest holocaust of a people on this planet is the African holocaust. Ten million of us died during the Maafa, the Middle Passage on the way over. Millions more died during plantation slavery. Millions more [sic] died during Jim Crowism. And million more are dying today because of poverty, police brutality and mass incarceration. You owe the African nation reparations. It's long overdue. It's due to the African people who built the economy of an imperialistic, capitalistic -- global capitalism was built on the back, the sweat and labor of African people.

So I stand today as a proud African, saying I'm a part of this diaspora, and my homeland is Africa. Africa, the land where the first fossils of human beings were found. Congratulations to Africans, to Africa.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Rivera on the resolution.

MR. RIVERA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to follow my colleague Charles Barron. The reason why I rise is because when I look at you, it is because I'm very grateful. I would not be standing here, I would have never been elected to office with my

accent. I'm Puerto Rican. I have a heavy accent. I speak fluent Spanish. I also been accused, rightfully so, of speaking fluent English. So I want to thank you for the -- for paving the way. And it is known that this great country of ours today was built on the backs of people. And yes, it was built on the back of African people. Yes, it was. Of the Mexican people. But I am once again want to show you all what I just got. We passed a piece of legislation giving undocumented workers the opportunity to have a driver's license. Today in Long Island, look what they put out there (indicating newspaper), *Assembly Democrat vote to legalize driving license for undocumented workers* --

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Rivera --

MR. RIVERA: -- who are committing many crimes in this City and this State --

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Rivera, remember --

MR. RIVERA: That is not -- you should all be ashamed --

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Rivera --

MR. RIVERA: -- and you should speak up against that --

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: No props, please

--

MR. RIVERA: Welcome --

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Thank you.

MR. RIVERA: -- to Albany.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: And I will remind members, please direct your comments to the Chair.

Mr. Taylor on the resolution.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief. I just want to stand and lend my voice to the sponsor of this -- of this resolution. And I don't think I can add much behind the two colleagues that spoke. But it's a proud moment and I -- I welcome our guests, obviously, to the Chambers [sic]. And I -- I think when we look around and we look at everything, I don't have props, but I think if we were looking at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, there's a White House that was built by black people. So, I don't know if Trump knows that, he may want to leave. But I am so excited and welcome and thank you and thank you -- and it is a moment -- to -- to Charles' point, we can't go back and say, *Well, I'm from the Blackland*. But we are from Africa, and it's proud and we should be. And I think when people look at folks of color, whether they speak English or Spanish, and they've been in the sun, and is born that way, we -- we shouldn't be necessarily fearful of folks like that.

So I am proud. I thank you for -- for bringing this to the floor, to the attention of our colleagues. And have a great day. Thank you much, Mr. Speaker.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The

resolution is adopted.

(Applause/Cheers)

Ladies and gentlemen, please.

Ways and Means, Speaker's Conference Room. Ms. Weinstein is on her way. Members of the Ways and Means, Speaker's Conference Room. Please start making your way there. Thank you so much.

Page 10, Rules Report No. 139, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A05821-A, Rules Report No. 139, Abbate. An act to amend the Town Law, in relation to the employer's ability to suspend a police officer without pay pending disciplinary charges.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

First vote of the day, ladies and gentlemen. If you are in Chambers [sic] or you can hear my voice, please make your way to your desks and cast the first vote of the day. Thank you so much.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A05940, Rules Report

No. 140, Abbate. An act to amend the Retirement and Social Security Law, in relation to eligibility for retirement benefits for certain members of the Unified Court System.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: The bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A05949, Rules Report No. 141, Fernandez, Arroyo, Cruz, Pichardo, Blake, Dickens, Dinowitz, Galef, Sayegh, Reyes, Crespo, Rivera, Joyner, Benedetto, Glick, Williams, Fall, Davila. An act to amend Chapter 465 of the Laws of 1994, amending Chapter 285 of the Laws of 1891 relating to charging a fee for admission to the New York Botanical Garden, in relation to making permanent certain provisions authorizing the imposition of a required fee; and to repeal Section 2 of such Chapter 465 of the Laws of 1994 relating thereto.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On a motion by Ms. Fernandez, the Senate bill is before the House. The Senate bill is advanced.

Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, if we could turn our attention now to Rules Report No. 275, it's on page 37 by Mr. Heastie, on debate.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A08281, Rules Report No. 275, Heastie, Cymbrowitz, Hunter, Dinowitz, O'Donnell, L. Rosenthal, Cahill, Thiele, Bronson, Ryan, Barrett, Mosley, Pichardo, Barron, Joyner, Richardson, Niou, Epstein, Romeo, Gottfried, Lentol, Weinstein, Nolan, Cook, Glick, Aubry, Perry, Arroyo, Colton, Peoples-Stokes, Titus, Benedetto, Hevesi, Jaffee, DenDekker, Crespo, M.G. Miller, Weprin, Quart, Solages, Steck, Bichotte, Blake, Dilan, Seawright, Simon, Walker, Carroll, De La Rosa, D. Rosenthal, Taylor, Cruz, Fernandez, Frontus, Jacobson, Raynor, Reyes, Sayegh, Rozic, Otis, Davila, Kim, Pretlow, Vanel, Barnwell. An act to amend Chapter 576 of the Laws of 1974 amending the Emergency Housing Rent Control Law relating to the control of and stabilization of rent in certain cases, the Emergency Housing Rent Control Law, Chapter 329 of the Laws of 1963 amending the Emergency Housing Rent Control Law relating to recontrol of rents in Albany, and the Rent Regulation Reform Act of 1997, in relation to making such provisions permanent; to amend Chapter 555 of the Laws of 1982 amending the General Business Law and the Administrative Code of the City of New York relating to

conversion of residential property to cooperative or condominium ownership in the City of New York, Chapter 402 of the Laws of 1983 amending the General Business Law relating to conversion of rental residential property to cooperative or condominium ownership in certain municipalities in the counties of Nassau, Westchester and Rockland, in relation to making such provisions permanent (Part A); to repeal certain provisions of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974, the Emergency Housing Rent Control Law and the Local Emergency Rent Control Act, relating to rent increases after vacancy of a housing accommodation (Part B); to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York and the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974, in relation to vacancy of certain housing accommodations and to amend the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974 and the Administrative Code of the City of New York, in relation to prohibiting a county rent guidelines board from establishing rent adjustments for Class A dwelling units based on certain considerations (Part C); to amend the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974, in relation to vacancies in certain housing accommodations; and to repeal paragraphs 12 and 13 of subdivision a of Section 5 and Section 5-a of Section 4 of Chapter 576 of the Laws of 1974 constituting the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974, paragraph (n) of subdivision 2 of Section 2 of Chapter 274 of the Laws of 1946, constituting the Emergency Housing Rent Control Law, and Sections 26-504.1, 26-504.2 and 26-504.3 and subparagraph (k) of paragraph 2

of subdivision e of Section 26-403 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, relating to vacancy decontrol (Part D); to amend the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974 and the Administrative Code of the City of New York, in relation to the regulation of rents (Part E); to amend the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974, the Administrative Code of the City of New York and the Civil Practice Law and Rules, in relation to investigation of rent overcharge complaints (Part F); to establish the "Statewide Tenant Protection Act of 2019"; and to amend the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974, in relation to expanding rent and eviction protections Statewide (Part G); to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York and the Emergency Housing Rent Control Law, in relation to the establishment of rent adjustments and prohibition of fuel pass-along charges; and to repeal certain provisions of the Administrative Code of the City of New York relating thereto (Part H); to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York, the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974 and the Emergency Housing Rent Control Law, in relation to recovery of certain housing accommodations by a landlord (Part I); to amend the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of nineteen seventy-four, in relation to not-for-profits' use of certain residential dwellings (Part J); to amend the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974, the Emergency Housing Rent Control Law, and the Administrative Code of the City of New York, in relation to a temporary increase in rent in certain cases (Part K); to amend the Public Housing Law, in relation to enacting the "Rent Regulation

Reporting Act of 2019" (Part L); to amend the Real Property Law, the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law, the General Obligations Law and the Judiciary Law, in relation to enacting the "Statewide Housing Security and Tenant Protection Act of 2019"; establishes the New York State Temporary Commission on Housing Security and Tenant Protection; and to repeal certain provisions of the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law relating thereto (Part M); to amend the General Business Law, in relation to conversions to cooperative or condominium ownership in the City of New York (Part N); and to amend the Real Property Law, in relation to the duties and responsibilities of manufactured home park owners and residents (Part O).

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: An explanation is requested, Mrs. Peoples-Stokes. No. Mr. -- I'm sorry. She was up, you were up. I didn't know which one.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: (Inaudible) over here.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Hi there.

(Laughter)

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Shh. One minute before we start, Mr. Cymbrowitz. Please, ladies and gentlemen, sides, rear, we'd appreciate your cooperation so that we may get this bill done.

Sir.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill would make the State's laws authorizing rent regulation permanent, helping ensure municipalities who are or may one day face a housing crisis, that they will always have access to this critical option. The bill would also extend the same opportunity to every city, town and village in New York State that is not currently eligible. In addition, the bill strengthens and reforms the rent regulation system, and bolsters protections for unregulated tenants Statewide, included in manufactured home parks where the imbalance of power between tenant and landlord is significant. This bill would also make significant and additional funds available for HCR to fulfill its mission to protect and preserve affordable housing, and hopefully improve its interactions with tenants and landlords. A better-funded agency will benefit all.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Fitzpatrick.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the sponsor yield?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Of course.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cymbrowitz yields.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Thank you, Steve. This is -- we knew this day was coming, certainly after last year's election, and we're taking up a number of bills that we have debated over many, many years and put it all into one package. Well, that should make for a bit of a quicker day today. Certainly, this being Friday and we'd all like to go home. But rent control, later known as rent stabilization,

has been a controversial topic in the State of New York for a long, long time. And after today it will continue to be, and I think it will be even more controversial because I think what we're doing here today is not just going more in a pro-tenant direction, but we are going in an extreme direction in that -- in that direction in terms of being pro-tenant, so much so that it's going to, I believe, really harm tenants in the future because we're going to have a problem incentivizing the construction of new housing.

Steve, I want to just -- you know, we -- had hearings and we heard a lot of testimony from both sides, and we know there were problems in the current system. And there have been Band-Aids applied in a number of areas regarding rent regulation over the years, and it's quite a mess. And one observation was that so much needs to change regarding the system that nothing ends up changing. I know you're going to attempt through the passage -- by passing this bill today to perhaps remedy that. But one thing -- there are three areas that are of concern. One is the loss of vacancy decontrol, and how we justify not having means testing for people who make a decent income and allowing them to enjoy the benefits of rent regulation at the expense of people who are in real need of affordable housing. How do you justify eliminating vacancy decontrol -- how do you justify eliminating vacancy decontrol and protecting a class of tenants that do not deserve such protection?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, firstly, I want to thank you for participating in all the hearings that we had. You were there,

you were one of the last to leave with me.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Mm-hmm.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: You stayed in New York City and Albany, and as well in Rochester, and appreciate the fact that you were there. The -- the vacancy decontrol, the 20 percent, has always been a tool that has been used to get tenants out, so that when a tenant leaves that apartment, the landlord is able to -- the landlord is always able to add the 20 percent. But all tenants deserve protections. And the means test is not associated with protections. These are for every tenant who is in a rent-stabilized unit.

MR. FITZPATRICK: But we implemented the 20 percent to allow -- the goal -- this was a temporary emergency. This is a temporary emergency that has lasted almost 70 years. The -- the goal was to slowly wean the City off of rent control or rent stabilization to kind of eliminate this emergency. The City, in our opinion, has not done its job in terms of creating the necessary zoning, the -- the tax structure, environmental regulations to encourage the construction of more affordable housing. The City obviously needs to do more, and I'd like to know what -- after we pass this bill, what are we going to do to create more affordable housing? I -- I'm concerned because passage of this legislation with all of its components is going to discourage, not encourage, the maintenance of our affordable housing, of our rental housing stock as we know. Most of it is constructed well before 1974 and even before World War II. It is -- requires a lot of maintenance. It requires a lot of upkeep. And when

you have government control of pricing through the rent -- Rent Guidelines Board and rent stabilization legislation, you are -- you are preventing, quite frankly, the proper upkeep of this -- of these -- of these buildings. How are we going to -- by implementing this -- this new reg -- this regulation permanently, how are we going to incentivize owners to up -- to maintain their properties, and at the same time provide affordable housing?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: As you know, rent stabilization exists, and part of it is to do a survey to determine whether there is a housing emergency. And if there is a vacancy of less than 5 percent, then the -- then the emergency continues. That's the reason it's continued in New York City, because it's always been hovering around 3 percent vacancy. So that continues. So the -- so it's not a matter -- it might have been temporary if the emerge -- if the vacancy rate changed, but because the vacancy is still less than 5 percent, it continues. But as far as building affordable housing, New York City, New York State and the Federal government have invested millions and millions of dollars to build affordable housing and they will continue to do so.

MR. FITZPATRICK: We -- we have the income limit of \$200,000 per year that upon lease renewal, if your income is that high, that unit can go to market rent -- market rate. Why are we protecting that class of renter? We are -- we are keeping people who need affordable housing on the sidelines. We are not able to provide for them because we are protecting a class of individual -- of -- of

tenant that does not merit or deserve that level of protection. And affordable housing, if rent regulation is designed to mitigate an emergency, why are we protecting these people? They can certainly go out and afford a market rate rental. And here we have families who need housing, some who need two and three bedrooms. But we have a system that encourages people to stay in a rent-regulated unit whether they need two or three bedrooms or not. In fact, there are many who are empty-nesters and no longer need such a large unit, but will stay there because the price is kept artificially low. How is that helping people who need affordable housing?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: In 2019, the \$200,000 amount -- and in most families there are two, you know, two wage earners. And \$200,000 is not an exorbitant amount of money. And those people who have been living there have been working hard and have been able to get jobs where they can now make additional dollars from what they've done -- from what they've labored in the past.

MR. FITZPATRICK: But still, you're -- you're -- we -- we have a large group of residents in New York City who desperately need affordable housing, and yet, a class of tenants who require and do not need -- who require no assistance from government are being allowed to stay at the expense of people who need it. And this system is encouraging -- in fact, it's going to make permanent that system. How is that going to create or incentivize more affordable housing?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I think the amount of -- the

number of units, affordable housing units that are building are never enough. But we continue to invest millions of dollars in order to build more. But every tenant deserve protections, no matter what their income is.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Regardless of income they deserve protection when we're trying to help those who desperately need it by protecting those who don't need it. That -- that, to me, does not make sense, and I think we're going to perpetuate that system. Which means the imbalance, the inequities, the economic madness of this rent regulation system is going to continue in perpetuity by making this permanent. It's -- it's a very sad situation. The -- let me ask you also by -- you know, the other item here by -- what we're really doing here is, we are transferring the cost of -- or shifting -- you know, when we create this homelessness issue with this lack of affordable housing, we are putting that burden, shifting that burden to the landlord and away from the City. We are basically giving the City a free ride or a pass here, because we're shifting that burden to the private property owner and letting the City off the hook, in my opinion. Some of the changes here by, you know, allowing people additional time when they don't pay rent - up to 12 months for nonpayment of rent - we are going to an extreme here to protect people who perhaps do not serve that protection. But we're shifting that cost to the property owner and to the people who pay rent when -- when that obligation belongs with the City, and -- and should be a society-wide cost or burden. Why are we doing that?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I don't know where you're getting the 12 months. What we have done is shifted, giving the tenant instead of three --

MR. FITZPATRICK: The eviction, I'm talking about the eviction.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Instead of three days notice, we're now giving them 14 days so that they can be notified that they have to be in court. Sometimes what we have found is that three days is certainly not enough. So we have not given tenants 12 months longer to stay in their apartment. If anything, what we've done is we've given them time to be notified. We give them ten days to be notified that they have a court appearance, and then once the judge makes a ruling they're given another 12 days. So we're talking about 34 days in total that we're giving a tenant time to -- to leave that apartment when the decision is made.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Okay. I want to -- just a question on the MCI, the changes to Major Capital Improvements. We are limiting the recovery of those costs. We're going to limit that to an aggregate amount of \$15,000. And no more than three separate improvements over a 15-year period. How do --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: That's the IAIs.

MR. FITZPATRICK: IAI.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

MR. FITZPATRICK: How -- how was that -- that \$15,000 figure arrived at? Because the cost of doing improvements --

doing a kitchen, doing a bath, those are probably the two principal improvements that we -- would be made -- are not cheap. That's -- they're quite costly. So, where -- where did the \$15,000 limit come from? How was that arrived at?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: That -- that was based on an average that we received from HCR, what the costs are.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Okay. So over -- given the age of so many of these buildings, I think that is kind of low. And limiting that over a 15-year period to \$15,000 is not -- I'm concerned that you're going to -- it's not going to incentivize people to do necessary improvements because, again, when you have issues like prevailing wage, the cost of these improvements are very expensive, you're not going to see the level of improvement. That is going to perhaps cost jobs and cost, I think, the economy because there is a significant level of economic activity done through the MCI and IAI system. Obviously, there are bad -- there are bad actors who abuse that system, but for the most part, that economic activity is going to be drastically curtailed. And how is that going to improve the lot for tenants?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I believe that landlords will continue to take care of their properties, will continue to improve their properties and will -- and will renovate the apartments as needed. So the fact that they have 15 -- over a 15-year period, they can -- they can --

MR. FITZPATRICK: But that -- that's --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: They have an aggregate of 15 -- \$15,000 to make those improvements.

MR. FITZPATRICK: That, Steve, is only if they can afford them. All right? So we are -- we are limiting that increase to 2 -- 2 percent, we're extending the period payment period, we're -- we're taking that, we're not allowing that to go into the base rent. And therefore, you're going to have a hard time being able to accumulate the necessary capital to have to pay for that. Also, you're going to see, there's already a drop in share price on some of the banks that lend to building owners. So, you're going to find it's going to be more difficult for them to finance this. They can't even include the financing in the base rent, they have to pay for that themselves. They have to pay for that themselves. But, again, we're going to such an extreme, you could say we're -- we're not just moving the goalpost this time, as I've said in the past, we're taking them down. And going -- you're going to make it more, I -- I believe, just extremely difficult for people to accumulate the capital. We're limiting the rent through the Rent Guidelines Board, we're not allowing them a 20 percent vacancy increase upon... upon vacancy to allow them to kind of catch up because we're artificially depressing these rates. They're in old buildings that are very expensive to maintain and upkeep, and getting more so. And you're going to make -- it's going to be very difficult to find financing to do these repairs to do this. So, I'm -- I'm just very concerned that we are going to make a bad situation even worse in an effort to protect tenants, some of whom don't deserve that protection.

But in an effort to protect tenants, we are making it so difficult for building owners to maintain and upkeep their properties, I fear you're going to see them either sell off their properties, allow them to go into a state of disrepair. We could see a return to some of the bad old days where people abandon their properties. This will not help tenants. This is going to be very damaging, and it's going to discourage any investment whatsoever in new affordable rental properties, and the City and -- and State are going to have to offer an incredible level of incentive now, more than they've ever had to offer in the past, to entice developers to go in and fix this problem. And without assistance from the City in terms of zoning and other regulation, there is a real -- there is a catastrophe, I think, in the making here that I think was perhaps ignored in an effort to satisfy the concerns of tenants. And there are some legitimate concerns, but we could fix this by perhaps tinkering and improving better enforcement and other areas, rather than just eliminating the goal posts, eliminating the rules, and stacking the deck so much in favor of tenants that we end up hurting tenants in the long run because there is -- every year there is a need for more and more affordable housing, not less. And, you know, without -- without a program, without a system to encourage the construction of new affordable housing, we're going to have a bigger problem going forward. I thought after we passed this bill, you know, our -- our Committee may be somewhat quiet for a while. But I'm starting to have second thoughts that we may be busier than ever because this system -- we're not making this system better, we are making it worse

by the changes we're doing here. It's going to be politically popular, no doubt about it, that -- that tenants are looking forward to what's coming. In fact, they want it even more. But if we don't -- if we don't encourage the development of affordable housing, the people of the City of New York and perhaps around the State, because we're going to open this system potentially to every municipality in the State of New York, we're going to have a problem of -- of a proportion we've never seen before. So, with that, I will... be going to --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: If I may --

MR. FITZPATRICK: Please.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I -- I really -- I -- I'd really like to respond to some of the comments. And thank you for using the goalposts. It might be the last time you use your goalpost analogy.

(Laughter)

But you're right, we will no longer use goalposts, we're no longer moving them. We have changed the sport. We are now either using a basket or -- or a fence, but we're not using goalposts. So, but I -- I think it's important to understand a -- a couple of things. And -- and first of all, it -- it's important that the legislation that we put in, number one, dealt with the fraud of -- of certain landlords when they did the IAs. And, you know, you heard the testimony of, you know, during -- during our hearings, and there were many landlords who -- who would just put any number down for improvements. And what we have done is we've made it more difficult for them just to use their own contracting company, to use a

family member who is -- who is part of their team. So we will be having a portal set up with HCR so all documents, all receipts, everything can be uploaded to HCR. And that's why we have limited the \$15,000 over -- over the 15 years because of the abuse. But you mentioned banks. And -- and I've -- and I've seen some of the news articles. But landlords will still be getting a return, although they may not be getting huge numbers as in the past, they do -- they will be getting 5 to 6 percent return, and that's over 30 years, and that's -- because it's 30 years, banks will continue to make loans. They will limit maybe, they will adjust the way they do it, but they will continue to do it. And I think the things that you're concerned about, things deteriorating in such a way, I don't believe will -- will occur.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Well, you -- you -- when you talk about the major landlords, the large players, I think you're probably correct. But we have a lot of rental housing stock that is owned by small business people, by families, by individuals who own one or two or three buildings and have used that -- that has been their business. They are the ones that are going to suffer. And their tenants are going to suffer as a result of this if they cannot get the -- the necessary financing to make improvements. If that housing stock falls into further disrepair -- because, as we know, a lot of it is very old housing stock -- what are we going to do to help those building owners meet the need? And what are we going to do to help the tenants who may fall into a really serious situation if that owner can't keep that house or keep -- keep that building? What happens then?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, I believe that the small landlords will -- will continue to use MCIs and IAIs. The amount of money that they will be charging the tenants will be smaller because of the amortization rate --

MR. FITZPATRICK: Right.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: But I think that will help the tenants be able to stay there.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Well, we will see. We will see. I think, you know -- we've -- we've depressed rents artificially for such a long period of time. But are we going to see -- they're dealing with old housing stock, they're dealing with -- you know, trying to improve and maintain their buildings at very high costs because of the age. But what -- what are we -- what are we doing -- as the City or the State, what are we going to do about maybe containing the rate of growth of property taxes for these people? You know, they have to their water bills, they have to pay their energy costs, fuel -- fuel charges, fuel costs. But especially property taxes. We have a property tax system that doesn't reward permanent rental housing. What are we going to do in those regards after we pass this legislation, Steve? How are these costs going to be -- how -- what are we going to do to help these people? We've made it more and more difficult for them to maintain their buildings through these changes. However, City government and the cost of fuel and electricity are going to continue to rise. How are we going to help them meet those expenses?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: There -- well, first of all,

there are -- in the City of New York there are HP -- New York City programs from HPD that will help many of these small landlords if necessary. Statewide, there's a 2 percent cap on property tax. And I do know that there is a -- a revamping going on, or at least they're going to announce a property tax revamping that will affect the entire City.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Okay. Very good. All right. Steve, thank you very much. I just -- I just want to compliment you on your professionalism and your leadership with the Committee. The hearings were very well done. The staff has, on both sides, worked very hard on this. There is -- there is a real -- a real need for some change.

And, Mr. Speaker, on the bill. There is a need for change here. But I do not believe -- we do not believe on our side of the aisle that the extent of these changes are going to be helpful in encouraging development of more affordable housing. And we desperately need more. By allowing vacancy decontrol, we were getting people who -- and especially the high-income decontrol -- we were getting units out of the system and making those people pay market rate. The current system incentivizes people to stay. There's no means testing for rent regulation, and perhaps there should be. Because a lot of people who make a substantial income enjoy the benefits of rent regulation at the expense of people who need it most. There are people who have been -- become homeless because they couldn't find an affordable apartment. There are families, large

families, who need two- and three-bedroom apartments who can't get it because there are people living alone in these places, have no incentive and will not move because the rent is just too attractive. And maybe they can afford more, but if they need a smaller place, they're not going to move. So what we are doing here is we are going to create an environment where it's going to be increasingly difficult for owners to keep ahead of their expenses because of what we're doing with the MCI amortization, what we're doing by eliminating the 20 percent vacancy bonus to allow them to try and catch up because rents have been depressed for so many years. By doing a -- a total flip in terms of giving people who are behind on their rent the ability to stay longer than they should be able to is going to encourage owners to keep units vacant rather than rent them out to people who have a spotty history. This is not going to help people who have a great need either.

So I just -- I just want to -- you know, we've been dealing this -- with this for so many years. There's a -- a great quote from an editorial from a number of years ago -- well, actually, it's a current, the Brookings Institution. Many of us know them. They're certainly -- they are a liberal-leaning think tank. And they had an interesting article, what -- called "What Does Economic Evidence Tell Us About the Effects of Rent Control?" And it has data from rent control laws in Cambridge, Massachusetts and San Francisco, California. Two places not known for conservative governance, to say the least. And it says, *Rent control appears to help affordability in the*

short run for current tenants, but in the long run decreases affordability, fuels gentrification, creates negative externalities on the surrounding neighborhood. These results highlight that forcing landlords to provide insurance to tenants against rents increases can ultimately be counterproductive. If society desires to provide social insurance against rent increases, it may be less distortionary to offer this subsidy in the form of a government subsidy or a tax credit.

That's the way to move forward here to help people. Let this market heal. Allow government to provide incentives or subsidies to people to find the housing they need, and let the market do what it does best. Because only a market will officially allocate that capital. And we have people who are getting a benefit that they do not deserve, who should be paying a market rent or a higher rate of rent, at the expense of people who really need this housing.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would encourage a no vote on this legislation because, again, this is a system -- we've had a temporary emergency for affordable housing in the City of New York since World War II, and every year it seems to get worse. It's the system that's currently in place that has created the distortions and the problems that people have in finding and keeping affordable housing. And it's created a nightmare for people who own that housing, and it's making it more difficult for them to maintain that housing, to provide a safe place to live for the people they call their tenants. What we are going to do today is going to make that system in the -- in an effort to be more pro-tenant and to help tenants, we are going to make this

system more complex, more problematic and make it more difficult for people to have, find and build affordable housing.

So I encourage a no vote, and thank you for your time. And, Mr. Chairman, thank you. You're a pleasure to work with, you're a good friend. And I look forward to future debates as we try to rectify the problems that we are creating here today. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Braunstein.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the sponsor yield?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cymbrowitz, will you yield?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, of course.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The sponsor yields.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: First, Steve, let me thank you for -- for all the work that you've done over the last several months to get us to this point. One question I've been asking that I haven't gotten an answer for, and -- and perhaps you know the answer, is, do we have any idea of what kind of impact this legislation is going to have for the City's property tax revenue?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, I -- I -- I think the -- the City is now -- will -- will continue to look as they revamp the property tax structure. So --

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: Now, when you say revamp the property tax structure, the City has yet to give us a date when their Property Tax Commission is going to come back with

recommendations, which we'll have to pass up here, which will be politically difficult. It's conceivable that it'll take several years for us to get a -- a true property tax reform. But in the interim, if we do pass this legislation it's estimated it could cost hundreds of millions to over a billion, up to \$2 billion to the City's property tax revenue. And I've been asking the City, I've been asking the Department of Finance. I have yet to get an answer from anybody of what impact this is going to have on the City's property tax. And this is something we should be aware of.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, I -- I -- I think we're still -- it's hard to estimate it, that's why you're not getting -- you -- you haven't been getting an answer is because it's very difficult to estimate what effect property tax changes will have. The rent rolls, though, will -- will increase. I mean, we're not saying that. So with rent rolls increasing, property taxes will be affected less.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: I -- I mean, even if we had a ballpark. I mean, I try to introduce legislation, we all do in this House all the time, and the City comes back complaining that it could cost, you know, a million dollars and then they push back. And now we have something that could potentially cost over a billion dollars, and we have no es -- not even a ballpark about how much it's going to cost.

Look, I'm voting in favor of this legislation. But this is something that's been frustrating me. I've been asking to get an answer, and Department of Finance -- I had a meeting with the

Department of Finance and they had not even an idea that this could be an issue.

On -- on the bill, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, Mr. Braunstein.

MR. BRAUNSTEIN: So, the reason I bring this up is because in the district I represent, I represent other Class 2 property owners, co-op and condo owners, and they pay the highest effective property tax rates in the City of New York. And these are middle-class families, these are young families just starting out, these are seniors on fixed income who live in these co-ops. And year after year, these property taxes are causing their maintenance costs to continue to escalate at -- at an exponential rate. And people are forced with trying to figure out how they're going to pay these es -- escalating property taxes. And my concern is that, yes, here we are protecting tenants, but there's a possibility that we'll have a severe impact on the City's property tax revenue, and I'm concerned of who's going to pick up that cost. This is all Class 2 properties, and my -- the -- the constituents I represent, I'm concerned that this cost is going to be shifted to them in the form of increased assessments. I've introduced legislation here in this House for years to put a cap on property tax assessments for co-op and condo owners, like we have for single-family homeowners in the City of New York. In the City of New York, if you own a single-family home, your property tax assessment can only go up 6 percent a year or 20 percent over five years, which is essentially a 4 percent

increase. In -- for co-op and condo owners, there's no assessment cap. I just re -- re -- heard from -- that a co-op in my district received an assessment from last year to this year that was an increase of 50 percent. Fifty percent assessment increase. So, the City of New York, they -- what they do is, they don't raise taxes, they don't raise the rate, but in order to get the property tax revenue they need to continue their spending, they manipulate the assessments. And if we're going to pass legislation here today that's going to reduce the property tax revenue to the City of New York in the tune of, let's say, a billion dollars, somebody is going to be paying for that, and I'm very concerned that it's going to be shifted to those middle-class families that I represent who are struggling to pay their maintenance.

Now, we've seen the Mayor of the City of New York, we've seen the City Comptroller of the City of New York, we've seen the Council Speaker of the City of New York rallying to have these rent protections put in. And I agree. I think it's important, and I think we need to protect tenants. But we should not be doing that, and at the same time just shifting a property tax burden to another class that just happens to own their homes but are in the same economic situation. So, I'm bringing this to light because I still haven't gotten an answer, which I think is an important question, of how much property tax revenue is this going to cost. And I just want to make it a point that I'm watching, some of my colleagues are watching. And if the City cannot get a handle on this and they decide that they're just going to manipulate the assessments again and put this cost on -- on other

constituents, maybe then we have to come back and finally pass my legislation to put in place caps like single-family homeowners have, for co-op and condo owners in the City of New York. We await the Property Tax Commission's recommendations. We all know it's going to be very difficult to pass, but in the meantime, for the next couple of years, it -- it would be a serious, serious problem if we continue to see these escalating property taxes for people who just happen to own their homes, the co-ops, small apartments, and don't rent. So I just wanted to bring that to everybody's attention that there are consequences to this legislation that we need to be keeping an eye on.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Schmitt.

MR. SCHMITT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Chairman yield for some questions?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cymbrowitz, will you yield?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, of course.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: He yields

MR. SCHMITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As was already established by -- by our colleagues' questioning, the vacancy rate continues to -- to be within the threshold to be considered a temporary housing emergency, and one that's existed since the early 1940s. But since that time, there's been either expiration or sunset provisions every time this legislation has come up. It has allowed for

there to be a reevaluation, they're allowed to be a -- amendments and adjustments as necessary for decades and decades and decades. Now, my understanding, this legislation will make all changes we're voting on today permanent, with no sunset or expiration provision. Can you really explain the reasoning behind the change to a permanent passage here today? And, you know, is this really a -- a point of surrender saying that we will never fully achieve the goal of ending the temporary housing emergency in the City and across the State now?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: The emergency itself is not permanent. That continues to be determined, say, in the City of New York every three years when -- when a vacancy survey is done. What we have made permanent are the -- are the guidelines that those that are under rent stabilization will follow.

MR. SCHMITT: Now, I -- I understand that response, but in 1943, 50's, 60's, 70's up until today, there's obviously been a need for a change in those guidelines. We're now saying there will never need to be a change in the guidelines going forward. So, what -- what is the purpose of that? I'm assuming in five, 10, 15 years there very likely will be different scenarios we need to go by.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: We -- we have been able to change -- it doesn't mean that the MCIs, the IAI's, those have changed. And we will see based on the Commission that is going to come out from HCR in 2022 how they've -- how they've succeeded. Or not. But the -- what has occurred after World War II where most of those that -- units that were built under -- before 1947 went under rent

control, and those that were built before 1974 were --

MR. SCHMITT: I'm sorry, I can't really hear you.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: -- are under rent stabilization.

MR. SCHMITT: Mr. Speaker, it's pretty loud in here.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. Members, we are on debate. Continue, please. Conversations out of the room. You need to consult with staff, take it out of the room. Members will have their seats.

Do you need to hear the question again, or --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No, no, no. I'm fine. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No, no, what -- what I was explaining was that those units built before 1947 are under rent control, and we've made changes to that as well in this bill. Rent stabilization of those units that are built before 1974. And HCR will continue to have jurisdiction over both.

MR. SCHMITT: Thank you, Chairman. It's also already been established that we'll be eliminating the decontrol of luxury apartments and high-rent, high-income apartments. I -- I want to bring your attention to a Wall Street Journal analysis that was published yesterday regarding these rent regulations. The article quotes the Citizens Budget Commission as stating, *Many of the proposed changes will further benefit upper-income renters without providing relief to lower-income households, most likely to be rent*

burdened. There are an estimated 28,000 households earning more than \$200,000 receiving rent protections. It -- it really seems here that we're making it easier for more affluent New Yorkers to stay in rent-regulated apartments, and not focusing completely our efforts on those who need it most, low-income renters.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I think those -- you know, you talk about those that are making more than \$200,000. I think it's really important they need protections as well.

MR. SCHMITT: Chairman, I'm not saying that every owner of property or renter of property doesn't deserve protection, but the -- it seems the aims of rent-regulated protections is to protect those in lower-income households who might have less ability to afford suitable housing conditions. Shouldn't we solely be focusing on -- on them?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I don't think we should be focusing solely on them. I think what we should be doing is providing more dollars, City, State and Federal funds toward different types -- towards more affordable housing. Even to Mitchell-Lama housing. Maybe we need to come up with a new method of --of funding those types of -- of units so that we cover everyone.

MR. SCHMITT: Now, during the hearings and this, really, I guess, Session-long debate that we've been having to bring us here to this point on -- on Fri -- on this wonderful Friday, a large discussion revolved around MCIs, Major Capital Improvements, and I know the first proposals that were put out there were to completely

eliminate them. Obviously, that's not the case here, and we've gotten to the 2 percent number. It's been arrived at. Can you explain again what is the methodology behind coming to 2 percent, and is there anything within this legislation that would index that to inflation that would allow it to change without further legislative action?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: We, as a Conference, felt that the no MCI was not going to benefit the -- the housing in New York -- in New York City as well as New York State. We needed to find a number that would -- that would help tenants throughout the State, and at the same time would allow landlords to continue to make MCIs, IAs. Changing the amortization rate, but at the same time using the 2 percent cap so that tenants would have less of a burden than the 6 percent.

MR. SCHMITT: Now, if I'm reading the bill correctly, it retroactively goes back to 2012 with the 2 percent limit in this legislation as well. Is that correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: If -- if a tenant is living in the unit and there was an MCI that they received before 2000.... 2007, then what would happen is going forward from the day this bill -- going -- going forward, this bill -- when the bill is signed, that -- that 6 percent would then change to 2 percent.

MR. SCHMITT: Now, this seems a little punitive. When do you -- what are owners expected to do with potentially seven years of MCIs that potentially and likely exceed 2 percent, now having to retroactively be decreased?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, they don't have to -- there's -- there's no credit that has to be given to the tenant. The -- the number that they are going to charge is now capped at 2 percent.

MR. SCHMITT: So, I understand they don't have to retroactively pay them back, but now they've already expended a certain amount of money. Possibly, and in many cases, for smaller landlords have financed that and we know the finance charges could not be included in any of these calculations, so we're basically leaving, you know, many times, these smaller owners holding this debt they'll never be able to figure out under our previous system, they had expected to be able to handle their expenses by.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, they will continue to be reimbursed, but at a different rate.

MR. SCHMITT: At -- at a rate potentially 4 percent lower than what they expected for -- for the last X amount of years.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, but for 30 years.

MR. SCHMITT: Okay. So -- and -- I know you mentioned there is going to be some funding regarding DHCR and some language about requirements to review 25 percent of all applications, including with individual inspections and document review. Are you able to tell us how much in additional funding is going to be allocated to DHCR to accomplish this?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, what we've done is we've increased the registration fee from -- from \$10 a unit to \$20 a unit, and all that money for all the units will be going to HCR to be

used for -- for enforcement and for TPU.

MR. SCHMITT: So is -- is there an estimated dollar amount that that will collect? That increase will turn into?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I -- I think we were talk -- we were -- we were looking at, you know, several million dollars each year of additional funds. And if you -- if you recall in our last budget, not only did we put money into the budget for 94 additional full-time employees at HCR, but we put in \$8 million for them to upgrade their system, their -- their computer system, so that they can be -- so that there could be more enforcement and more efficient. And I think that by setting up the portal that is part of this legislation where all landlords will be able to upload all documents in which there -- if they are going to be using -- going to be doing IAs in units. That will save a lot of money.

MR. SCHMITT: So now with the changes in this legislation -- with the increases that they're receiving in funding in this legislation as well as what you just mentioned in the budget, do you believe that they will be fully satisfied with their staffing levels and funding levels, or is there going to be a potential in the next budget year or in other legislation where we're going to have to allocate them additional staffing and other financial resources?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Fully satisfied? I don't think anyone is fully satisfied.

MR. SCHMITT: Not in government, correct? Going -- going back I -- I know you mentioned IAs in -- in your previous

answer when we were talking about MCIs. And also with -- with the Ranking Member discussed the \$15,000 limit over 15 years. You know, my research and my understanding is that an average one-bedroom apartment can easily run in the range of \$25,000 in IAI improvements. If an apartment that has been occupied for 20 years or longer becomes vacant, there have been -- the average charges can easily hit \$60- to the \$80,000 range for a full renovation and repair. I -- I really believe this cap on IAIs has the ability to really compromise the living conditions that we -- we should be guaranteeing tenants are -- are living in. So, off -- off the bat, I think we're already at a deficit of, you know, ensuring the living conditions that all tenants should be entitled to. But more importantly, \$15,000 today was not what \$15,000 ten years ago equaled out to, and it's certainly not what will be happening in the future. And as what we've already described -- discussed earlier and you described that these are -- are permanent, this entire legislation is permanent, is there any formula or -- or any type of adjustment allowed in this going forward to account for economic factors outside of our understanding of rent control right now for IAIs to go up, or is it also going to need further legislative action if there become -- if, in my opinion, when there's an outcry because conditions have deteriorated?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: The \$15,000 is the median amount of -- of -- of money that is spent on IAIs. And that's where we got that number from. If -- I mean, the -- the apartments you're describing, those renovations are quite high. But if -- if you're

spending \$15- -- you know, if you're spending more, you get -- you still only get \$15,000 back. But HCR is responsible, and they will come back to us in that Commission in 2022 when they show whether -- maybe the \$15,000 doesn't work and they will recommend that that number should be either lowered or raised.

MR. SCHMITT: So, say before that timeframe we -- we see an outcry from tenants and -- and -- there -- there's real trouble, are you open to -- even though we've made these changes permanent and even though it might be a year or two years out from that recommendation from -- from them, would you be open to, in that scenario, reevaluating this if need be?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I think that we would -- I think 2022 is a -- is a good enough period of time for us to get a very good look at what those -- or how those numbers work.

MR. SCHMITT: We will see. We will see. The -- going to the changes on the eviction proceedings, including a provision to allow judges to issue a stay of eviction for up to one year where the tenant cannot find suitable housing in the same neighborhood or where the eviction would cause extreme hardship, can you please explain to me what would be considered the same neighborhood? What -- what are the parameters this legislation considers?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, I think when we're talking about the same neighborhood, we were talking about when a family has to leave an apartment that has children, we did not want to

have those children to have to leave to go to a different school district, or we're allowing someone who might be receiving chemotherapy, going for treatment. We want them to be able to stay so they can continue whatever life experiences they might be going through. And it's giving the judge discretion to make those decisions.

MR. SCHMITT: Will -- will it be the judge, will it be DHCR who is tasked with coming up with what constitutes an extreme hardship? Will there be a standard list?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: It's -- it's the court.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Schmitt, you have --

MR. SCHMITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: -- used your -- your time. Thank you.

Mr. Raia.

MR. RAIA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Chairman -- sorry, I know you just sat down -- but will the Chairman yield?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Will you --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Of course.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Yield?

MR. RAIA: I promise I'm not using 15 minutes.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cymbrowitz yields.

MR. RAIA: Thank you, Chairman. I've been on the

Housing Committee for 17 years, and, you know, I know a little bit about it. But it's never been a concern for my constituents. Now that's -- I guess there's a potential for all of the State to move in this direction, correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: If -- if communities opt in, yes.

MR. RAIA: Now, can we talk about how the community opts in? Because I'm getting pounded with phone calls from people that I guess picked up the newspaper and just realized that this is -- potentially could affect them. So what is it, 5 percent?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Below 5 percent, yes.

MR. RAIA: So, how is that number determined?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: The municipality hires somebody to do a survey to determine whether the vacancies are below 5 percent.

MR. RAIA: Now, we have a huge problem on -- in -- in Suffolk County in some of my towns where they don't actually allow accessory apartments, but you have tons of people that -- that rent apartments. Do they get factored into the mix?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: If -- if they're legal apartments, yes.

MR. RAIA: Okay. Well, and we have a lot of illegal apartments, too. They don't get factored into the mix.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, you can't count illegal apartments --

MR. RAIA: I know, I'm kidding.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Just making sure.

MR. RAIA: What is -- so the 5 percent, they -- they hire a company, I guess New York City does it, they work off of the census and they have to look at every type of -- of apartments. Now, my town -- and I'm going to use me as an example because I'm actually a landlord, if you could call it that. I -- I have an accessory apartment in my house, which essentially means I rent a room in my house. I can only do that with the permission of the Town of Huntington. They -- there's a yearly permit fee for \$225. I have to renew it every year. Part of the problem is -- is -- is the Town is always changing the laws and, quite honestly, they may decide to eliminate that process altogether. So my question is this -- two questions. I currently have a tenant who's month -- on a month-to-month verbal lease. The way I read this is I can't terminate that lease, he has to be the one to terminate that lease. Is that even remotely correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No.

MR. RAIA: Okay. That's good to know. Now, if I have, let's say, a yearly lease with -- with that tenant, and the Town of Huntington decides not to renew my yearly permit. Does that give me grounds, then, to break that lease with that tenant? Because now to continue to have a tenant in my house I will be violating local law?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes. You would just have to give notice to the tenant.

MR. RAIA: Thirty days?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

MR. RAIA: Okay. All right. Thank you, Chairman.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Malliotakis.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Thank you.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: First, let me start off by saying that, you know, the nine years that I've been here I have voted for the extenders of our rent stabilization. In 2011 and 2015 as well. I think that tenant protections are very important. I also believe that there needs to be a balance between the tenant -- the tenant and landlord relationship, and particularly looking at property taxes as well and as they are going to affect homeowners in our districts. But before I talk a little bit about the property taxes, I just wanted to say some of the things that I've seen here in this bill -- look, this is a very big bill. It has multiple bills that we've taken up previously in it. They would call this basically a "Big Ugly." And I don't think that we should be taking up these pieces of legislation in block like this because there are many provisions that many of us can support, and there are others that we don't like, and it puts in a situation where we either have to vote "yes" or "no" on the entire package. But what I'll say is that from my observations and from listening to this debate here today, you know, this bill will hinder investments in -- in -- and development of affordable housing, which is so critical right now, and

that is truly what we need in the City of New York. It'll also make it very difficult for our small landlords to make capital improvements, to make repairs. Not only difficult, it's going to make it literally unaffordable for them to do so. And I've had a number of constituents that have written to me saying that, you know, they've had properties that have been in their family for generations, and they are good people that work hard, they have other jobs that they -- they are working to try to maintain those properties and keep up with expenses of the City of New York. And -- and -- and we all know the property taxes, the water bills, those aren't being frozen at all, those aren't be capped. And so it's putting a tremendous burden on those small landlords, and -- and particularly those who've had these homes for generations. And we should really be sensitive to that. The housing stock is aged. We're talking about homes before 1974, and as was mentioned, a majority of them are pre-World War II. And so these are homes that are going to need repairs. Look at NYCHA. Look at NYCHA. Look what happens when you don't make necessary repairs. The tenant ends up suffering. It's going to be their quality of life that's going to deteriorate. And this bill actually doesn't require any means testing. So, basically, we're protecting the wealthy tenants in this bill. We're saying that, you know, *If you're wealthy, you can -- you don't have to pay market value, you can pay a rent-stabilized unit -- be in a rent stabilized unit that you're now going to take away from a low-income individual who truly needs that protection.*

Additionally, what we're not doing today I find to be

more problematic, okay? Because we are totally ignoring the fact that the co-op/condo abatement program which has been a protection for those middle-class families in our districts so they don't see their property taxes soar, that's not being renewed. We're actually potentially going to leave here this Session and not renew that, and I think that is particularly problematic. And you'll have to go explain -- explain to your constituents why their property taxes will soar 30 percent if we actually don't renew that property tax abatement.

But what I'll say that affects probably my district the most because we are mostly residential single-family, two-family homes. This bill is going to shift the burden, the property tax burden onto our one- and two-family homes. How so? Well, because we know that the property -- there's four classes of property taxes, right? And Class 2, which is what's being addressed in this bill, they base their assessments on rent rolls. Now, if we're artificially suppressing those rent rolls, then they're not going to be assessed at the proper value and they're not going to be paying the proper property tax that they should be to the City of New York. So now what's going to happen is, that revenue has to be made up somewhere because we know how much the Mayor loves to spend money in the City of New York. It's got to be made up somewhere. So, what's going to happen? That burden is going to be shift onto our Class 1 property owners, the single- and -- and two-family homes in our district. And I know that many of you are receiving complaints from your constituents about how ridiculous property tax bills have become, particularly those of

you from Staten Island, from those of you from various parts of Brooklyn, from the Bronx, from the -- Queens. It's the outer boroughs. Those low- and middle-income communities that are most affected by the current property tax system. And what we're saying today is we're going to shift the burden more onto them. Now, in the City of New York the property tax levy over the five years has increased 44 percent. Forty-four percent. And guess what? Our Mayor and our City Council are set to increase it again in their budget that's coming up. So it'll probably be over 50 percent increase in just five years, and we're going to make it worse if we pass this bill today.

And so, we do need tenant protections in the City of New York. We need to make sure that we have more affordable housing in the City of New York. But, we also need to make sure that those who own their homes can actually afford to stay there as well, or else we're just making the -- the problem worse. And we are driving out our young people. We are driving out our senior citizens. We are driving out our young families that want to start a life here, because they cannot afford this rapid increase in property taxes. Which, by the way, if you're a renter, those costs are passed on to you. So, you're either paying it one way or another. So all of us need to work together to stand up to the City of New York and say, *You've got to cap property taxes. You've got to cap your spending.* This is -- you know, this is not a limited -- unlimited bucket of money. Money does not grow on trees. And we can do the right thing here to protect the rent -- tenants, to protect our homeowners and keep the people in the City of

New York and protect our low- and middle-income families from being forced to sell and flee to other states.

So I will be voting against this bill. And I think that we need to work together for a better solution that protects everyone, and actually truly goes to the core of why New York City is so unaffordable in the first place. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the Rules Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Rules Committee, Speaker's Conference Room immediately.

Mr. Garbarino.

MR. GARBARINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cymbrowitz, will you yield?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, of course.

MR. GARBARINO: Mr. Cymbrowitz, I have just a couple of questions about how this -- this bill is going to apply to properties outside of New York City. You know, we've heard a lot about the big bad landlord and what they -- what they do to tenants. But my 95-year-old grandmother has an accessory apartment at her house on Long Island. And there is a couple of bills --- a couple of parts of this bill that affects the landlord-tenant relationship that she has. She's 95, she's elderly, she's on a lot of medication. She's not

doing great, but she relies on this rent, you know, to -- to stay alive. And, you know, I just want to run a couple of hypotheticals past you to see -- see where we are with this. There's something here, I think you add Section 227(f) of the Real Property Law. So my -- my grandmother wants to rent this apartment to somebody -- they have -- she has a prospective tenant. Again, like I said, she relies on this money, this rent, to survive. And she finds out before she rents to this person that he has 27 judgments of eviction against him for nonpayment of rent. Are you saying with this new section she's no longer allowed to say she doesn't want to rent to him because he -- because of his previous landlord-tenant convictions?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Was she -- she already rented to him?

MR. GARBARINO: No, she -- she was going to rent to him, but then she finds out that he's had these prior issues, 27 convictions of -- warrants and a conviction of -- a judgment of eviction. So she can't say, *I don't want to rent to you because you've had these previous problems?*

MR. CYMBROWITZ: She's determined that she doesn't -- you know, she can -- you know, you can't discriminate based on, you know, based on court data that you've received. But if she finds out when she's talking to him that he has been -- he says to her, *I've been convicted* or *I've been found guilty 27 different times*, she doesn't have to rent to him.

MR. GARBARINO: Well, I'm not sure -- because it

says here, 227(f) it says, *No landlord of a residential premises shall refuse to rent or offer to lease a potential tenant on the basis that the potential tenant was involved in a past or pending landlord-tenant action.* So if -- so if she finds out that he's been involved in these previous actions for nonpayment, she can't say, *Oh, wait. No, never mind?*

MR. CYMBROWITZ: She can't base her decision solely on that.

MR. GARBARINO: Well, no. But if he -- but if she rents to him and -- and he doesn't pay her rent, how is -- how is she going to survive?

All right. Next question, Mr. Chairman. There's something else here -- and I know Mr. -- my colleague mentioned it before, but he -- just briefly. It was about the month-to-month tenancies. So now we've made my grandmother rent to this gentleman who doesn't pay his rent and -- well, he's -- he's been there for a year, they had a lease. Now he stays for the 13th month and it goes to a month-to-month tenancy. And now, she says -- she gets a call from her 97-year-old brother who's very sick, he needs somewhere to stay. Is she allowed to tell the tenant whose lease has expired, is now on a month-to-month tenancy, *I'm sorry, I need this apartment for my sick elderly brother, 97? I need this apartment, you have 30 days.*

MR. CYMBROWITZ: It doesn't change the law at all. She can.

MR. GARBARINO: Well, I'm looking at the section,

though, 232(b). Section 232(b) of the Real Property Law.

Notification to terminate monthly tenancy or tenancy from month-to-month outside the City of New York. *A monthly tenancy or tenancy from month-to-month of any land or buildings located out of the City of New York may be terminated -- the current law says, by the landlord or the tenant upon -- is notifying of the other at least one month before.* But the bill strikes *landlord*, so it only allows the tenant to give the notification of terminancy [sic]. It's on page 45 of the bill, line 48.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: But in another section we say that it has to give 30 days notice. And that's the intent, is that we wanted to make sure that the landlord could continue to give 30 days notice.

MR. GARBARINO: But this -- this section already requires 30 days notice. So what -- why -- why -- and -- and I believe -- I know the law now only requires 30 days notice, so what's -- why do we have to strike it here?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, I -- I think it's -- it was a cleanup and -- and this is -- we just wanted to continue to make sure that there was a 30-day notice given.

MR. GARBARINO: So is there -- well, in this section we remove the landlord's availability to give 30-day notice on a month-to-month tenancy. Which section of this bill -- which section of this bill allows the landlord to give 30-day tenant's notice on a month-to-month tenancy? Because this -- this section removes that.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Okay. 226 allows you to do that.

MR. GARBARINO: 226. And that's -- what page --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: 226(c) --

MR. GARBARINO: 226(c) --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Of the Real Property Law.

MR. GARBARINO: Okay. But that's -- so -- what -- now what does 226 -- see, this -- this gets rid of the 30-day notice. 226 has different notice, doesn't it?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Not for month-to-month.

MR. GARBARINO: Not for month-to-month.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No.

MR. GARBARINO: Okay. So you're telling me the intent -- my grandmother, if she needs to, for her elderly brother, get rid of a -- tell a month-to-month tenant that he needs to leave so she can take care of him, she can still give 30-day notice?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: That's -- that's the current law and it doesn't change.

MR. GARBARINO: Okay. Mr. Chairman, just another couple of questions. This -- this -- going back to the tenant, the one who's been known not to pay his -- his rent, 27 times he's gotten judgment, and my -- my grandmother needs her -- this money to survive. Needs it monthly. You know, she has these medications that she has to pay for. Now, if the tenant doesn't pay the rent, as he's been known not to do, currently, I believe there's a three-day notice,

correct? Of demand for rent due? Currently.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well -- currently, yes.

MR. GARBARINO: So now, I believe this bill says, *Grandmother, you don't get your money. I'm sorry you can't pay for your medication.* But you have to wait to the fifth day before the rent's considered late. Then you have to give the tenant 14 days for demand of rent due. And then if it's still not paid, 10 to 17 days to start the -- notice to start the real property and proceedings action. Which then can be adjourned for 14 days on an unconsented [sic] adjournment. And say you then go back after all that time and get a judgment of eviction and warrant, you then have an automatic 14-day stay until that can be issued. You know, I -- it adds up to -- from -- and then all this time there's been no rent paid for my poor grandmother and her medication. Fifty-seven days minimum, 57 days minimum that this tenant who's not paying his rent and my grandmother is -- just can't get her medication, can stay in that apartment.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: My addition is a little different. I come up with 34 days. But that's -- that's neither here nor there. What we're doing is --

MR. GARBARINO: 34 days --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: We're -- we're giving the tenant -- we're giving the tenant 14 days notice in the beginning, then we give 10 days if there is going to be a court date, and then once the court decides that that person -- that tenant has to leave, you then give them the additional days to get out.

MR. GARBARINO: Okay.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: An additional 14 days to get out in order to find another apartment. So that your grandmother can continue to collect rent and continue to take her medication.

MR. GARBARINO: But --

(Laughter - Applause)

But -- but if she's on --

ACTING SPEAKER REYES: Ladies and gentlemen in the Gallery, please, silence.

MR. GARBARINO: At your own admission, 34 days minimum by your calculations, that's a long time to go without insulin, because she's on diabetes -- she has diabetes. But, you know, we'll just get her some juice or something, I don't know.

Mr. -- Mr. Chairman, just a couple of more. I just -- I do -- I want to go back to the uncontested adjournment portion.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I'm sorry, which part?

MR. GARBARINO: The uncontested adjournment in a -- in one of these actions, a tenant is entitled. Does the tenant have to appear at the court proceeding to get the -- does it have to -- does the tenant have to request the adjournment for the -- the proceeding?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: It's the current law, it doesn't change.

MR. GARBARINO: Well, no, I mean, the judge usually makes it -- I don't believe it -- I don't think you're mandated an

adjournment.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: It is current law. Yes. That doesn't change.

MR. GARBARINO: All right. Okay. Mr. -- Mr. Chairman. So, I -- I just want to make sure -- you know, this -- I think I brought up a couple of issues here about my grandmother that, you know, should possibly be addressed. Because she's not the big bad landlord that, you know, some of these other people might be. She's a -- just an elderly old woman who just wants to get her medication. This bill here with these changes seem -- it sounds like they're going to affect the way she has -- the way she rents her little accessory apartment. And I don't believe that that's the intent of the overall legislation. Maybe some of these rules, these changes that were put in were done without thinking of my grandmother. I'm hoping you think some of these -- there -- there could be room for some amendments in this legislation at a later date.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, I -- I -- I do want to wish your grandmother the best of health. May she continue to live a long life. And HCR will be looking at -- at these regulations, and when they file the report, we'll take a look at it.

MR. GARBARINO: Thank you Mr. Chairman.
On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER REYES: On the bill.

MR. GARBARINO: I -- I thought this was April Fool's Day when I was reading some of this legislation today. To me,

this is -- this is close to insanity, what's being done here to just the landlord-tenant -- to property owners. The Fifth Amendment says that you should not have your property taken for public use without compensation. People's properties are being taken. If landowners are losing the right to their properties, this is -- this is -- like I said, insanity. I can't support this bill. It goes way too far. It talks about tenant protection, but this -- this is taking a property owner's property and giving it over to someone else with no compensation, and I can't support it.

Thank you, Mr. [sic] Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER REYES: Mr. Mikulin.

MR. MIKULIN: Thank you. Will the Chairman yield?

ACTING SPEAKER REYES: Will you yield, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, of course.

ACTING SPEAKER REYES: The Chairman yields.

MR. MIKULIN: Just a -- a few quick questions here. One, the preferential rent. Now we're going take away the ability to do the legal rent upon getting a new lease, right, upon re -- renewing the lease.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: What we're doing is saying that the tenant that is in place and receiving a preferential rent, that has to become the base rent. And any increases would be based on the Rent Guidelines Board.

MR. MIKULIN: Okay. Now, let's say that we -- we do have a good landlord, right, and right now that landlord had the tenant for, let's say, about 20 years, and, you know, it's going back. So 20 years ago, and they've done small increases throughout. So now what's going to happen is is they're going to have to do it off the preferential rent, correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: He's going to have to do what --

MR. MIKULIN: Raises (inaudible) --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I'm sorry, I didn't hear what -- if you can talk a little louder.

MR. MIKULIN: Oh, okay. They're going to have their raises off the pre -- off the preferential rent, the basis and not the --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, that becomes -- that becomes the rent.

MR. MIKULIN: So why aren't we allowing them at least, you know -- I understand this -- why aren't we allowing the landlord at least one more opportunity to net off the base rent before sticker shocking them and continuing it off the preferential rent? Wouldn't it be better to allow them one more opportunity to do what it is that they're doing?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No, the -- the laws become effective when -- when the Governor signs it.

MR. MIKULIN: Okay. And just another question

for you. Now, when we talk about, you know -- I -- I would like to think that we would like to incentivize people to keep their tenants that there are right now, because there's a difference good and bad --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I'm sorry. Could you talk louder?

MR. MIKULIN: I think that we would like to incentivize people to keep the tenants that they have now. So, was there any consideration in if somebody has with rent stabilization a tenant over 20 years, done everything good to -- to give them an increase beyond the -- the 1 to 2 -- 2 percent to say, you know something, you've -- you've done something and we're going to incentivize people in order to not try to have a continual flow out of the apartment?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I'm sorry, was there a --

MR. MIKULIN: I said have -- have we -- have we thought about how allowing a landlord to get a special increase if they kept a tenant for a long period of time?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, I think land -- all landlords like to keep those tenants who continue to pay their rent, and the landlord can continue as in New -- in New York City, based on Rent Guidelines Board, can increase the rent.

MR. MIKULIN: Okay. And just one more thing. Are -- are you familiar with what's going on in Nassau County?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I'm sorry?

MR. MIKULIN: We have an assessment in Nassau

County, a -- a new assessment system that -- that's coming into effect, and with that new assessment system we -- we have rent-stabilized apartments. And in that, if people have been challenging their assessment, they have a lower assessment. But now their -- their taxes are -- some of them could be raised considerably. So, with their taxes being raised considerably and some of the provisions put in here that -- they -- they -- they can't raise the rent when the person vacates an apartment, that could potentially effect that mom-and-pop landowner and -- and make it unaffordable for the landlord to continue to operate.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, since Nassau County is already under EPTA, their increases will come from their Rent Guidelines Board.

MR. MIKULIN: Yes, but also their -- I mean, there's now two governments in play here because there's a reassessment. So, you know, there could be a potential tax increase while they're not going to be able to do what -- what it is that they're normally doing to make it less likely for them to afford the apartment house.

Okay, that would be all. Thank you.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. MIKULIN: I -- I think protecting tenants is a good thing. However, I -- I -- I do think that we have to be more considerate when it comes down to landlords, especially ones that are mom-and-pop and not these big corporations. It could affect these individuals, quite frankly, greatly, and -- and make it unaffordable for

them to continue to operate their homes. And -- and I think that if we get more landlords selling their places to developers, I think we're going to have the anticip -- we want to increase the affordability for tenants, but I think what's going to happen is rent-stabilized apartments, we're going to actually decrease them because of the sales and the developments.

So with that, I'm going to have to vote in the affirmative. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Dinowitz.

MR. DINOWITZ: Thank you.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. DINOWITZ: Oh, where's Mr. Fitzpatrick? Oh, I don't like talking about this without him present, but okay. So, I remember -- I remember sitting right here -- actually it was right here (indicating) at the very last day of Session in 1997. That was the year that Senator Bruno, the Leader in the Senate, announced that all the rent protection laws were going to go away. And, of course, he could have made that happen because the tenant protection laws had a sunset clause. And we had to spend the next several months negotiating to try make sure the laws were renewed and the Emergency Tenant Protection Act was renewed and so on. But starting that year, and actually even before, every single time there were successful efforts made to weaken the protections that tenants had. And that year was particularly bad, because although we were successful in getting the

law renewed, several provisions were put into the law that really were anti-tenant. And I think those who supported that understood that it would take a number of years for it to really achieve its full effect. So this is what the effect has been of the -- of the weakening of tenant protections which started 20 and 25 years ago. Homelessness in New York City went up significantly. And if there's no coincidence that the homelessness went up the same time rents skyrocketed, if you look at the statistics on homelessness and the statistics on rent, if you put it in a chart, in a graph, you wouldn't be able to tell the two apart. Most people who are homelessness -- who are homeless in New York are homeless, they're families, because they can't afford to stay in their apartments. And it's gotten worse and worse over the years. And every gimmick in the book was used to raise those rents. It wasn't only the Rent Guidelines Board increases -- which in some years were actually very high, even if not so in the past few years -- but it was the 20 percent vacancy bonus. And it was the MCIs. It was the IAI's. The list went on and on. And in a year's time, in some apartments rents could be doubled. Not to mention all the apartments over time that were being forced out of rent stabilization because they exceeded the threshold.

So what's being done here today is going to help reverse that trend. Now I know it was mentioned earlier that the pendulum is going too far. The way I see it, the pendulum went too far in the wrong way many years ago, and all that we're doing here today is to try to put the pendulum back in the middle to try to correct

some of the past mistakes that were made and to try to put tenants on a level playing field. The 20 percent vacancy -- can you imagine? Why should somebody get a 20 percent increase for basically sitting on their chairs and doing nothing?

(Applause)

Why should they -- why should they get that? And as far as -- and I know some of this, I'm sure, was said already, but the MCIs and the IAIIs were so subject to abuses. And I know this firsthand, because we have a lot of people that come to our office dealing with these problems. And there is no question in my mind that while some landlords may actually turn in honest bills on the IAIIs and MCIs, there are others who don't. And some of the individual apartment improvements are made not to improve the apartments as such, but simply to raise the rent. And so they will tear out a kitchen which didn't need to be torn apart, tear out the fixtures in the bathroom and so on, spend X number of dollars and maybe submit a bill for five X number of dollars. And the formula is such that they get these enormous increases, and they never go away and every future increase is compounded on that. Well, that's not going to happen anymore. But landlords are still going to get some money off MCIs and IAIIs. It's just not going to be what they're used to. And one of the biggest problems we've had in our district, and I assume throughout the City, in recent years is the problems caused by preferential rents. And the preferential rents are such that tenants may be paying less than what -- what their -- the landlords are allowed to charge and what the

maximum legal rent is, but it's not less than what the market will bear. But the problem is is that the landlords have the right today to go back to the legal rent at the next lease. And that means that no tenant is going to want to ever make any demands of the landlord, even those demands are well-deserved -- like, you know, *Fix something* -- because they're afraid that the landlord will simply jack up the rent from the preferential rent number to a very high number. We're changing that here today. And one of the other things we're doing, it's actually one of the -- one of the bills in this package that I had originally, which is to deal with the rent overcharge look-back. Right now, if a landlord overcharges and you move into an apartment some years later - and I'm not saying the landlord was committing fraud, although that could have been the case - but simply a mistake and it happened four-and-a-half years ago, you can't do anything about it. You can't get that mistake corrected. We changed that. We make the look-back period a six-year statute of limitations, and there's even a further look-back under certain circumstances. So when you take these issues together, what it means is that these enormous rent increases, which is the single biggest cause of homelessness in New York, won't be happening to the degree that they have been happening for the past 20 or 25 years. This is going to protect people that we represent, and I can tell you that representing my district, the four districts in the West Bronx -- mine, Assemblyman Rivera's, Joyner's and Pichardo's -- we have perhaps the highest or one of the highest concentration of rent- regulated apartments anywhere in the City. And

so we have a huge number of people who are going to benefit from us simply leveling the playing field and having that pendulum swing back to the middle where it should be. So landlords, yes, they'll still be able to make a profit. I mean, when I hear people whining and complaining, no, they're going to make lots of money. They just may not make quite as much money, and that's money that's going to be in the pockets of average New Yorkers who are trying to live and stay in the City and be able to afford to have their own apartment.

So I'm very -- after all these years, after all these years, I am so ecstatic that we are finally doing this. I'm thankful to -- to our Chair, to our Speaker, and everybody because I know this is a package that a lot of people participated in. This is going to make life better for people in our districts and people in the State. So I would strongly urge a yes vote.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Richardson.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today extremely emotional because of the impact that this housing package bill will make on the ground in communities across the State of New York. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I proudly represent the 43rd Assembly District which encompass the communities of Crown Heights, Prospect Leopard Gardens and East Flatbush, Brooklyn. Ground Zero for gentrification and Ground Zero for displacement. I want to create a scenario. Not a hypothetical one, but one that is very real for the residents that I represent who are suffering with preferential rents. Who upon renewal of their lease can see upwards --

an upward tick of \$3- to \$5- to \$600 in just one rental increase. I'm talking about individuals who have to choose constantly between paying the rent or food, let alone paying the rent and prescriptions. I represent, Mr. Speaker, a county -- a district within a county where we have the second-highest concentrations of eviction. That means that every single day at housing court at 141 Livingston Street, someone who I represent is standing on that line. They're standing on that line from the very laws that we have put on the books here in the State Legislature, the very laws that we will reform today. We have been subjected to abuse by programs that were supposed to help to, you know, protect our rental stock, but by greedy landlords and greedy developers, it was abused. I'm talking directly, Mr. Speaker, about MCIs, the criminality of it. I'm so proud with this bill that we have lowered the cap to 2 percent Statewide. Mr. Speaker, the most abused program in the State of New York, Individual Apartment Improvements, IAIs. We got reform on that here today. Where you will only be able to take three IAIs over a 15-year period. And guess what? Yes, it is capped at \$15,000 because, no, Mr. Speaker, a toilet should not cost \$3,000. Then on top of jacking up the rents to displace longtime residents for, guess what, Mr. Speaker, people who do not look like me, because let's just talk about the racism that's in housing. After you displace the tenant out of their home, good for you, landlord, you get a 20 percent bonus for kicking someone out. Well, we have ended that today. There will be no more vacancy bonus, and there will be no more vacancy decontrol. I hear people

talking about it here today, that the landlords are going to suffer, the buildings will fall in disrepair. But I'm here to put it on the record that the buildings are already in disrepair. We have mold, we have all kind of things that are going on in buildings -- stop clapping -- we have so many things that are going on in buildings that is despicable housing conditions that none of these people will want their mothers to live in, but they think it's fit for our constituents to live in it. And today we say no more. And you know, what Mr. Speaker? Let me just say thank you. I want to see him. Thank you for your courage. Thank you for your courage. Thank you for your courage for bringing a bill like this to the floor. I was elected in 2015, and when I reached here to the New York State Legislature, it was to my dismay at where we were with the housing laws in 2015. We didn't get any real changes, minimal fake changes that did nothing but, you know, gloss the surface just to say we did something. And I was a depressed legislator. You want to know why I was mad? Because every single day I would go back home after being up here serving, and I'm looking at my community fall apart. My community's falling apart. My residents are coming into the office asking us for help and I could do nothing for them. I thank you, Carl Heastie. I thank you. I thank you because this is real to the 43rd Assembly District. We have taken great reforms with the look-back. We're not going only look back four years, now we're going to look back six years now. We're going to give people opportunity to really right the wrongs and empower HCR to take action and enforcement for all of the bad actors. We are

expanding the ETPA across the State of New York because to all of our Upstate, Upstate, Upstate, Upstate, Upstate allies, I want you to know that we love you, and I'm from Brooklyn and I love you and we will support you and we will advocate for you and we will continue this fight for years and years and years to come. And so we did not get all of good cause eviction, but we got elements of it, and we will continue to keep pressing. We heard your voices, and we promise you to continue the fight for you.

Today we are saying, *No more*, and we are putting it on the record. There's going to be no more blacklisting. There will be no more displacement, disenfranchisement. We say yes to transparency. We say yes to housing stability. We say yes to the empowerment of our community with prosperity. Because we deserve housing justice for all. Not just for some, Mr. Speaker, but for all. Oh God.

(Laughter)

I want to speak directly to the residents of the 43rd Assembly District, and I want to tell them how much I love you. I don't claim to be perfect as a legislator. I show up every day, everywhere, just Diana Richardson, and I thank you guys for loving me. There's -- there's nothing greater than this moment for me to be able to have worked with some of the most dynamic colleagues in this House who showed a spirit of resiliency. Even when we felt like we were losing, we still kept going. And it was them, alongside you guys who loved me, that allowed us to be here today. We are going to be

changing lives. Because there's a recipe to homelessness, and there's a recipe to displacement, and today we just remixed that recipe and we're serving a new meal.

So let me tell -- let me say this to all those who are going to be what we say in the community "big mad." Oh, well. I say oh, well. Oh, well. Because in these Chambers [sic] and in these halls, the influence has swung justice in the wrong direction for far too long, and now we have a crisis on our hand. And through your same greed, you brewed a spirit of new leadership in so many of us who are here, and we are very unapologetic and we are very unafraid. So bring on whatever you got after this, because we are ready for the battle.

I want to say thank you. Thank you to everyone who supported us. Thank you for everyone who stood tall. Thank you for everyone for all of your encouragement. It's because of you. It's because of your love. It's because of you showing up and encouraging us and sharing your stories and not being afraid to testify and put it on the record, even when it felt like we were not going to win. It was because of you. You uplifted us in the times where we were low, and that we are here today.

I say thank you, Mr. Speaker. I say thank you, Mr. Speaker. I say thank you, Mr. Speaker. And with that I vote in the affirmative.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you. Thank you. Please, abstain.

Mr. Montesano. I don't know why you want to do that.

(Laughter)

MR. MONTESANO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield, please?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cymbrowitz, will you yield?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, of course.

MR. MONTESANO: Most of my questions have to do with the modular homes, but just before I get to that I just have a question. One of the amendments that's being made is to Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law regarding eviction proceedings. And I know this particular provision is limited to the housing courts in the City of New York. But in there it allows judges to issue a stay of eviction for up to one year when a tenant cannot find suitable housing in the same neighborhood or the -- or the eviction would cause an extreme hardship. And I just wanted to ask, during that one-year period that the judge stays the eviction, does the tenant have to pay use and occupancy to the landlord?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

MR. MONTESANO: Now moving over to the modular home. Well, just let me back up for a second. If the eviction was brought on for a nonpayment because the tenant didn't have the ability to pay, what would happen in that one-year period? In other words, is the stay of the eviction only predicated on their ability to pay

the rent per year?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: There's judicial discretion at that point.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. Thank you. Now, regarding modular homes, and there's a lot on it. Now, when we talk about modular homes, are you speaking about those homes that are, like, on the concrete blocks and they're sitting on land, correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes. Those -- those are the homes that people live and do not own -- they -- they own the building, they own the modular home, but they don't own the land.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. So essentially, they have a ground lease to put their home on. Am I correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: They're -- they're paying rent --

MR. MONTESANO: Okay.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: -- to the landlord of that property.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. And as part of that rent, does the landlord provide the electric service and sanitary service?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No. All they supply is the hook-up, but the -- the tenant still pays the rent. I'm sorry, still pays the electrical bill.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. So now because these modular homes are really not considered real property - they have a title from the Department of Motor Vehicles as proof of ownership - it

seems like we're creating a landlord-tenant relationship or, you know, in order to effectuate their stay there, that doesn't exist. Like, these places, they have a lease for their ground to rent the ground, and that's essentially it. What I see some amendments to the law is doing here is that -- so I'll bring out the point with the ownership. They rent to buy. So the rent to buy, I believe - and please correct me if I'm wrong - has to do with the mobile unit itself or does it affect the ground portion?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, it's the mobile unit itself.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: But this is all under Section 233.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: So this is a landlord-tenant relationship.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. So, now if they -- it says here that the rent-to-own contract shall be in writing. But prior to this, under this provision of law, because they rent to buy or just rent the unit itself, just as a renter, it -- does it create a landlord-tenant relationship?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes. The -- with the rent-to-buy, what -- what you have is how much you're paying in rent, and then how much you're paying --

MR. MONTESANO: Towards the unit price.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: -- to rent to buy.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. But in a case where a

person is just renting the unit, they're not -- they're not renting to buy, they're just renting it, is that under the law currently, a landlord-tenant relationship?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. Now.... just bear with me one second because I lost my spot. Okay. So anyway, under this bill it says that all rent increases, including fees, rents, charges, assessments and utilities shall be subject to judicial challenge -- challenge. Does that mean that if a landlord gives notice to the tenant that there's going to be an increase in one of these fees, that automatically the tenant could go into court and challenge that increase?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No. You're entitled -- what we have done for the first time is put a 3 percent cap on annual increases. That never existed before. So that the owners of that -- of that property can just put any type of increase whatsoever. So we put a 3 percent cap. In addition, that if there's anything above 3 percent but less than 6 percent, then the tenant can then go to court to challenge that increase.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. And if the landlord can substantiate the increase because maybe there's tax increases or whatever the case may be, will he be entitled to collect the increase?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: If -- if once they go to court and the judge makes that decision, yes.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. All right. Now, also you have in here that in the event -- Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I can't

hear.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. Shh.

Ladies and gentlemen, looks like some folks in the back there may be a little distracted.

MR. MONTESANO: In the event that the -- we have a -- you have a provision now I understand that's where the park owner changes the use of land and he seeks to evict a manufactured homeowner, it says the owner must provide the manufactured homeowner a stipend of \$15,000 prior to the execution of a warrant for eviction. Now, why would he have to do that?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, that's for the cost of -- of moving their mobile home. It's \$15,000 or the court -- or an amount determined by the court. It could be less, it could be more.

MR. MONTESANO: All right. But one of the issues we have is, so the modular homes are not really -- in the sense, anyway -- permanent fixtures. It's something that you could hook up to a trailer. If it has the wheels on it, you could roll it away. Some of them, of course, are mounted onto cinderblocks. But they are what they are. They're not really real property, they're mobile homes and they have a DMV title. If the property owner decides he wants to take his land -- and let's just pretend for a moment there's 100 mobile homes on there, and he thinks that he can redevelop his land for a, I don't know, retail building or any kind of construction he wants to put on there, it's his property. Why should he have to pay people if he gives them the proper notice, *Hey, look, I'm not renewing your leases*

and you have to move. Why does he have to pay them any damages or fees to move away?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, I think we're talking about two different types of -- of property. We're not talking about a mobile home in the sense that they have wheels. These are manufactured homes that are -- do not have wheels, they are placed on -- on -- on blocks and is a residence. It's a permanent residence. They can't pick up their home and just move it some place else.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. But in the case of -- and in that scenario, still, why does the landlord have to pay the tenant to move? Why does he have to pay those costs for? It's his property. If he decides to change the use -- I mean, that could go to any building that we have -- a regular building, also. The landlord decides, *You know what? I'm going to have my tenants move out, I'm going to take the building down and put something else up.* Why does he have to pay, like, a penalty to the tenants to have them move?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Because this is their home.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. But it's also his property. And -- and -- and the reason why I bring that out is while many of the things here, you know, are going to provide some relief to tenants, many of these things are going a step too far, almost to be a deprivation of the landlord's property. It's almost a taking of the prop -- of his personal property by government. You know, and so where do we draw the line when we -- listen, we had a situation right outside my district, okay, in -- in -- on Jericho Turnpike there was a big

mobile home park there for years, and the guy decided, *You know what? I don't want to do this anymore. The better use for my property is to sell it to a developer, let him put some housing there.*

And this case dragged out for two or three years. People demanded all kind of payments and everything. Why should a property owner be subject to that when he wants to develop his own property?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: We didn't come up with a number out of thin air. This was the result of meetings that we had with the Manufactured Homes Association, with HCR, with the Attorney General's office, and with some of my colleagues here who have advocated strongly for the manufactured homes. And this isn't -- these -- these are rules that we came up with together, and that dollar amount was something that -- that was agreed to.

MR. MONTESANO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr.
Speaker, for the opportunity to interrupt our proceedings yet again.
We should call the Governmental Operations Committee to the
Speaker's Conference Room. Ms. Titus will be on her way.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Governmental
Operations, Speaker's Conference Room.

Ms. Byrnes.

MS. BYRNES: Will the speaker yield? Excuse me --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The sponsor will

yield. I never yield.

(Laughter)

MS. BYRNES: Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield?
I've been sitting here way too long this week.

Let me start off right where we just left off. Well,
first of all, will you yield?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, of course.

MS. BYRNES: Okay. Starting off where we just left
off, my impression is while we've been -- and the statute refers to
manufactured home parks, you're not -- so you're not talking about
mobile home parks, you're talking about something called a
manufactured home park?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: They're year-round,
manufactured home parks, yes.

MS. BYRNES: Well, I understand, but because --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: It's like the ones that -- that
our friends in Akron, not far from your district, live in.

MS. BYRNES: No, no. I understand, because all of
the parks I'm familiar with -- well, first, they do have some
manufactured homes, but then a lot of them that rent the spots, the
land, also are the homes that do have wheels underneath, they're
mounted onto concrete. And -- and they are, as was referred to with
wheels underneath and, technically, have DMV titles, and those are
the parks I think we're talking about. And they usually then have
either concrete or metal put around the edge. These are permanent

homes. So I'm just trying to distinguish so that if this legislation becomes law, as I expect it will, so that if we have manufactured homes and mobile homes on the same sites, are we only talking about manufactured homes, not mobile homes?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Section 233 applies to both.

MS. BYRNES: Okay. What is this statute -- so man -- so what's the definition, then, of a manufactured home for the purposes of this legislation?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Okay. Under Section 2 -- 233, for the term manufactured home means, "A structure transportable in one or more sections which in the traveling mode is a body -- feet or more in width -- it goes -- "... when erected on site is 320 or more feet." I mean, there's a definition in Section 233.

MS. BYRNES: Okay. All right. Whatever that definition is, that is the type of home that it applies to and none other?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Correct.

MS. BYRNES: All right. So if something else might be on the property that is not under that definition, this law won't control that property, correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: This law would what? I'm sorry.

MS. BYRNES: This law would not control if another type of unit was sitting on the property.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No, it would not apply. No.

MS. BYRNES: All right. Now, I wanted to also get

into the definition of a manufactured home seller to see if that's part of the rent-to-own. Obviously, before a manufactured home ends up on its site, you've purchased the home from a seller. Rarely are they already on the site. So does this mean that you can engage in a rent-to-own contract with the manufactured home seller?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No.

MS. BYRNES: So the home already has to be on a site, at a park, and then if somebody decides to rent that unoccupied place, this law applies.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

MS. BYRNES: Okay. Now talking for a second about the legality of rent-to-own, the statute obviously talks a lot about rent-to-own and all of the requirements for eviction and things of that nature, but the statute never actually says that rent-to-own is legal. Is rent-to-own legal in our State? For manufactured homes on these sites.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: It's already happening. It's unregulated.

MS. BYRNES: And I know it's happening. Is it legal?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: It's legal, but it's unregulated.

MS. BYRNES: Okay.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: And that's why we're doing this.

MS. BYRNES: Because I do have a number of

manufactured home sites within my district, and my understanding is that a number of them have been threatened by the Attorney General's office with criminal prosecution because the Attorney General's office has told them under threat of prosecution that rent-to-own is a violation of the Federal banking laws. Are you aware of that, sir?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: The Attorney General helped us draft this legislation, this part of the legislation. So they're very aware of -- of -- of manufactured homes.

MS. BYRNES: Okay. Did they tell you that they --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: They might -- they might be -- you know, they -- my -- my thought would be that they are saying this because they might be investigating bad practices within the park.

MS. BYRNES: And that might very well be. So going back to it, if they had told these parks that it is illegal under Federal law and that they would be prosecuted by the Attorney General of New York State, is a violation of law -- banking laws for them to engage in this practice, would the Attorney General's office have been wrong in telling them that?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I think it would be a mistake on my part to talk about what the Attorney General's office is doing, why it's investigating. And that's something that the park owner -- either you or the park owners would get involved with the Attorney General's office.

MS. BYRNES: With all due respect, sir, you brought forth this very intricate legislation with all these rules about

rent-to-own. My question is, is it legal, is it even allowed under New York State law?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: That -- that is an interpretation that the Attorney General has made, that it is.

MS. BYRNES: Okay. So you are affirmatively telling us that the Attorney General and the State of New York, that it is legal to engage in this practices so that if my constituents do this, they are not violating law?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No, what I'm saying is we have deferred to the Attorney General and their interpretation.

MS. BYRNES: Well, if the Attorney General says it is illegal, then why are we working on this law?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, that's not what the Attorney General has said. They -- you said -- you stated the facts of them investigating a park or several parks. I can't tell you why they're investigating.

MS. BYRNES: All right. Moving on, you would agree with me, however, that rent-to-own can be a tremendous benefit to people who have poor credit and otherwise could not afford to actually engage in homeownership? Do you agree with me on that?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I -- I think rent to --

MS. BYRNES: We can at least agree on that.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I -- I -- I think rent-to-own is a terrific system in which people can work -- continue to live in a manufactured park and one day own that mobile home.

MS. BYRNES: A lot of times, frequently people who couldn't get a bank loan because they don't have good credit, but they can still achieve that American Dream of homeownership through this process. Correct, sir?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Okay.

MS. BYRNES: But in order to do it, you've got to have people willing to rent-to-own and companies willing to do it. My question is, if we have established under the -- that if a manufactured home tenant -- tenancy is terminated, all rent-to-own payments made during the term of the contract shall be refunded. Is that going to be part of the law, sir?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

MS. BYRNES: So you could have somebody spending \$500 a month to rent a manufactured home for five years, have paid \$30,000 to the park. They do something to get thrown out of the park, but yet, the park has to pay them back \$30,000. Is that correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: This is in the section of rent-to-own. It's not the rent that they're paying on a monthly basis. There are two different rents that are being paid.

MS. BYRNES: But I'm saying, sir, you indicated, though, that the payments made during the term of the contract shall be refunded. So that potentially \$30,000 over five years, even if there -- the tenant is the reason for the termination, that it would be the park that would have to pay them back. That's what it says, correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: They would get the refund of the \$30,000, but we have to make it clear that they're not getting back the monthly rent that they've been paying during that period of time. There's two categories: One is the rent that they're paying, and the other is the rent-to-buy category.

MS. BYRNES: We're talking about the rent-to-buy payments.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

MS. BYRNES: So in other words, they would have had use of this home for five years ultimately cost-free, other than just renting the land underneath it.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No. Remember, they're paying monthly rent.

MS. BYRNES: For the land.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: -- in addition -- they're paying monthly rent in addition to rent-to-buy dollars. So they're paying two sums of money. The one is to pay their monthly rent, the other are -- are dollars that they're paying to rent-to-buy.

MS. BYRNES: Okay. Is the monthly rent --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: And that's the (inaudible).

MS. BYRNES: But the monthly rent is the rent for the land that the home is on, correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No. It's for them to live in -- in the home.

MS. BYRNES: So, they're going to pay three rents

for three things; rent for the land and then rent for the home, and then another additional amount on top it towards the rent-to-own?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Rent-to-buy.

MS. BYRNES: Rent-to-buy. Well, buy and own.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: But the -- the tenant has -- has the right to enter into an agreement if that's what they want to do. Nobody's forcing them to do anything.

MS. BYRNES: I understand it. But I'm just making sure that ultimately, the person who's going to lose even if the tenant is at fault in the termination is the person who actually owns the park. They're the ones who are losing out here of everything. I mean, shouldn't we want to be encouraging people to do and engage in this rent-to-own and not discouraging them? Because it is --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Oh, I agree with that. I agree with that. That's -- it's --

MS. BYRNES: All right. Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, Ms. Byrnes.

Mr. Carroll.

MR. CARROLL: On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. CARROLL: For too long, our rent laws have been tipped in favor of landlords. Today we make sure that stops. By eliminating vacancy decontrol, the vacancy bonus and curtailing

preferential rent during the lease term and severely curtailing IAI and MCI adjustments, we rebalance the scales in favor of tenants, in favor of long-term residents. We make it clear that greed is not good. We make sure that individuals who have spent generations in neighborhoods can sleep at night without anxiety or fear of being displaced.

This is a wonderful bill for all of our communities. It makes sure that communities can be maintained. It makes sure that our housing stock is preserved, and it rebalances our rent laws in favor of tenants, in favor of families. I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this wonderful piece of legislation, and I commend the sponsor.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Pichardo.

MR. PICHARDO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. PICHARDO: Well, first of all, this is an enormous day and a fantastic day for tenants. Ladies and gentlemen, Speaker and my colleagues, you've heard this (inaudible) before. Elections have consequences. And at the end of the day, when tenants and individuals across this State rose up and changed the old guard and put in a new guard, this was important for them and their priorities. Because this is something that affects them on a day-to-day basis. In my time as a legislator here in this House, I have knocked on

thousands and thousands of doors across the West Bronx and talked to hundreds of my neighbors, and their priority has always been and will continue to be is that, *How do I afford to stay in my home?* The laws in this State, unfortunately, have been so skewed to one side of the conversation that I could never have guaranteed and said to my -- to my neighbors that I will do everything that I can to try to keep the rents as -- as low as possible. But under the current laws that exist today in terms of rent regulations in this State, particularly within the City of New York, the rent would continue to go up to a point where my neighbors, unfortunately, would find themselves in situations where they could be working full-time, both parents, and including some sons and daughters in that household, and they would have to live in a homeless shelter. Imagine that, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues. Do you think that it is fair that in the year 2019, when we see individuals living in our districts that are working full-time, are trying to achieve the American Dream and have their slice of the pie, that they barely have enough to either pay for rent or to the point where they don't have enough to pay for rent and have to live in homeless shelters. One of the first events that I did as a member of this Body and this House in my -- in my district was to visit families in a homeless shelter during the holiday season. And it broke my heart, ladies and gentlemen, that when I went to visit that homeless shelter and I spoke to those parents, many of those parents wearing nurse's uniforms, uniforms for fast-food restaurants, for clothing stores, they were working full-time and they were grateful

that we were -- myself and my colleague from the other House were able to bring over supplies and toys for the kids, and talk to the parents and the folks who are there, if they had any other needs or assistance that we could help them with. That sort of almost -- the pride and the dignity that a lot of these folks had was lost in that moment, that they needed to get continual help from the government because, unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, Speaker and my colleagues, we, as a Legislature, have failed them.

Today we correct that wrong. We right this ship. We swing the pendulum in a determinative way to make sure that tenants in this State deserve and have the right to have a home. Ladies and gentlemen, we today are creating laws that are more fair, just and really move the scales and makes us closer to that great American experiment that we are all equal, that we deserve to pursue the -- the right and have the liberty to pursue happiness and justice. But here today, I am proud. And one of my proudest moments here as a member of this House and this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, that again, we are tipping the scales of justice and the rights of tenants back where it belongs. My neighbors in the West Bronx deserve to have a home. My neighbors in the West Bronx deserve to not to worry that they're going to be evicted or have their rent increased 40, 50, 60 percent in one shot. It is unfair. It is unconscionable that I have to sit down with constituents on a weekly basis, coming to me saying, *I am going to be evicted from my home. I'm going to lose my home where I raised two children, sent them out*

to college, did the right thing, and my government has failed me; to protect me and protect what I've worked for all these years.

I am proud not only as a son of the Bronx, but as a son of immigrants that I'm standing up for them, I'm standing up for tenants today, and I thank the Chair of the Housing Committee, my colleagues who have stood with me in this fight in making sure that we tip the pendulum and the scales back to the people and the power where it belongs. And thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Ra.

MR. RA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cymbrowitz, will you yield?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, of course.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The sponsor yields.

MR. RA: Thank you. So, I know this has been brought up a couple of times, but I still am a little unclear on this because my reading and the reading of some of our staff is different than -- than what I've heard on the floor today and even yesterday when this was brought up in the Codes Committee. So on pages 44 and 45 of the bill, you know, there's 226(c), which is a new section, that goes through this, you know, the landlord providing 30 days if the tenant has been there less than a year, 60 days if more than a year, and then, you know, 90 if more than two years. But the question was

raised earlier regarding Section 7 of the bill, which -- which is the amendment to Section 232(b) of the Real Property Law. For notification to terminate monthly tenancy or tenancy for month-to-month outside the City of New York. Now the -- the question, very simply, is is this removing the landlord's ability to give notice to quit and, you know, with -- and then have -- after 30 days have -- be able to -- to cancel that tenancy?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: The answer is no. We -- the intent was we wanted the length of time to be considered, and I -- I think you'd be -- you wouldn't be shocked if I said that four different lawyers read this and came up with four different responses.

MR. RA: I -- I would not. That's why we get to charge so much.

(Laughter)

MR. CYMBROWITZ: But it was our intent -- intent that -- that if you have a month-to-month lease but you've been in the same location for 20 years, then our intent is that you receive the 90 days. But if you're only there for 30 days, then you receive 30 days notice.

MR. RA: Okay. But so -- but that's under 226(c). So -- but the Section 232(b) -- I guess I'm unclear what -- what situations would -- would one apply as opposed to the other? Or does -- does 226(c) apply in those situations, and then at what point what is -- what is the effect of 232(b)? Because what it does here on this -- you know, and this is at the bottom of page 45 of the bill, lines 43

through 52 -- currently a monthly tenancy or tenancy from month-to-month of any lands or buildings located outside the City of New York may be terminated -- under current law it says land -- by the landlord or the tenant. What this bill does is strike landlord.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: We've removed landlord from that section.

MR. RA: Yes. So does that mean that in a month-to-month tenancy, the landlord cannot provide a 30- day notice?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No. In another section, the landlord -- there -- it says that the landlord can -- can terminate the -- the tenancy.

MR. RA: And so -- so that -- that goes back to --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Go back to 226(c).

MR. RA: Okay. So -- so your intention is that the landlord would still be able to provide that 30-day notice --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Absolutely.

MR. RA: -- in a month-to-month tenancy?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

MR. RA: Thank -- thank you very much, Mr. Cymbrowitz.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Thiele.

MR. THIELE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And with my time today, I would like to focus on the portion of the bill, Part O, that deals with manufactured home parks. Frequently also called

"mobile home parks." And I would encourage my colleagues to never call them trailer parks, ever call them trailer parks. These are homes. You don't get a Ford pickup truck and, you know, attach one of these to the back of the pickup truck and move them. These are people's homes, and these are communities in our State. And, quite frankly, they are a major source of affordable housing across the State of New York. There are 1,900 manufactured home parks in New York State. There are over 70,000 residences, places that are called homes in these manufactured home parks. And it's not just on Long Island. It's the Hudson Valley, it's the North Country, the Southern Tier, Central New York, Western New York. From Riverhead to Akron, mobile home parks, manufactured home parks, provide a needed and very necessary source of affordable housing. And the reason why there's a special section in the Real Property Law for manufactured home parks is because of the special and unique relationship that exists with regard to park residents and the park owners. Homeownership in manufactured home parks differs from other forms of homeownership, and it is different from traditional landlord-tenant relationships. Unlike other homeowners, because manufactured homeowners own their home -- they own their home, but they do not own the land on which the -- the home is located. Because of this, they have no control over a substantial portion of their housing costs. Further, vacancies in existing manufactured home parks are extremely rare in this State, and the cost of relocating a manufactured home, even if such a vacancy exists, is prohibitively high and threatens the structural integrity of

many of the manufactured homes. Manufactured homeowners total -- have a total lack of bargaining power, and that disrupts the normal operation of market forces and renders such homeowners captive to whatever terms a park owner may choose to impose. Although there are many good park owners who choose not to take advantage of their superior bargaining power, we have many cases across the State where many of them do. This often results in manufactured homeowners being evicted because of manufactured home park rents they -- that they can no longer afford. And as a result, they lose all together their -- their homes, and they have no alternative locations on which to -- to bring them. Under current law, park residents who rent lots in manufactured home parks have no legal remedy for an unjustified and unreasonable rent increase. So, in summary, they own their home, but they have to rent the land. And unlike tenants, they just can't pick up the House, their home, and move it somewhere. They have little bargaining power. They're vulnerable, and they have very little legal protection. And who are they? Well, mostly they're senior citizens and they're people that are on fixed incomes. But not all of them. Many times it's -- it's a first home for many young families. They're working-class people. They pay their taxes, they're an integral part of their community. And all they're asking for in return is home security, that they will have a safe and affordable place to live. But the history in New York State, the fact is is that they've often been subjected to unreasonable rent increases. A lot of times the money that comes from their rent isn't reinvested in the park and they have substandard

conditions. And oftentimes they live with intimidation and unscrupulous business practices.

During my term in office, I've met with these mobile home park residents in town halls, in community rooms, in their -- in the manufactured home parks and in my office. I see their frustration. I see their anger. But mostly, I see the fear on their faces with not knowing what's going to happen with their home. Will they be able to afford to stay in their homes? Will they even have a place to live? Well, in my meeting through the many years, I made a promise to them to try to pass legislation that would at least give them a remedy from rent gouging, from unconscionable or unreasonable rent. I promised to try to pass that legislation or die heading in that general direction. And after many years, I was beginning to fear it would be the latter and not the former, because over the decades the Assembly year after year has passed unconscionable rent remedies for mobile home -- manufactured home park tenants, only to see the bill die or to see the clock run out in the Chamber across the hall from us. Not this year. Not not this time. For mobile home residents, today is their -- their day. This is their time. Today we're going to be passing landmark legislation that will give residents a remedy against unreasonable rent increases and home security. The bill does even more than provide a remedy with regard to unreasonable rents. It also provides, as was mentioned before, transparency and protections for homeowners with regard to rent-to-own contracts. It also provides protections when there's going to be a change in ownership. It expend

-- extends the time before eviction can take place, and provides the opportunity for moving expenses. With the existing opportunity that -- that residents have when a park is going to be sold and the use to be changed, they have the right of first refusal. We're extending the time there, also. And it -- they're given greater information about what their rights are as manufactured home tenants.

This is an extremely important bill, and it will change their lives in a very meaningful way. I want to thank the Speaker for including this bill as part of the overall housing package that we're doing today. I want to thank our Housing Chairman, Mr. Steve Cymbrowitz, for all of the great work that he did with regard to this legislation. Making it, quite frankly, a much better bill than the bill that I've been passing in this House over the last ten years. And I also want to thank the Assembly staff that is sitting next to Mr. -- Mr. Cymbrowitz. I got pretty emotional about this bill, as some folks might know, in conference. I think today you know why. But the staff, they did the hard work on making this a better bill. And I'm mindful of the fact that earlier this week while we were at our End of Session party, they were rewriting this bill to make it a better bill, and calling me on the phone to keep me apprised of what changes they were making, and making me feel real guilty that I was at a party while they were doing the work. But I thank them today for all of the great work they did. This is probably the least discussed, and the part of the overall housing bill that gets the least attention, but in many ways, for many people, it's the most part of this bill.

I want to thank, again, all of those who had a part in it. And I want to urge my colleagues, if you've got manufactured home residents or mobile home park residents in your district, take a good look at that part -- this part of the legislation. It's reason enough for your yes vote on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Niou.

MS. NIOU: Hello, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make a couple of comments. I think that this is one of the most important bills that we are going to be passing in the entirety of this Session. And so I want to tell you a little bit about what I have to go through in my district. The realities of the tenant harassment in my district are -- are so dire. I'm going to tell you a little bit about what happened with 85 Bowery. 85 Bowery was rent-stabilized tenants who were majority Asian-American, with the oldest in the apartment being 97 and the youngest being three days old. And when they were told by their landlord that they had to vacate their apartment due to the landlord not fixing their stairwell after a court order that had passed for two years asking the landlord to basically fix the stairwell, they were -- they were shocked and also dismayed, to say the least. And I just had to help them to make sure that they were able to even have warmth for the night and that they -- they could even get food for the evening because they had to move out as many of their things in the

emergency as possible. They were vacated from their apartment during the evening of one night from -- by the -- by the Department of Buildings, and -- and they were not able to actually be able to get back in for nine months. During that time, the landlord continued to harass them. The reason why the landlords want to harass tenants is so they can get them out of their building so that they could rent the buildings for more or to completely make the buildings uninhabitable and -- and unlivable so that the tenants would want to leave so that they can demolish the building and build luxury high-rise condos. Because my area is the 65th District, and the 65th District encompasses all of Lower Manhattan, the Financial District, Chinatown and the Lower East Side and Battery Park City. And in that area, our medium market-rate rent is approximately \$3,700 for a one-bedroom. So when you're talking about being able to make that kind of market-rate rent, you can understand why, you know, some landlords are incensed to harass their tenants out of their buildings in order to be able to collect that very large amount of market-rate rent. We have seen some of the worst landlords in Lower Manhattan. We have seen Steve Croman. We have seen Joe Betesh. We have seen so many different landlords who have gone down the tenant harassment route because they know that they can collect a vacancy bonus, and they know that, you know, whenever they switch tenants they can get -- they can up the rent until they reach vacancy decontrol and then they can charge market rate. And then the more that they harass tenants, the more that they will, you know, be incensed to leave. And so this is the trend that goes on a

lot in the Lower East Side. We hear the arguments of folks saying, like, *Oh, there's going to be, you know, less high-quality maintenance if we get rid of MCIs or IAs*. But the opposite is, I think, true because in my district, people are given the worst quality things. People are literally harassed with bricks through their toilets, holes on their -- in their floors. The landlords have, after vacating one apartment, will make noise in that apartment until other tenants are harassed to leave. These are the trends that we have been seeing. And the reason why it is so important that we are giving these tenant protections is to make it so that the tenants don't have to suffer that way anymore.

In the case of 85 Bowery, the landlords continued to harass the tenants so much during the time that they were there that they even took their belongings that they had left in their apartment and threw them into a dumpster, and *I* had to go in and get their things out of a dumpster. I was dumpster-diving to save my constituents' belongings. They threw out electronics, money, clothes, students' books, backpacks. Like, it was purposeful and also purposefully deceitful, because they didn't want the tenants to come back. They didn't want the tenants to have any recourse, and they didn't want the tenants to be able to actually fight for themselves. And most people wouldn't have been able to go through that, wouldn't have been able to be displaced for nine months. And when you think about it, it's like, *Oh, wouldn't it be okay if the landlord is even, you know, paying for, like, the hotel next door, et cetera?* But living in a hotel for the entirety of nine months is not easy. You cannot buy your groceries

because you cannot cook for yourself. You're eating takeout. You are not breathing air that is actually movable because you don't have to open a window in a hotel. This is -- this is not the same kind of harassment that people would think, like, every single day. But this is the kind of harassment that is, I guess, overlapping and all-encompassing and it takes over your whole life. It makes it so it's hard to go to work, it's hard to go to school. It's hard to send your kids to school. It's hard to make it so that you can go get groceries every day. This is the kind of thing that impacts your life every single day. And when we went to go and listen to all of the hearings in Rochester, and when we went to go and hear the folks who were in Syracuse, Buffalo, and when they came to that hearing in Rochester, it was so prevalent the issues that they were going through were so similar in the things that we were going through in lots of ways and so different in other ways. The harassment was so similar, because one of the stories that hit me the hardest was how difficult it is to be able to actually move out, constantly, of a place. Because every single time you move into a new place you have to pay first, last deposit. First, last deposit. First, last deposit. And every single time that happens, it makes it so that you are depleted of a large amount of funds. People ask, like, *Well, isn't it cheaper to just buy a place and pay a mortgage rather than being able to pay this rent all the time?* Well, how can you even save up for a large amount of funds, enough to put down for a -- a -- a homeownership? Like, I -- I think that it's really interesting how that is, because this is actually a systemic issue.

This is what -- something that we actually have historically made possible because of interests that are with the landlords and with -- with the real estate agency, because we have made it so that, you know, it's -- it's -- it's so systemic to make it so that the cost of being poor is so high. Poor people pay such a large price, whether it's to get a gallon of milk, whether it's to get a loaf of bread. Whether it's to get housing, whether it's to be able to figure out where and how to live, and to even send their kids to school or to find child care. There is such a systemic high cost to being poor. And today in New York, we're eliminating one of the things. We're helping to make it so that one of those things in our system of -- of --of keeping the poor poorer and make the rich richer a little bit more even. And today I want to thank our Housing Chair so much for the work that he's done, because we couldn't have put together this package without you, Steve. And it's so incredibly huge that we are able to have so many different perspectives represented, and I want to thank all of my colleagues for being able to present those perspectives at the table. I also want to thank our Speaker for being bold enough to be able to move this package today, because for so long, for decades, for decades, for decades, we have systemically made the poor poorer and today we're going to make that shift in the other direction for a change.

So thank you so much, and I -- and I appreciate the time that you've given me to speak, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER MR. BENEDETTO: Thank you, Ms. Niou.

Mr. Walczyk.

MR. WALCZYK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Chairman, on behalf of the sponsor of the bill, would yield.

ACTING SPEAKER BENEDETTO: Mr. Chairman, do you yield?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, of course.

ACTING SPEAKER BENEDETTO: The Chairman yields.

MR. WALCZYK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I -- I wonder if you could tell us how many mobile home parks -- or how many mobile homes there are in New York State today?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I think we're talking about 5,000 -- there's -- there's about 5,000 parks, 35,000 people -- 85,000 people.

MR. WALCZYK: Was that 185,000?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No, that was 85-.

MR. WALCZYK: Okay. So over the -- the latest statistics that I could find were about a decade old, but we've lost about 100,000 trailers or --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I wouldn't call them trailers.

MR. WALCZYK: -- mobile homes in the last decade?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I -- I -- I can't tell you what they were, but I can tell you that we have 85,000 now. We have 85,000 manufactured homes.

MR. WALCZYK: 85,000 manufactured homes, trailers, whatever -- whatever term that you want to use there.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Okay.

MR. WALCZYK: Okay. Where -- where are the bulk of those located throughout the State? Is there a certain concentration or area that the manufactured homes or trailers or mobile homes are located?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: They're all over the State. They run from Suffolk County to Kingston to Columbia County to all of Upstate and Western New York.

MR. WALCZYK: Excellent. Would you say they're located in more rural or urban areas?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I would say they're in rural areas.

MR. WALCZYK: How many -- how many of these manufactured homes, trailers or mobile homes are located within New York City?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: There's one in -- I'm -- I'm told there's one in Staten Island, right?

MR. WALCZYK: Okay. That's -- that's one home or one park?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: One park.

MR. WALCZYK: All right. I appreciate that. And how many are located within your district?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: None.

MR. WALCZYK: How many are located within the sponsor's district?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I don't believe there are any. But that's not why we did this. We did this for all the people of New York State. We represent New York State, not just New York City.

MR. WALCZYK: No, I -- I understand that, and I represent the 116th Assembly District that has a lot of these. If I wanted to bring a bill before this Legislature that impacted mobile home parks, I would be happy to talk with you about that. But that's part of the issue that I have.

On the bill, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. WALCZYK: So the Housing Stability and Tenant Protection Act of 2019 addresses a problem, and I've heard a lot of -- a lot of great points and well-intended legislators from New York City that talk about an emergency that's been ongoing in New York City for the last 75 years. And I can appreciate that, and I can appreciate you wanting to address that. So hats off to you on whatever policy you think is best for New York State and how New York -- or New York City and how New York State can help that. But what I do have a problem with is when these omnibus bills encompass things that impact the rest of the State, that offer in many cases bad ideas to the rest of the State without the input from Upstate New York, from rural areas like the one that I represent. When you look at New York City or San Francisco and the -- and the issues that they have with --

with housing, they're very different from Upstate, rural, northern New York. The front yard of America, you name it. So I'm happy to have those conversations. But each time we put one of these omnibus bills, these "Big Ugly" bills together that include policy that -- that impacts Upstate and the rest of the State, and the sponsor of the bill or the Chairman that's debating it on the floor can't even say that they have one of these units within their district, I -- I think that speaks to the process and how it's broken here. So while you -- you continue to apply pressure to New York City and -- and love on them and squeeze them with all the government policy that you can to try and make things better, we see how that's worked out for their housing situation over the last 75 years. I would say don't take those bad ideas to Upstate New York.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on the bill. I want to congratulate my colleagues and a long time coming. And correctly put, it's been a minimum of 75 years in New York City alone has endured a whole lot. But this bill is not just for New York City, it's for the entire State of New York, where a tenant -- folks that own mobile homes are able to find security relief, and I think it's a time where people can now look at their government and feel proud to know that their voices are being heard, we're responding. It's been a long time coming, but now we're here. I think

it's important that people understand that this legislation is a game changer. When you look at what it proposes to do, it restricts and reduces the IAI's, the MCIs, and it says to the property owners that you can't look at this as an opportunity to say, *Let me fatten my coffers*, but, *What am I doing? What am I investing in? Am I making sure I'm taking care of the community which I invested in?* And we should not be in a position where when people buy, we have to move. I think it should be just the opposite. They should adapt to where we're living when they move into this community. And I think there are a lot of bad actors, and this sends notice that if you're not a bad actor, that's great. Then you have no problems. This has been a long time coming, and I am so ecstatic, because I don't have to sit at my desk and say to anyone that walks in, *Well, you know, you signed a preferential rent. You know there's nothing I can do. You know there's no Legal Aid that can help you. You have to pay up or get out.* Those days are far behind us, and I applaud loudly what's going to happen. When you look at Harlem, when you look at Washington Heights and communities in New York City, yes, it's a City problem. Folks get money from the City and they move to the 'burbs. I'm not mad at them, but we should not bear the brunt of this State in our cities. And if people want to do business in New York City, then they got to do under these guidelines.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing this legislation to the floor.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, Mr.

Taylor.

Ms. Joyner.

MS. JOYNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to first start off by commending our Speaker, our Chair of Housing, for sponsoring this bill. Despite some people who doubted us, I have never once doubted us. I always knew that today we would be in this position and that we would be getting the results for the people that will be getting the results after we pass this bill. Because we're the people -- we are the People's House. We represent the people. This is the number one concern in my district. Every four years, we will be getting calls about when -- what's going to happen once the rent laws expired, and I'm glad today that I will not be getting those calls, that we will now have people that will be able to stay in their homes for decades and allowing their children to move back into the community because of the strong rent package that we will pass today. There were hypotheticals today about grandmothers and, you know, their hardships, but in the Chambers [sic], on my way walking through the halls, I ran into seniors. Real grandmothers. We can have a theoretical debate, but today we are talking about real people with real problems, and today we are addressing those issues. Seniors that were -- are struggling to walk, people missing work that came today to advocate for us to strengthen our rent laws, and we are doing that. With all of the worries that people have, having a roof over your head should be the last one, and today we are minimizing that worry. I have had tenants in my district and landlords who have done, let's say for

example, bathroom and kitchen renovations. And one building, one landlord decided to remove everyone's bathroom, right? This is a six-story walk-up building. And they had one bathroom for the entire building. It became a communal bathroom. And the landlord decided to put an MCI on top of all of those tenants' head. Landlords are refusing to give working refrigerators. Seniors who cannot now properly store their medication in refrigeration -- in refrigerators because the landlord fails to provide these basic services. On top of that, they're continuing to see increases of MCIs. We have seen landlords who have made the abuse of the MCI process as a business model. After today, the threat of MCIs, the loss of preferential rent leases, the threats of harassment are now mute. I am glad that we are here today, and today is an opportunity to right all of these decades of wrongdoing, and I am looking forward to casting my vote in the affirmative. Thank you.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Ms. De La Rosa.

MS. DE LA ROSA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, ma'am.

MS. DE LA ROSA: I want to first commend our Speaker for having the courage to bring this bill to the floor, the Chairman of the Housing Committee, and all of our colleagues who, together, worked with the advocates who are here to craft the strongest

possible package. You know, in my district the number is 40,000. Forty thousand units of rent-stabilized housing. Forty thousand to many landlords is a number where they see profit. Forty thousand. But when you ask me, when you're in the -- in the business of serving, when you're in the business of housing, you're in the business of service. Because that 40,000 number translates into hundreds of thousands of families. Hundreds of thousands of families in my district who have been victim to displacement at the hands of laws that were crafted by a legislature prior to this one. Forty thousand units that house children that now make up the number of homeless children attending our schools in New York City and across this State. There is a tool kit to displacement. There is a strategy for gentrifying our communities. There is a strategy for ensuring that working-class New Yorkers can no longer stay in the communities that they have lifted up. There's a strategy, and as one of my colleagues said, this strategy is a system that is designed to displace us, to oppress us and to silence our voices. This tool kit for displacement looks like housing that is not up to par for any human being to live in. Apartments riddled with mold and roaches and rodents and bedbugs and holes in the ceiling and water leaking in the -- in the ceilings. And floors that are sinking in. Frankly, conditions that are reserved for some of the most developing nations in the world. Conditions that shouldn't exist in New York State, exist in Upper Manhattan and exist across New York City and exist across New York State. When we look at that tool kit for displacement, we have things like IAs and MCIs and vacancy

bonuses and preferential rents. We have hidden fees in security deposits and registration fees that are simply designed to tell tenants, *If you want an apartment in New York State, you have to jump through hoops. And those hoops are not reserved for you, the disenfranchised and the disempowered.* Well, today we are turning that tool kit of displacement into a tool kit of survival and justice for the tenants of New York State. We say that today we are passing these laws because we understand that we cannot talk about child care, we cannot talk about health insurance, we cannot talk about access, we cannot talk about education if you do not have the basic, sound ability to live in an apartment where you have the dignity of going to sleep and not waking up because the ceiling is falling in on top of you.

Today we make sure that these rent laws are permanent so that my constituents don't have to come here every five years to tell us to do our jobs. Today we repeal the vacancy bonus. Today we make sure that the laws that deregulate units in a massive amount, en masse, are no longer on the books. Today we do away with schemes that displace tenants to preferential rent. I'm a preferential rent leaseholder, and thankfully, I have the ability to pay for my rent. But that is not the case for the thousands and thousands of constituents that walk into my office every day. We know that wages in this State are not increasing at the pace that the market is increasing. We know that there are seniors with fixed incomes who do not have an increase in the amount of wages that are coming in, but their rents are going up. And each and every day, we see those tenants

come into our offices. And each and every day we had to turn those tenants away because the laws do not take into consideration the human, the human capital. The human beings of those tenants. Today we also make sure that we are giving tenants justice when it comes to rent over-charge complaints. You know, in my community we pay our rent with money orders. It's very difficult to track a money order once it's out in the world. And what landlords have been doing for decades is sending out mass eviction notices to see who they can catch up in that system. People who are afraid to go to court because they look like me. People who don't know their rights. People who think that if they show up at a courtroom, there's going to be a consequence from showing up to that courtroom. People who are afraid to simply answer court notices. And when they do go to court, sometimes justice is unfortunately not on their side. And so today we're giving them the ability to go in and have some more time to build their cases. We're expanding ETPA for tenants across this State because we know this is not a New York City issue. We know that across this State there are inequities that exist for tenants everywhere. We're eliminating blacklisting. Have you ever tried to rent an apartment when you've been on a black list? I'm on a black list. Because my name is Carmen De La Rosa and my mother's name is Carmen De La Rosa. And in the 90's she went on a rent strike because they wouldn't fix our apartment. And when I went to rent, I was on a black list. And I had to call a credit company to fix my credit and prove to them that I'm not my mother in order to rent an apartment in New

York State. And when I called the landlord to tell them before I called the credit union that I was blacklisted, the landlord said to me, *Well, your parents should have paid the rent.* Well, you should have provided dignified housing for me and my parents and my siblings so that we wouldn't have to go to court because my father didn't spend that money. He put it away and he went on a rent strike because our rights as people were not being upheld. Because we deserve to live in an apartment with heat and hot water and no bedbugs.

And so today we are proud that this package is coming before us. We know that the road has been hard. When I was elected, I knew that this was a fight that for my community was a priority. Because in order for our communities to continue to survive and thrive, we have to be able to live in them. We have to be able to continue to contribute to our communities. And today, the tenants of New York State are proud of the work being done here, because we're returning justice and dignity for the tenants of New York State. And I believe that once this bill is put into law, we will see great, great gains from tenants who are no longer living in fear in our communities. We know that tenants are living day-by-day, trying to get by. Trying to make ends meet. When a tenant walked into my office because he can't -- he or she can't pay her rent, she's not going there saying, *Guess what? I didn't pay my rent this month.* They go there with fear that if they're not able to make the next month's payment, they will be in housing court. And there is no recourse in existing law for those tenants to stand up.

Today, thanks to the work of our colleagues and the advocates, we'll be able to deliver housing justice for the tenants of New York State. When the time comes, I look forward to proudly voting for this legislative -- this legislation, because the tenants of Northern Manhattan sent me here to ensure that there is equity in the work that we're doing, and that we're putting people before profits. And my message to those who say that buildings will be dilapidated, as my colleague stated earlier, our buildings have been neglected for far too long. Our buildings have collapsed. Our buildings have carbon monoxide poisoning. Our buildings are riddled with violations that we have no recourse in law to actually fix. And so I look forward to ensuring that the fight for tenants, which today, we take a major step forward will continue, because we have to make sure that tenants have a leg up in order for our communities to continue to survive and to thrive.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Walker.

MS. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor rise for a couple of questions, please?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cymbrowitz, will you yield?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Of course.

MS. WALKER: Thank you. So, I wanted to commend you for the great job that you've done in terms of putting together this very, very important package which will address the

preservations of neighborhoods all across our State. And we've heard a lot of communication from many of our colleagues who've commended you over the course of your work on this as to really how great and how hopeful we are that this will change the game for a number of our constituents. But I was concerned by some of the individuals who are in here -- actually, some of -- I'm concerned about some of the individuals who seem to be exempted from this piece of legislation. As you know, I represent the neighborhoods of Brownsville, East New York, which are not just low-income communities, but in many instances very low-income communities. And on page 7, Part E, at line 39 it begins, "... provided that for buildings that are subject to this statute by virtue of regulatory agreement with the local government agency or for buildings which receive project-based rental assistance, that these particular buildings are exempted from this with respect to their legal rent." Can you tell me a little bit about why these exemptions are listed for Section 8, I'm assuming, tenants, and for tenant with these regulatory agreements?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: These are project-based Section 8s, and the tenant continues to pay 30 percent of their income. And the reason it's exempted is because the Federal government pays the difference, no matter what that -- whatever that amount is.

MS. WALKER: So does this only apply to Section 8-based buildings, and not necessarily to Section 8 voucher tenant holders?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: This is only project-based

Section 8 buildings.

MS. WALKER: Okay. So in that respect, it also covers buildings with regulatory agreements with respect to an exemption. Is that correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: That's correct.

MS. WALKER: So, some of the things that have been happening with respect to Mitchell-Lama developments in my community, they have been reduced to Article 11 conversions and other conversions where there are these enhanced voucher situations where HPD, by virtue of a regulatory agreement, will say to these tenants, *I know that you're paying \$600 today, but we are going to raise the rent to, let's say, \$1,700. You, resident, will get a voucher so that you don't feel the rent burn of this increase. But the enhanced voucher will pay the difference between what you had been paying and the legal rent.* In this particular situation, it indicates that if there is a regulatory agreement that the new legal rent is not what it used to be, which was the last rent that a person paid, it became the rent that the regulatory agreement says that it is, so that the next person who enters into that apartment does not come in at a legal rent that may have been \$600, but at the new rent which is at \$1,700. So, it is just my suggestion or hope that we are also taking a look at particular situations like that for communities which are very, very low-income, and the rent was at very low amounts and we recognize that the City and the State needed to kick in resources, but we -- for those particular individuals, but we want to

make sure that we are preserving it for the future as well so that the people who are coming into our communities are not starting at a rate of \$17- to \$1,800 a month when the rent right before that was about \$6- or \$700 a month. So thank you for answering that particular question.

There is another question that I have with respect to fees. And, I'm sorry, if you will follow me to page number 47, Section 702 at line 41. It says that, "No fees, charges or penalties other than rent may be brought in a summary proceeding pursuant to this article..." Does that include attorneys' fees?

(Pause)

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I'm being told that the summary possession that you're talking about is only for possession, and the attorney fees could be brought up in a separate action.

MS. WALKER: Okay. So there is no straight exemption on those particular fees. So I appreciate you for answering those particular questions.

On the bill, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the bill, Ms. Walker.

MS. WALKER: So, again, I want to commend Speaker Heastie, as well as Chairman Cymbrowitz for bringing this very important piece of legislation to our community and to our State. However, I want to also make sure that, particularly, the most vulnerable and rent-burdened communities across our State are also

protected. Because while I do have a number of rent-stabilized apartments within the communities that I represent, many of those individuals were not -- are not necessarily covered because they are in -- some individuals are in rent -- are in the Section 8 program -- building-based Section 8 programs, and other individuals are in these sort of legal regulatory agreements within HPD as well. So it brings our amount for legal rents up. It doesn't start us out on the same playing field. And all the while that there is a voucher that's available for that particular tenant and for that particular apartment, then all is good and everyone is happy. But what happens the day that person is no longer in that apartment? Now we are starting out in a community like Brownsville where the rents are normally about \$6- or \$800 a month, to legal rent being -- being -- started at the amount somewhere near around \$1,700 a month, which scares me.

In addition to that, one of the things that we're seeing happening is the mandatory inclusionary housing, because we didn't talk about 421(a), which also does not seem to be a part of this particular package. And what happened under MIH is, basically, in a way to get around many of these changes in 421(a), the City of New York decided how it's going to determine rent within our City for many vulnerable communities, particularly those who are going through up-zoning right now. And whenever there's an up-zoning situation that takes place and someone is looking to build -- for instance, NYCHA looking to build on a parking lot in our community, they are utilizing State bonds, 421 -- 421(a) scenarios and regulatory

agreements which allows for rent to be set at much higher rates than we are seeing now presently in our communities. And these are the buildings that are ravaging through our neighborhoods, and they are particularly exempted from this particular piece of legislation.

So while this is a very happy day in many instances, I do still -- I do still believe that we still have a lot of work to do ahead of us in order to make sure that our most vulnerable communities, particularly those with a number of New York City housing apartments and vacant land where we are going to be noticing a number of buildings taking place within our neighborhoods. Many of the Mitchell Lama conversions which will becoming rent-stabilized units under regulatory agreements, as well as the Section 8 building-based developments which are taking place all across our City, and definitely within the communities that I represent.

So, again, I want to commend the sponsor. I want to commend this entire Body for all of the work, including the staff. And this is a very proud moment, but this cannot be a moment where many of the vulnerable communities across our State will not, you know, sort of see their day in the sunlight. And I encourage each and every one of us to continue pressing forward so that all of our tenants can be collectively celebrating in this very great and momentous occasion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Thank you.

Mrs. Barrett.

MRS. BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the bill,
ma'am.

MRS. BARRETT: I would like to thank the Speaker and the Chair of Housing, Mr. Cymbrowitz, and the staff for what is a revolutionary Statewide approach to rent regulation, and to say that it was my honor to be able to take Chairman Cymbrowitz around my district to visit the mobile home communities that -- where he saw power lines basically under water, and open sewers and heard directly from constituents of my district, the challenges that they're facing. In the seven years that I've been in the Legislature, I've been hearing over and over again about protections for New York City renters and -- and every two years, these rent regulations, and never have we been able to address issues that impact Upstate. And so I'm really thrilled. I think this is really extraordinary to see our Conference embrace tenant issues and rent issues and housing and affordable housing issues in a Statewide, holistic way. And I really commend the Speaker and the Chair for understanding the importance of that, and to my colleagues for supporting the work that we're doing for communities that are -- that are marginalized outside of New York City as well as those that are in New York City.

So, thank you for this opportunity to speak, and again, I commend my colleagues on this.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Thank you.

Ms. Wallace.

MS. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the bill, Ms. Wallace.

MS. WALLACE: I rise to speak on behalf of that portion of the bill relating to mobile home parks. I have four such mobile home parks in my first-rig suburban community in Western New York. And like so many of these mobile home parks across the State and across the country, residents own the home but not the land upon which they sit. And the name "mobile home", as has been mentioned here many times, is really a misnomer because it's not actually mobile. People, and many times they're seniors, and I can say from having walked through all four of these mobile home parks in my community, they are -- most of them are seniors, purchased these homes relying on the fact that they are in a park, and expect to live out their golden years and expect that to continue as a mobile home park in perpetuity. But what is happening is that big out-of-State corporate interests are buying the land and evicting these residents of the park; people who invested their life savings, their nest egg, in that mobile home, or jacking up the rents to where it's simply unsustainable for them to continue to live there. This actually happened, as was mentioned earlier, in a mobile home park in Akron, New York, which is not in a district that I represent. But it is nearby and could just have well have been, where an investment company from out-of-State bought the property and raised the rents to an unsustainable amount,

and they're now threatening to evict these residents, these seniors, from the homes. What are these people supposed to do? They can't pick up and move their \$100,000 or their \$50,000 investment. This dramatically decreases the value of their property and reduces the invest -- the value of their nest egg. And as between the seniors in my community and the out-of-State corporate interests, I side with the seniors.

So I want to thank the Speaker, I want to thank the Chair, and I want to thank Mr. Thiele and Mrs. Barrett for their tenacity on this issue, and I'm going to be casting my vote in the affirmative on behalf of the residents in my mobile home communities and across New York State. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Thank you.

Mr. Crespo.

MR. CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the bill, sir.

MR. CRESPO: What a great day for the people of my district. What a great day for renters across New York State. What a great day for all of us, and we should be proud to make history, changing the dynamics that far too often affect the livelihood and the stability of families across our districts and communities. I am one of those rent-regulated tenants. I have seen firsthand what it is like when your landlord plays games, when they play around with the -- the rules and/or make you -- even if -- even in the instances where

they have the ability to do certain things, they do so with a determined effort to scare you and/or push you out. Why would anybody want to live with constant threats? Why would anybody want to consistently hear that there is no repairs coming? Why would anybody want to consistently be threatened with -- with notices and/or threats of being pushed out or phased out or priced out of their homes? And that is what has been happening. Anybody who comes to my district office, I encourage anybody to visit, and you will sit there for a day and see 40 to 50 people walk in, looking for help. I can assure you that upwards of 80 to 90 percent of those on a daily basis are renters going through a problem with their landlord. A building on Stratford Avenue across the -- two blocks away from my district office, we've been organizing there for the last year-and-a-half. They spent two years without gas in the building, without elevator service in a seven-story building. Many of the tenants who put forward complaints were reminded of their immigration status and told that if they complained too much that the landlord would, you know, "make other calls" on their behalf. We have seen this far too often in our neighborhoods, and finally today, I have an opportunity to be a part of something to offer relief, to offer a fair playing field, and to give some additional protections to renters in my community. How many times have I been to meetings in buildings not that different from my own where the community gathered to hear about a proposal where finally an improvement was coming, but it was going to cost them a significant increase that many of them could not afford. Imagine living in a building where heat is a constant problem,

despite the fact that the law says that you have to be provided heat during the winter, but yet, it just doesn't come or it comes intermittently or it goes out for extended periods of time and you're forced to live that way. Your children shivered through the night. Day after day, your elderly family members -- I know one of my colleagues talked a lot about -- earlier today about the -- the condition or potential condition of their grandmother. Well, how many grandmothers have I visited in buildings where they were forced to leave and -- and live in somebody's living room because their own unit simply was uninhabitable for an entire season? Those stories are commonplace in my district. Those stories -- I know we heard an impassioned speech what happens in Brooklyn. We've heard an impassioned speech about what happens in Northern Manhattan. We've heard those speeches about communities across the State. I can tell you that in the Borough of the Bronx, when folks are talking about displacement, when folks are talking about gentrification, when folks are talking about stability and just having a chance to continue to call the Bronx home, it is what we are fixing today that will offer them finally a sense of relief and opportunity. It won't guarantee them anything, but it will certainly give them a fighting chance that some of these games will stop, and that -- and that they will have greater opportunities to remain in place.

This package, the fact that is permanent is a historic step for renters in my community and all -- the State of New York. The vacancy bonus elimination, the preferential rent -- preferential

rent being protected, and lease renewals. The expansion of the look-back on rent overcharges. I just had a constituent, with the assistance of my office, secure a quarter-of-a-million dollars in a court order in treble damages. Imagine what that family had been put through for an extended period of time to get to that level of relief? And that is not a unique story. The MCI reforms and IAI reforms. And the immediate reduction for those that have seen MCIs in the last seven years to be able to immediately upon passage and signage of these protections, see a reduction in their rent because of a reduction of the MCI charge. That, in itself, is a game changer for families who are struggling to really pay for that medicine, or to really afford to stay in their homes. I -- the eviction reform -- oh, by the way, I got elected in 2009. One of the first things I did was take a brochure from "Editorial." That was a tenant rights brochure that was made available to members, and I posted it proudly online. Well, what I didn't realize was the unintended consequence of that, because I could assure you that on a weekly basis, my office gets five to ten calls from renters around the State, outside of my district. Many of them the very people who were forced out of their -- of their home in the Bronx and ended up living in other counties around the State -- many times in private homes or in small buildings -- and they had no idea of what they can do given the circumstances they were in. I got a call from a former Bronx resident whose mom still lives on the block where my office is. She was being threatened with eviction because she complained about a flood that was occurring in her kids' room, and -- and she moved to a county

Upstate and she had no idea who she could turn to. She called several offices. There was no clarity as to where she would get any protections or assistance. Somebody said, *Well, just go to court.* Well, that wasn't an option for her. She didn't know her way around. There was no relief. So the fact that we are extending protections Statewide to finally give clarity as to what tenants can do across -- renters can do across the State is a game changer for so many families.

I -- I -- I have to say this: I don't know of another bill that I have seen yet in my time here that I've had a chance to vote on that will have as great an impact in my county as this one. And -- and I know that, unfortunately, many of the damages that have occurred because of the abuses in this industry and towards renters that have occurred in other districts and other counties in the City of New York -- you know, in the Bronx we always talk about how now people are realizing the potential and the changes that we've seen in our community, increased economic development. The increased income as more Bronxites are working now more than ever before. More development, which is changing what the market rates in the Bronx are. Well, that has been a threat, a constant threat. While yes, life is getting better, but if you are a renter, as the majority of the people in our community still are, you are now potentially going to get phased out because those improvements are not meant for you. And today the message we send with this bill is that it is.

And so I want to thank the Speaker, I want to thank the Chair, Cymbrowitz, all of the colleagues who were part of the

hearings. I want to thank all of the colleagues and advocates who will support this, and everybody who mobilized around the State, and to tell my staff that finally, we will have better tools to help all those const -- constituents who come to seek our assistance.

I will proudly be voting in the affirmative, and I want to thank everybody who made this day possible.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Ms. Simon.

MS. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the bill, Ms. Simon.

MS. SIMON: For far too long, families have been forced out of their homes and neighborhoods because of huge and unfair rent increases, and landlords who gamed the system and put profits over people. For far too long, this Legislature gave landlords the tools to game the system and to harm the people of New York. The single largest cause of homelessness in New York City is because the rent is too damn high. And the rent got too damn high because our laws allowed it. Well, that will no longer be the case. Today we make a huge step forward to prot -- protect tenants and correct the balance. We're eliminating vacancy decontrol. We're eliminating vacancy bonuses. We're eliminating the misuses of preferential rent. We're limiting the amount of increases to rent-controlled tenants. And we're cutting back on a landlord's ability to misuse MCIs and IAIs in part by narrowing the categories for which they can be used, and reducing the

amounts of MCIs, and by requiring that costs -- shockingly -- be reasonable, actual, and verifiable.

I'm so happy that I will no longer be getting phone calls from 80-year-old women who are in tears, crying about the latest MCI. Statewide, we're protecting -- we're prohibiting retaliatory eviction, and prohibiting landlords from using databases of court information to blacklist tenants like Carmen and her mother, and to forbid the sale of that data to third-parties, along with many other protections. And perhaps most critically, we're making these changes permanent. No longer will we be back here every few years fighting this battle, banging our heads against the wall, and tenants will now not only have the protections that they have needed, but peace of mind.

I want to thank the Chair of our Housing Committee, Mr. Cymbrowitz, for all your work. For all my colleagues who advocated for these reforms. I want to thank Speaker Heastie for his steadfast commitment to getting this done, and I thank the advocates who never gave up, who advocated and educated and made the abuses of our laws real by telling their stories.

In 2015, I was one of only three Democrats in this House who voted against the end-of-year omnibus bill because of the terrible way it treated tenants. Today I'm going to be honored to vote for this bill.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Thank you.

Ms. Linda Rosenthal.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the bill.

MS. ROSENTHAL: Like many young adults returning from college, I went home after graduation to live with my grandmother in her rent-controlled apartment on the Upper West Side. Shortly after I moved in, her -- her landlord tried to evict us. I didn't know the rules, so I didn't know at the time that it was an illegal eviction action designed to intimidate my grandmother into leaving her home, a home she had occupied since 1939. But I knew I needed to fight. I went to court. I had a bad lawyer. I wasn't involved in community and politics, so went to housing court. The judge said, *Grandchildren are not immediate family*. Not true. He doubled the rent, but he gave me a rent-stabilized lease. But those months of worrying, subpoenas of my 87-year-old grandmother were heart-wrenching, stressful and are still inside me today. My grandmother and I were lucky that we won, but most -- many people are not that lucky. After years of harassment and in some cases dozens of frivolous eviction attempts, many tenants simply give up the fight. They lose their homes, and we lose another affordable housing unit to landlord greed. This sad scene has replayed countless times over the course of the years since I won my eviction case, and we have lost thousands of units of affordable housing as a result. For years, the laws that we had on the books, the ones that we will finally replace

with today's votes, not only did not do enough to protect hard-working New York renters, in many cases, they actually provided perverse incentives to landlords to harass and evict their tenants.

I first introduced the bill to repeal vacancy decontrol and reform rent control ten years ago after seeing the heartache and upheaval these two laws together caused my constituents. Mary was an 83-year-old retired journalist who came into my office looking for part-time work, because as a rent-controlled tenant she could no longer afford to pay her rent after years of automatic biannual 7.5 percent rent increases. This was before we increased SCRIE to \$29,000, so Mary could not qualify to have her rent frozen. My office cobbled together a series of grants to help Mary pay her rent, and she started freelancing as a writer online at 83 years old in order to pay her ever-rising rent-controlled unit's rent and an unconscionable fuel pass along.

Stanley was 94 when he came to my office. He was nearly deaf, incredibly frail, and had a colostomy bag. He was one of three rent-controlled tenants left in the building where he'd lived for 50 years, and his landlord served him with frivolous eviction papers. He went to court, and with the help of MFJ, he won his case. In the few years before his death, Stanley's landlord tried to evict him multiple times. Each time, Stanley, older and sicker, had to go to court, where he would eventually win. The landlord hoped he would wear Stanley down and he would just leave. Stanley did not leave. He won, but his final years were a misery because he was under

constant threat of eviction. That is what vacancy deregulation created.

Nelson is a rent-regulated SNAP recipient. His landlord has served him with eviction papers no fewer than 30 times in the last ten years. One time the landlord based the case on Nelson keeping a welcome mat outside his apartment door. Nelson is scared to file a harassment case, because even though he's very clearly likely to prevail, he fears landlord reprisal and more frivolous eviction attempts.

Paulette has lived in her rent-stabilized apartment for decades. It's big, it's beautiful. She pays an affordable but reasonable rent. But her income is so low, she is not required to pay taxes. Knowing this, her landlord filed a high rent, high income deregulation petition against her year after year. That means she must prove her income. She's elderly, she's partially disabled, and without tax returns struggles to provide the relevant documentation. As soon as she satisfied the claim one year, she has to begin again the next.

Each of these people is real, and their stories are representative of thousands of others. These people have stood on the precipice of homelessness, terrified and fighting to stay in their homes when they should have been enjoying their golden years, because landlords wrote the rent laws through their campaign contributions. I have fought alongside these tenants. Everyone, like my grandmother -- and I'm proud to say that my office has never lost an eviction case. But how many others, the ones who didn't visit my or any other elected official's office, how many of them are still in their homes or

fearing eviction or an increase in rent any moment?

Today this package of bills will help undo the years of suffering, prevent the kind of harassment and/or abuse that our weak laws have allowed for far too long, and I'm so proud of the part that my colleagues here have played, and to helping to realize this moment. In the year since I started doing this, the Movement for Housing Justice has grown to include so many people an organization who understands that housing is a human right. New York Communities for Change, Make the Road New York, Crown Heights Tenants Union, Housing Justice for All, Flatbush Tenants Coalition, Legal Aid, on and on and on. Upstate/Downstate Coalition. They were the ones who made sure that this happened this year. You know, we waited until the end of Session to get the best deal we could.

I am so proud of this package of bills. I thank the steadfast Chair for keeping his cool, and keep marching straight ahead. I thank the excellent staff who would take my frantic calls and assure me they were working hard to get this done. And I thank the Speaker for maintaining his steadfast commitment to getting the best rent package that we could get in this House. This House has been leading on tenant reforms for decades. I want to make sure everybody out there knows that. The Assembly has been the partner of the advocates for years. Every year we could reliably say that the Assembly would pass these wonderful rent regulations. This year we have a great partner in the Senate. This year we say to landlords, *Your money didn't count. You have no friends here.* We are shifting the scales of

justice which were so lopsided in one way. We're making them even. We're saying, Tenants, we represent you. We're on your side. We will ensure going forward that you don't have to live under threat of harassment, under threat of eviction, under threat that you will not be able to continue to live in your beloved City and State.

And so I thank you all for all your effort on behalf of tenants in this State.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Davila.

MS. DAVILA: On the bill, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill.

MS. DAVILA: Thank you. So, I've heard a lot of testimony here today, and it's come the time that -- that we really are going to vote on these nine bills, and I'm extremely humbled and honored that I'm here. I am thankful to the sponsor of the bill and our Speaker.

You know, as of 30 years ago, I have three children that I raised in Williamsburg and Bushwick, and I was one of those people that were targeted by their landlords and had to fight back. It took a long time. After that, I became very astute and educated as far as housing laws go, and I was able to at least prolong the process for about eight years, which gave me enough time to help my children grow up a little bit and find another place to live. In the mid-90s we -- we saw a big turnover in my community. Everyone knows that Bushwick and Williamsburg is the epicenter of -- of gentrification, people being pushed out. Up to this day, we have about 30 people

every two weeks coming into my office because I have a legal clinic going on, and the stories that we hear are so heartbreaking. We're talking to my community and saying, *Don't worry, we're going to make this right. We're going to make this right.* Today has come the day.

I have to tell you that most Saturdays -- I will give you an example. Last Saturday I was shopping, and I had reported a building that was going under renovations, and the City put a stop order. And I actually found employees going through the back and bringing in supplies to still continue the work. It's almost like such a big disrespect, while two seniors, only two seniors living in that building.

It is time. It's time, and I am so proud to be part of this Body in this historical moment. To me, it is so extremely important that all of us stuck together on this. We worked on it. And I know that I have spoken -- spoken to several people and say, *Never doubt the process.* We're all here on the same -- the same way. We know things are going to get done. And this is important to the people in our communities.

So once again, I want to thank the sponsor, I want to thank the Speaker, and I want to congratulate all of us for sticking by it, and finally we get to at least slow down the process. We still have a couple of housing -- apartments in my district that aren't rent-regulated, so I'm extremely happy that we are able to at least save a lot of those apartments that are still left.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the sponsor of the bill. And congratulations to all of us. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mr. Colton.

MR. COLTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. COLTON: This is truly an historic piece of legislation. And it's historic for a number of reasons. First of all, it really seeks to address problems that tenants -- and when we say tenants, tenants are not a commodity. Tenants are people and families. Tenants are seniors on a fixed income. Parents with children. Persons with disabilities. Persons who have real personal lives and personal problems. And when you put stress on people because they're afraid they're going to be evicted, because they're afraid they're not going to be able to afford the rents. Because they're afraid that they may not be able to find another apartment near where their children go to school, near where their doctors are. That creates a real problem. And what this bill seeks to do is to prevent these people and families from being abused in order to make more money. Not all landlords do that. There are good landlords. There are landlords who really are concerned about maintaining their buildings and doing what is right for the people and families that live in their buildings. But, unfortunately, human nature being what it is, there are some landlords who are simply looking to make more profit. And they have used

some of the instruments that have been provided in previous laws in order to create problems for people and families who live in their buildings, whose homes are in their buildings. So we -- we addressed the issue of vacancy decontrol. The rents have become increasingly high in all districts. Much faster than the incomes, and that puts stress on families. We address the issue of MCI increases, where an increase would be made by changes and there was really no restrictions. I had one situation where I actually went to court representing a building where the landlord claimed that he had spent \$1 million renovating -- redoing the roof. I don't know whether he used gold bricks, but he spent \$1 million. And when we went to court, we found out that DHCR at that time would not even look at whether the work was done or what was the cost -- the -- the fair cost of such work. It simply looked at the check and how much was written on it. And the check was written from the landlord to a subsidiary of the landlord for \$1 million. So it went from one pocket to another. This bill will try to prevent that from happening by having audits of -- of MCI applications. Tenants normally are not going to be able to find that. And we were able to win that case, but it was very difficult. And DHCR fought it all the way, saying it wasn't their obligation to look at whether the work was worth \$1 million or not. If the check said \$1 million, that was it.

So I really think that this bill tries to eliminate some of the problems that people have been faced with because of some people - not everyone - but some people who have tried to take

advantage. And this bill is not punitive. It doesn't seem to take away MCIs from landlords. If they do some improvement, they're entitled to a fair return on that improvement. They need to have some incentive where they don't -- where they will get some of their money back. But they should not be taking advantage of people and families whose homes reside in the building.

And so, I really want to thank the Speaker. I want to thank the Chair of the Housing Committee, and all of those who were involved in getting to this point where we put this legislation together. And I think we have something that we can be proud of and that is going to make a positive difference in the lives of people. And by the way, it's historic also because it is permanent in the sense that it doesn't have a sunset, a date when it expires. You know, it is not good for either landlords or tenants to have uncertainty, where a bill is in effect for two years, four years. And then there's always the question, *Is it going to be renewed by the Legislature at that time?* At least here, this is the law. We can learn to correct those things that might be problems as we -- as we proceed, but we don't have to have people worrying whether that law will continue or whether at the end of two years it will not be renewed. And certainly, it is not a good thing for people and families, whether they are landlords or tenants.

And so, I can be very proud to vote yes on this bill, to go back to my office and instruct my staff in terms of these different parts of this bill, and -- so that they will be able to help the many constituents, the people and families who come to our office with

serious problems and questions about their homes, whether they be -- own a two-family house or rent a six -- in a six-unit building or a big apartment building. These are people with problems, and this bill helps solves problems for people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Palumbo.

MR. PALUMBO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield, please, for a few questions?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. --

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, of course.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: -- Cymbrowitz, will you yield?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Yes, he does.

MR. PALUMBO: Thank you, Mr. Cymbrowitz. I'm going to confine my comments and questions really just to those notice provisions that were discussed a little bit before. The new notice provision under 226(c), as well as the cross-reference to 232(b), which is for notifications to terminate monthly tenancies or tenancies from month-to-month outside the City of New York. And I know there was some discussion on this a little while ago, but specifically, the 232(b) section that I just -- that I just highlighted that a *monthly tenancy or tenancy from month-to-month of any lands or buildings located outside of the City of New York may be terminated by* -- now it

says *the tenant* upon tenants notifying a landlord. We're striking *landlord* completely from that section, right? That's -- is that accurate?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

MR. PALUMBO: Yes. And that would apply, of course, Statewide. And you had mentioned earlier that there would a cross-reference that the landlord would then make notice -- or provide notice pursuant to Section 226(c), the new notice provision with those different timeframes?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: That's correct.

MR. PALUMBO: Okay. And -- and in 226(c), though, it specifically references to residential tenancies only, correct?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Correct.

MR. PALUMBO: So, by default now -- could you explain to me how a commercial tenant or a tenant in -- a residential tenant in a commercial building, for example, there are a lot of those in my district, in fact I have one myself, with a law firm on the bottom and two residential tenants upstairs in a commercial property, how they would notify terminating a month-to-month tenancy in a commercial situation?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I'm not sure about that. We would have to check that.

MR. PALUMBO: I think that's the wrinkle. Because my only understanding is the notice provisions for a -- to -- to -- a notice to quit for a commercial tenant in New York State outside of

New York City is pursuant to that section, 232(b). So now by default -- and -- and I -- I'm assuming that's the reason why -- maybe it wasn't -- it wasn't the -- necessarily intended to be that way, but we couldn't strike that entire provision, because then there would be no notice provisions for commercial tenants anywhere in the Real Property Law. So, do you think that that's something that we might consider amending, maybe a quick chapter amendment before this becomes law?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: We'll check that and get back to you on that.

MR. PALUMBO: Okay. Very good, Mr. Cymbrowitz. Thank you so much.

On the bill, please.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. PALUMBO: And, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that my colleagues will certainly take a look at that, and I'm really hopeful because in the event -- for example, particularly in suburban areas where there are residential tenants above a commercial space in these smaller buildings, or even somewhat larger, it doesn't appear to have -- we don't appear to have any way that a landlord, other than by cause, could terminate a month-to-month tenancy by striking that provision. It looks quite simple but, in fact, it's quite catastrophic to landlords throughout the State, who are always acting in good faith. But in that event -- one of my colleagues' grandmother who needed her medication that he so fondly discussed -- in the event someone simply

by month-to-month tenancy and the nature of it, wanted to remove someone and maybe move themselves or a family member in, they'd be unable to do so under these particular provisions. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Glick.

MS. GLICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues, we've heard from most of the members around the State who have had tenants facing one type of problem or another, whether it's harassment, or whether it's a short eviction notice. Over the many years that I've been here, the number one problem, the number one issue has been housing. So, I want to thank the Speaker for bringing us to this point, and I want to thank the Chair of Housing Committee and the excellent, outstanding staff that has worked so hard on this.

The most important thing to a person is the roof over their head. To have that challenged, to have that arbitrarily threatened, the abuses -- and I know some of my colleagues on the other side feel that this is very punitive towards the landlord class, but it is simply a leveling of the playing field. It is the outrageous abuses that some landlords have engaged in for decades, decades that we are trying to redress here. Stable neighborhoods start with stable housing for individuals. We have a homelessness problem in New York City in large part because people have unjustifiably lost their homes. So, again, this is -- having been through many, many reauthorizations of rent regulations, this is a major step forward not just for people in the counties where there has been rent regulation, but for New Yorkers all

over the State. New Yorkers who have felt squeezed by an economy that has not done right by them, but has done right by the wealthiest among us.

This is a great day. I look forward to an opportunity to explain to my constituents precisely the benefits that they will enjoy as a result of this rebalancing, rebalancing of the relationship between tenants and landlords, giving them a fighting chance to stay in their homes, the homes where many of them have resided for decades. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is great day. Again, the Speaker, the Chair of Housing, we are grateful to you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Bichotte.

MS. BICHOTTE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, ma'am.

MS. BICHOTTE: I want to thank the Speaker and the Chair of Housing on this very, very important and historic piece of legislation, which is the Housing Stability and Tenant Protection Act of 2019. And this as it relates to rent control or rent stabilization, vacancy decontrol, increase in rent and eviction protections, fixes and repairs, all of which is to be repealed. The many of the injustices that slum landlords and their lawyers and the court system have caused our New York tenants to be homeless, unstabled, abused and economically challenged. For a very long time the rent has been too damn high, and it's still too damn high. I represent the 42nd Assembly District, which represents Flatbush, East Flatbush, Midwood, Ditmus Park, and which

also is the highest rate of eviction in Brooklyn. So I'm very proud today because this bill enacts that New York State rent regulation laws are now permanent; the statutory vacancy bonus of up to 20 percent is now repealed; repeal the deregulation of units; prohibit preferential rent in its current form and remain that the rent for the life of the tenancy; would increase the look-back period for four years to six years for overcharged claims by landlords; limit rent-controlled rent increases; capping MCI, which is Major Capital Improvement; rent increase to 2 percent down from 6 percent; and that would redefine the meaning of MCI where MCI has been exploited by far too many landlords --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Bichotte, we're -- I'm sorry to ask you, we -- suffer an interruption, we need to do a -- a piece of business.

On a motion by Mr. Heastie, the Senate Bill is before the House. The Senate Bill is advanced.

Ms. Bichotte, you may continue -- excuse me.

Transportation Committee in the Speaker's Conference Room immediately. Thank you.

And now, Ms. Bichotte, thank you for your patience.

MS. BICHOTTE: Sure. Reducing IAI costs with a correct and fair amortization rate; eviction reform which would have mercy on struggling tenants to give them more time to stay in the apartment, allowing them to come up with a payment. I do hope that in the coming years that we look at succession rights for spousal and

immediate families to get on the lease. Again, housing has been one of the biggest issues in my district. I remember four years ago, my colleagues and I got arrested mandating for stronger rent laws, and we walked away with a compromise bill. Four years later, we are here today. And I stand proud, very proud with all the tenant advocates across the City of New York who have been calling for housing justice for all, calling that housing is a right.

Lastly, I want to thank one of my tenants, 85-year-old constituent, immigrant whose name is Jean Souffrant, who when I knocked on his door, he presented to me his situation. His situation was a preferential lease that was given to him. After living in his building for many, many years, he was tricked into moving into another apartment for a lower rent, just to find out that his rent would increase significantly. I was moved and I was saddened. But then it was that moment that motivated me to fight. So I joined the fight.

Today is a great day. Today is a day for justice. I am so proud of my colleagues in government and the advocates, the tenant advocates, for staying strong. Mr. Speaker, I will be voting in the affirmative. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mr. Mosley.

MR. MOSLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

Make sure your mic is on. Go ahead.

MR. MOSLEY: Thank you. I remember as a child grown up on days on which I had to go to my grandmother's house, an unregulated house that her -- that she rented out and eventually would buy it with my grandfather in Crown Heights. And I would get there early enough where she was watching her stories and she was watching *The Young and the Restless* and *General Hospital*. And there's a story in between *General Hospital* and *Young and the Restless* called *The Bold and the Beautiful*. And I know a lot of my colleagues want to look at this bill as a Big Ugly, but I want to look at it as something that is bold and beautiful simultaneously. It's bold because there's going to be permanent provisions in place that we will never have to revisit again so long as we stay on the watch. It's beautiful because this will be a robust bill that will apply Statewide, in part to both -- to both of our constituents in the City as well as throughout the State of New York. It's bold because it took advocates like Crown Heights Tenant Union and IMPACCT and UHAB and so many advocate groups in the City as well as throughout the State, to have the courage to stand up to special interests. And yet it's beautiful because no matter where you live in the State of New York now going forward, you have some provisions and some rights of protection as a rent -- as a renter and tenant. It's bold because it took us to make some very difficult choices in our -- in some of our districts to create the dynamics we have today both in the Assembly and the Senate. And yet it's beautiful because we have two leaders, our bill sponsor and our Speaker and the President of the Senate, who worked together,

understanding that what we're doing is transforming lives and communities and neighborhoods throughout our great State. It's bold because it speaks to the very essence of why we're here as legislators. And yet it's beautiful because when we talk about other issues and other concerns and public policy measures, it will only be ex -- accentuated and highlighted because we created a level of stability in communities all throughout our State from Buffalo to Brooklyn. From Nassau County to the North Country and all points in between.

So to our Chair and to your staff, I commend you. To our Speaker and to our Senate President, I commend her and him. Because this is not about being the Big Ugly, this is about accentuating what was bold and beautiful in this piece of legislation. And I'll be proud to be voting in the affirmative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Schmitt for a second.

MR. SCHMITT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Chairman yield?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cymbrowitz, will you yield?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cymbrowitz yields.

MR. SCHMITT: Hello again.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Hello again.

MR. SCHMITT: It feels like a whole other day. I want to expand on some of my previous questions in regards to the Statewide expansion of rent regulations, particularly the amended Section 14 of the Emergency Tenant Protection Act which will extend the regulation to any municipality in any county in the State whose local legislative body has declared a housing emergency. I just wanted to clarify, because I know a lot of local governments probably will be reaching out to myself and the rest of our colleagues. Will this apply in equal fashion to counties, cities, towns and villages?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes, it does.

MR. SCHMITT: And a village would be able to declare an emergency within the confines of a town that otherwise would not be -- believe they need one or would be willing to do that?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Only after a survey is done, showing that there is a vacancy rate less than 5 percent.

MR. SCHMITT: So they would declare the vacancy only after -- or they'd declare the emergency only after the survey was completed.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: That's correct.

MR. SCHMITT: Not the inverse. Now, I -- I know a colleague several hours ago had asked about that survey. Is it required they go through the Census Bureau like New York City? Could they do that internally with, you know, with internal staff of the government? Does it have to be the Census or can it be somewhere else? How would that process work?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: The municipality can decide any way they want to do it. They have that option. They could do it themselves, or they can hire somebody to do that.

MR. SCHMITT: Now, is there any oversight process with HCR in regards to that survey process, whether they did it in-house, hired somebody, some other mechanism?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Not as far as the survey, no.

MR. SCHMITT: Okay. During that process, are they -- are they required to take certain resident input? Are they -- is there a process of objecting to that any way? Either laid out in this legislation or through HCR?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Resident input as far as what? As far as the survey?

MR. SCHMITT: So, I'm -- I'm a citizen of the village XYZ, this process is going on, not pleased the way it went or have questions, concerns. Is there a -- a way to object or to contest it through a, you know, a process with HCR?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: There's nothing in this bill that talks to that, but it's up to the muni -- the town, the municipality. Whoever does that can set up their own rules for that.

MR. SCHMITT: Okay. I know the -- the bill also provides that for any new rent guidelines board created after the bill's effective date, the members thereof must be appointed pursuant to the recommendations of each local municipality which has determined the existence of a housing emergency. I know in New York City I believe

it's comprised of nine individuals appointed by the Mayor. Again, are these individual -- other village towns, counties, cities, are they required to follow that model, or can they come up with any type of structure they would like?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Well, they follow the model of having representatives from landlords, from tenants and from the public.

MR. SCHMITT: And that -- is this required in this legislation?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes.

MR. SCHMITT: Okay. I want to move on to the Statewide security deposit changes. Would you be able to explain to us how one month was settled on?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: We felt that that was a fair number based on housing throughout the State.

MR. SCHMITT: So I find it interesting, New Jersey is a month-and-a-half, Connecticut's two months, Pennsylvania is two months. So, we don't really align with anybody else in the region. So is -- what were the indicators Statewide? Maybe -- was it based on solely New York City data, did we include information from -- from every corner of the State to come up with just the one month?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: This is working with HCR.

MR. SCHMITT: It was their recommendation for one month?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: It's -- it's -- you know, the

Governor, I'm being told, is -- it was in his budget.

MR. SCHMITT: Can you repeat that?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: The Governor recommended that.

MR. SCHMITT: This is a Governor's recommendation?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: Yes. Our Governor.

MR. SCHMITT: Thank you for the -- for the clarification. Now, with the one month, are there any exemptions whatsoever including maybe for people with poor credit ratings, are there any restrictions or requirements maybe in reference to pet deposits or fees, or any changes based on age of the individual?

MR. CYMBROWITZ: No.

MR. SCHMITT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
On the bill, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. SCHMITT: I -- I believe this debate that we're having here today is a -- a true definition of an ideological and economic divide, the policy divide that we see and why we have a two- party system. I -- we've -- we've had a robust debate, and -- and it truly comes down to some disagreements on the rights that -- for -- for private property owners. And I believe that a lot of the measures that we are focusing on here today really will artificially distort -- distort the market, causing price spikes, quality issues, inventory issues. And I think that's why you're seeing the opposition from

myself and -- and several colleagues and the debate that we have here today.

I want to read into the record a piece of a recent editorial from Crain's dated May 27th of this year, which I think speaks to some of those -- some of the issues that we debated here. It sums up very nicely and kind of shows that that economic ideological divide that we are dealing with. Crain's states: *Regulating residential rents is like trying to make a balloon smaller by squeezing it. Every action creates another problem. The outcome is a tangle of rules and a market worse off than it had -- if it had been left untouched. New York launched rent control in the 1940s, reducing incentive to invest in buildings. Properties deteriorated, so higher rents were allowed for fix-up. They can wreck a budget. So the State put off rent increases until a tenant moved out. That created an incentive to push tenants out, so antiharassment laws were enacted and bureaucracies created to manage it all. Some regulated rents were higher than tenants could pay, so preferential rents were allowed. That put tenants at risk of big increases. The proposed solutions would, of course, create still more unintended consequences. The pattern is obvious, yet State lawmakers think they can break it by changing the rules which expire June 15th. They're kidding themselves. Some politicians know rent regulation is deeply flawed, but consider it the third rail. Others think ending regulation would trigger mass homelessness, even though that didn't happen in Massachusetts after voters killed rent control in 1994. Economists broadly agree that rent*

control makes housing markets inefficient and doesn't redistribute wealth. Better to give poor housing subsidies that do not distort the market or to require some no-fill units in residential projects. Mandating below market rent limits the creation of housing, just as no farmer would plant oranges if their price were capped at one cent, limiting supply further. Tenants with artificially low rents rarely leave. An empty-nester will stay in her price-controlled three-bedroom for decades, and her landlord will provide lousy service because the system encourages such decisions. Rent regulation in the City does not focus help on needy New Yorkers. An \$180,000 a year earner can lock in -- can luck into a regulated unit, while an \$80,000 a year earner pays twice as much for a smaller unit, and a couple making minimum wage ends up in a shelter. No rent law reform being discussed in Albany would change that. What's worse, there is talk of expanding the system to more apartments in more parts of the State. Rent control's simplistic visceral response to high housing costs that doesn't address the root causes. New York's system was imposed seven decades ago to address the housing emergency. That, not coincidentally, persists to this day. We should summon the courage to stop poisoning the market and let it heal.

I'll be voting no. I appreciate the time, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Goodell.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. GOODELL: My friends and colleagues, four score and seven hours ago --

(Laughter)

-- our leadership presented some legislation dedicated to the proposition that no one who owns rental property in New York City should be allowed to make a return on their investment. Now, there's no doubt that the world will little note nor long remember what I say here. But the housing market will never forget what we did here. And for all of our compassion for the tenants, which I share, what we're doing here is saying that if you make preferential rent available, which is a lower rent than normal, that lower rent must be permanent. And having dealt in the business world for most of my life, what that really means is that we are today eliminating preferential rent. So all those folks that used to enjoy a lower rent, albeit for a temporary period, will no longer get it. And we've made sure that if there's a Major Capital Investment, we don't even include the cost of the transaction, the interest costs and the carrying charges. Which means that no landlord will move forward on a Major Capital Investment unless forced, because they will lose money on every capital investment. And we've said to all of our tenants in New York City, *Your landlord cannot invest more than \$15,000 in upgrading your apartment.* If only we had this bill earlier before I had to redo my kitchen. And we say, *We don't care what your income is, you can make a million dollars and still be in a rent-controlled apartment,*

keeping that apartment off the market for someone who really needs it. And so looking at the financial ramifications of this bill, do we really want to say to all the tenants in New York City, Sorry, we're not going to invest more than \$15,000 in new furniture and furnishings. Sorry, we're not going to make Major Capital Investments in your property anymore unless forced to.

Now, I've heard a lot of compelling and moving statements about how delapidated the buildings are in New York City, at least some of them. How there's a serious problem with homelessness. How some of my New York City colleagues are inundated with tenants with housing problems. And I'm -- I'm compassionate and I'm -- I'm appreciative of those challenges. And I am thankful that in my district we don't have those issues. So what do we do Upstate? We -- we take a system now where the owner of a property -- and in my district most of the time it's a -- a mom-and-pop operation, they may own a couple of houses. And if they're not being paid the rent under the current system, you give them a three-day notice and if it's still not paid you bring a petition within 5 to 12 days and you're in court. If you get an eviction warrant, that's served within three days, the process takes about three weeks. What about under the proposed process? You have to give a five-day written notice by certified mail. That's before you start. You have to give a 14-day demand for payment. That takes you up to 20 days. The Notice of Petition must be at least ten days. That's 24 days. The tenant's entitled to a 14-day adjournment if they ask for it. That takes you, assuming

they ask for it, 38 days. When the warrant is issued, it can be up to another 14 days. We've taken a process that Upstate would normally take three weeks and we've now made it two months. But that's if the process moves smoothly. Because we have provided in here that if that the tenant has died, and now you have an -- an apartment unit or a rental unit that's owned by someone who is no longer -- rented by somebody who is no longer alive, you cannot bring the eviction proceeding until -- until the estate's formed. I mean, it could be three, six, nine months before you have an estate that's actually formed. And we say if you get a warrant and you're a tenant who hasn't been paying, can't find a comparable apartment within the same school district or town or village, they can stay up to one year in the apartment. One year after the eviction. And the rent, under this bill, is limited to what they paid or were charged the month prior to the -- the warrant being issued. What's that mean? It means that the landlord following these new procedures gives 90-day notice that he's going to raise the rent, and the tenant doesn't want to pay the higher rent. The tenant doesn't pay, because when they go through an eviction they can get a one-year extension, at the old rent. We're saying to landlords, *It's illegal for you to check or base your decision on whether to rent to someone based on the fact that they were -- been evicted for nonpayment of rent at the last six places. Or, that they were evicted for trashing the apartment.* We make that illegal. We do allow the landlord, by the way, to do a credit report and a background report, but presumably that background report has to say, *And don't tell me*

whether they trashed the previous apartment or were evicted. And presumably, we need to give special instructions that the credit report isn't supposed to report all the eviction judgments, or the landlord is facing a fine that could be up to \$1,000. We say that the landlord can no longer get attorneys' fees if there's a default judgment. But we eliminate any requirement that the Answer be served on the landlord in advance. Which means that the landlord won't know whether there's a default judgment in advance. We say that under this bill, the landlord cannot during the eviction process charge or seek payment for anything but the rent. Forgetting that there are a number of other charges, apparently, the landlord typically would include, like utilities. And we're told that the response to that is the landlord should bring a second lawsuit, presumably for the utilities, the cleaning costs, the attorney fees or whatever. Now, although we have taken the eviction process and moved it from three weeks to two months, this statute that we're voting on limits the amount of security deposit to 30 days, which means even if the landlord moves as fast as humanly possible to evict a tenant who's engaged in nonpayment of the rent, by law we prohibit that landlord from collecting in advance enough security deposit to cover his out-of-pocket losses.

Now, I arrived here this morning without a major housing crisis in my county. Sadly, I will be leaving with a housing crisis developing, as the landlords in my district and across much of Upstate New York wrestle to implement new rules designed to solve a problem that didn't exist in our community, that creates a raft-load of

new problems.

Thank you for allowing me to share that -- comments, and I am confident that even though I have just finished speaking, the Assembly will little note nor long remember what I've said. But nevertheless, I'm happy to share those comments. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the Cities Committees to the Speaker's Conference Room? I believe Mr. Braunstein may be already there.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Cities Committee, Speaker's Conference Room immediately.

Mr. Raia.

MR. RAIA: Mic's -- oh, there we go. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the bill. I've sat here through, oh, I think six renewals of rent control, and it's really only been a -- an issue primarily for New York City, a little bit in Nassau County, and I've learned a lot over the years. And I have concerns about what this is going to do to New York City. It's not renewable. If it doesn't work, we're going to find ourselves back here after a crisis has already been created. But now you've pulled everybody outside of New York City into the mix. And over the years, my local daily newspaper, Newsday, sometimes we agree on things, sometimes we don't agree on things. But they really got it right in an editorial today on the impact that this is going to have on Suffolk County, my county. I'm just going to take

a moment to -- to read some of the editorial. *Albany Rent Bill Will Hurt Island. While the State Legislature's efforts to expand rent regulations are intended to help residents by improving their ability to find and keep reasonably-priced rental housing, one piece of the rent legislative package would have the opposite impact, especially in Suffolk County. The pending bill would allow communities to opt in to rent regulations in their vacancy -- if their vacancy rates sit below 5 percent. That might seem like a good idea. But in Suffolk County, where there are few apartments and much open land to build them, the bill would have unintended detrimental consequences. Rent rules would stifle attempts to build reasonably-priced rental housing as developers and lenders would find themselves unable to finance and build rental housing. What more, it could lead landlords of existing rentals to consider converting them into cooperatives and condominiums, making the lack of rentals more dire. Also concerning, how little anyone knows about how the bill would work and where it would apply. Communities would do their own studies to determine eligibility based on whether there's a housing emergency when the retail vacancy rates fall below 5 percent. You see, the problem is this: In New York -- New York City is made up of five counties. Suffolk County is made up of ten towns, some of them small, some of them pretty big. And if you're going to have to have a different standard in each of those ten towns - some may want it, some may not - it is going to cause absolute havoc in my county. I think this bill -- I think there should have been hearings on this final piece of*

legislation instead of rushing it through behind closed doors so my constituents could have had an opportunity to have input in the final product. That did not happen.

I'm not willing to roll the dice on my constituents. I will be voting in the negative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

(Applause/cheers)

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes to explain her vote.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for an opportunity to explain my vote. First of all, I want to thank Speaker Heastie and Leader Stewart-Cousins for, I think, an historic opportunity for people who need to rent apartments anywhere in the State of New York. The thing I like most about this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is that it allows local governments to make their own decision. This is not something that is being forced on any government anywhere in the State of New York. Those governments can decide any piece of this legislation that they would like to have in their communities. I think that's valuable because often we think we know what's best for everybody, and sometimes it's best to let them make their own decision. As a -- as a -- the granddaughter of a landowner who sharecropped his land and the daughter of parents who

always had rental property, and a person who owns rental property right now, I do believe that investors should make a return on their investment. But they should not make that at the expense of the tenants that they serve. And so I think this is a good piece of legislation. It's well-rounded, and allows everybody to thrive and an opportunity to live in decent, safe housing.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to vote in support of this legislation. And to add just one more thing, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure why so many New Yorkers doubted the State Assembly. I'm not sure why so many New Yorkers doubted that we were going to have the interest of the people first and foremost. But I hope they understand now that we are you. We live your experience. We understand what you're going through. And we can get the job done in due time. Again, thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing us the due time to get the job done. Pleasure to vote in favor of this.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. Peoples-Stokes in the affirmative.

Mr. Lentol.

MR. LENTOL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise not to talk about the bill, so much as about the tenants associations in my district who have urged me and who have been on the streets for over 40 years that I can recall. Like St. Nick's Alliance, IMPACCT, Los Sures, the National Congress of Neighborhood Women, North Brooklyn Development Corporation, the People's Firehouse. The loft tenants and even other groups that I'm not even mentioning who have

come to me early and often. But most importantly, we wouldn't even be here today if it weren't for the great Speaker of the Assembly who came out in favor of this early in the Session and said he was going to do something about tenants' rights. Just like he did two years ago when he announced before we even did a budget, that we were going to do something about Raise the Age. Not only did he say it, he did it. And he did it this year with the great help of the -- that wonderful Housing Chairman from Brooklyn, Steve Cymbrowitz and his wonderful staff. And I want to thank them for bringing this bill to the floor so we have an opportunity this year to vote on it.

This is an historic occasion, and I'm proud to be a part of it. I vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Lentol in the affirmative.

Ms. Frontus.

MS. FRONTUS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join my colleagues today in saying how proud I am to join my colleagues and to vote for this historic piece of legislation today. This day will truly go down in history books as the day that this House, this Body, stood up and did the right thing on behalf of tenants. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I represent the 46th Assembly District, and I'm very proud to represent the Southern Brooklyn communities of Coney Island, Bay Ridge, Bath Beach, Gravesend, Brighton Beach and Dyker Heights. It is not hyperbole when I tell you this afternoon that no topic is of greater importance to my constituents today than housing

and tenant rights. This issue has become an outright crisis, and every single day, every single day we hear from constituents who are being preyed upon, who are being abused, who are being taken advantage of. We have seniors, we have widows who without any warning get letters in their mailbox telling them that their rents are being doubled and at time triples, which is hard to believe, but it's true. And enough is enough. And today we are sending a message that we are not going to stand here and take this anymore.

So I would just like to stand and say how proud I am. As a freshman member of this Body, it fills my heart with joy that we are making history together. And to all of the housing advocates in my district in Southern Brooklyn, thank you so much for your hard work. Thank you for your advocacy. And we did it.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you -- thank you.

Mr. Ortiz to explain his vote.

MR. ORTIZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to explain my vote. Today not only is a historical moment, but is a historical moment for the tenants who happen to win this piece of legislation. Throughout the years, tenants has come through this House advocating for justice for tenant rights, for decency. And, Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this country I used to live with my aunt in 1980. During those days in Sunset Park - which is the area that I represent today - in order for the landlord to get rid of the tenants, they

were trying to light a fire in some of the apartment that was empty. So we had to jump from the third floor, second floor and even from the sixth floor, some of the tenant who lived in the uppers floors, through the fire escape because they want the tenants to get out because they was in Section 8. I witnessed that in my district when I was -- when I came to this country. And today not only is a great day, today we are erasing a chapter that was created in the past and opening a new chapter with new legislation that will give our tenants the right that they deserve, the dignity that they deserve, and the human kind that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to be standing on this floor to protect the people of the 51st Assembly District, the areas of Sunset Park that I represent, proudly enough to vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Ortiz in the affirmative.

Mr. Blake.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and colleagues. From -- from the time I was elected in 2014 there's been no topic that has had more impact in our community in the South Bronx than -- than housing and standing up for our tenants. And I -- and I thank the Speaker and our Leader Stewart-Cousins and our Chair, Steve Cymbrowitz, and the tenant advocates for standing up today, for fighting whether it be VOCAL or Nos Quedamos or Mid Bronx Desperadoes. So many that came here to say enough is enough,

and say very clearly housing is a human right. This is personal in many reasons. My -- my mother was homeless. And she would regularly tell the stories about what had to happen to protect and stand up for our family to the time when I grew up at 2095 Crescent Avenue and we sold dinners on Saturday afternoons because we didn't have enough money to pay our rent. You should never be wondering if you can keep your home. You should never be wondering if could have a chance and have dignity. You should never wonder if someone comes in with a -- a fridge or an appliance that'd be the reason why your rent gets increased. You should never be wondering if you have a chance to make it each and every day. No bill should be the reason why you lose your home. And, yes, we understand there have to be improvements and changes, but we are very clear that housing is a human right in every possible way, no matter what is happening.

That is why today is a historic day. Today is a day where we make it very clear to all people across New York State that you don't have to live in fear, you don't have to wonder if you'll keep your home. We proudly stand with the tenants, and I vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Blake in the affirmative.

Mr. Phillip Steck.

MR. STECK: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will be voting in favor of the bill to provide Upstate New York municipalities with the option, in their discretion, to adopt rent

control. I must stress that this legislation gives Upstate New York cities, town and villages rent control as a tool to aid their local economies if they believe conditions warrant. Studies have shown that rising rents have outstripped any increases in income. This creates a dangerous situation in the economy. If people are forced to spend too much of their income on housing, they have little discretionary income left over and they are unable to spend an appropriate portion of their earnings on goods and services in the economy. This reduction in purchasing power will harm the Upstate economy. In New York City, which I am familiar with as the grandson of Manhattan renters, rent regulation is imperative because too much money is chasing too few apartments. Wealthy persons from other nations and other states buy or rent apartments either for investment or recreational purposes, which is driving longtime middle-class residents out of the City. The situation in Upstate New York is different. Incomes are lower. But rent control can also be a tool to address an imbalance between rent and people's ability to pay. I wish to thank those who spoke to me, constituents, about the proposal that placed mandatory restrictions on rent increases, limiting those to 1.5 times increase in the consumer price increase. I agree that restriction was unreasonable, and I thank the Majority Conference for eliminating it from the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Phillip Steck in the affirmative.

Ms. Walker.

MS. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request

an opportunity to abstain from voting at this time in order to explain my vote. This legislation is groundbreaking. It really is. And it will change the -- the dynamics of a number of individuals who right now are sitting in our housing courts under the threat of eviction. And it sends a strong message to any of the individual landlords who are looking to plague our constituents as well as our communities that today, the State of New York has taken a stance. And I heard throughout everyone's testimony that today we say, *No more*.

However, there are a group of individuals who are not going to be allowed to vest in the groundbreaking piece of legislation that we are partaking in today. And these are the individuals who are under Article 11, who are Mitchell-Lama. These are the individuals who are under a regulatory agreement with HPD. These are the individuals who are in our Section 8-based building developments across the State of New York. And particularly, these buildings are located in the most lowest of income communities throughout the City of New York. And so while I recognize that we did a lot today, I also agree that there is still a lot left for us to do, and that we need to get rid of this provision that allows for an exemption for buildings that HPD is allowing right now to plague our communities by charging very high rent and setting very high legal rents at amounts that don't particularly look towards our communities.

So while I do rejoice in this day with my colleagues, and I do appreciate all of the work that the Chairman, our Speaker and all of our staff has put into this legislation, I agree that there's more

work to do --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Walker --

MS. WALKER: -- but I will vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Walker in the affirmative.

Ms. Romeo.

MS. ROMEO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote. I am a proud representative of Upstate New York, the City of Rochester and Monroe County, and I'm very proud to cast my vote today in favor of this bill. Particularly for the protections -- the Statewide tenant protections that have been included in this provision. And I want to thank the advocates and the members of this room who have successfully worked on this issue and knowing that there is more to go. I want to thank the members that came out to Rochester, an Upstate city, where we heard from both residents within the City of Rochester, but also in neighboring suburban communities, the issues that they faced regarding retaliation when they spoke up for their rights. And we heard countless stories of families that were facing eviction and homelessness because they stood up against having to live in deplorable decisions [sic]. And thanks to some provisions in this, that will no longer be an issue that they have to face. I want to thank the members that really fought to get that -- those measures included and the advocates that did. I think this is a very important step, particularly for our Upstate's residents, that this protection -- no family will no longer have to fear speaking for their

rights of their families to live in safe conditions because they fear being evicted, and I think that that's really important.

And I wanted to -- I cast my vote in the affirmative.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Romeo in the affirmative.

(Applause/cheers)

Please. Thank you.

Mr. Rivera to explain his vote.

MR. RIVERA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My mother brought me to this great City of New York September 10, 1946. We lived in a homeless shelter for six months. We moved to the Bronx where we pay affordable rent, \$54 a month for a three-bedroom apartment. By 1980, there were those that were burning down the Bronx, arsonists for profit. We lost a population of 150,000. We organized the People's Convention then in 1980 to call to the attention of the Democratic party that was meeting in -- in -- in Madison Square Garden, and we set up on a plan to rebuild the Bronx. And we began to rebuild the Bronx. I got elected in '82. So now about four years ago, Bill de Blasio, our progressive liberal mayor, came up here with a beautiful plan to build affordable housing. Oh, how much we welcomed that in the Bronx, affordable housing. His plan called -- you had to make \$60,000 a year in order to qualify. Nick Perry -- if I remember, Nick Perry, brother, the Chairman of the Black and Puerto Rican Caucus, sent him back to New York with a different plan. He

came back, \$50,000. And we sent him back. He came back with \$31,000. Now we voted for \$15 an hour minimum wage. It's only \$30,000 a year, but not everybody in the City of New York made \$15 a -- a -- an hour minimum wage. So what happened? Bill de Blasio's plan calls for you to qualify, you gotta make \$31,000. \$15 an hour comes to \$30,000. Something is wrong here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for this, and I want to thank the Senator, Senator Cousins for this. And I want to thank all of you because, listen, you finally, after 17 years, gave me a salary increase --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. --

MR. RIVERA: Now I can afford to pay \$2,300 a month rent --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Rivera --

MR. RIVERA: Now I can afford to contribute to my children, my grandchildren going to college. What we told them, tuition --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Rivera, how do you vote, sir? Mr. Rivera.

(Inaudible)

Thank you, sir. He votes in the affirmative.

Ms. Reyes.

MS. REYES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. I know it's been a very lengthy debate. Housing has been one of the most prevalent issues in my district. Ninety-five percent of the

constituent cases that come to my office deal with housing. I can't tell you how powerless I have felt to not be able to do more for them. I am proud of what we've done here today. Everyone deserves to live with dignity. I want to thank all of my colleagues whose individual pieces of legislation have helped craft this initiative and this bill. I want to thank the Speaker for his leadership.

I am proud to cast my vote in the affirmative for all my constituents in the 87th and all the tenants in New York State. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Reyes in the affirmative.

Ms. Simotas.

MS. SIMOTAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to explain my vote. Today is a day when fairness has prevailed. It is a day when unscrupulous landlords can no longer game the system in order to force hardworking families from their homes with MCIs and IAIIs. It is a day when greedy landlords can no longer manipulate the system and further benefit from the tactics with vacancy decontrol. It is a day when balance is restored to the relationship between landlords and tenants. A day where preferential renters no longer have to fear unreasonable rent strike -- rent spikes. Today is a day when we grant aggrieved New York renters a sufficient amount of time to go to court and fight for their justice. As my good colleague from the 57th Assembly District from Brooklyn stated earlier today, today is a beautiful day. Sanity has finally been restored

to our housing laws. I thank the Speaker, the Chair of the Housing Committee, the staff and all those involved in shaping this monumental legislation. Today is truly a day when this Legislature has improved the lives of our constituents.

I proudly vote in the affirmative. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Simotas in the affirmative.

Ms. Fernandez.

MS. REYES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before becoming an elected official, I did constituent services in the greatest 80th Assembly District of the Bronx. And so many times, I had constituents come to me with papers with their -- with their leases, in tears in fear of losing their homes. And so many times I had to let them walk out of my office, helpless with my hands tied with the laws that be. It was sad to see them to go home with the feeling of continuing being threatened, mistreating and the possibility of homelessness. When I was elected, I made a promise. I made a promise that I would fight for them. That I would do everything right every chance that I got. And I'm so happy that today I can do the right thing when it comes to their housing rights. I'm grateful for this honor to be a part of this historic movement. Thank you to the advocates, to my constituents, for your tireless efforts and for reminding me what I had to do. Thank you to our Speaker for your leadership in bringing this to the floor, and to our Chair, and for listening to our cries on behalf of our constituents' cries. And thank you to the sponsors of the

nine bills that helped us get to this point to put this big piece together.

This will change lives and keep people in their homes. And for those who say it's not perfect or it needs to be worked on, yes, and so what? I would rather make this giant leap towards doing what is right than do nothing at all. And for that I proudly vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Fahy.

MS. FAHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to abstain while I explain my vote. And I, too, rise today to commend the Speaker as well as the -- the Committee Chair for the work over these months, and it's been a bit of a grueling few months, I must say. I am going to mainly spoke -- focus on the tenant protections here, because rent control components are probably not going to apply within my district. But the tenant protections are really truly historic, and will offer some true stability without discouraging development. And this is a very delicate balance, and I think that we have struck that balance rather well. It is about building the neighborhood economically and protecting its vitality, at the same time protecting long-term residents and their needs, particularly those who are struggling to afford growing rent increases. Albany has a rather unique or -- or unique challenge, but a very serious challenge, and that is that we have some blocks that have more red Xs on them or vacant homes than we do homes that are -- homes and rental property that is occupied. We also -- at the same time, while we are in need of developing those, we also have a number of landlords taking

advantage of -- who have taken advantage of vulnerable tenants. This bill balances those interests to create -- help create a growing and stable community. A couple of things that I think have been very significant here is that we are limiting -- tenant protections will require one month -- no more than a one-month security deposit. No retaliatory -- retaliatory evictions, more notice for month-to-month renters -- rentals or tenants when -- when they are being evicted, as well as making unlawful evictions a Class A misdemeanor. There is more to do. There's always more to do. I look forward to next year as we focus more on code enforcement, helping to fund it and incentivizing affordable housing.

And with that, I vote in the affirmative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Fahy in the affirmative.

Mr. Gottfried.

MR. GOTTFRIED: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm -- I'm tempted to quote Charlie Rangel, who would occasionally say, *Everything's been said, but not everyone has said it*. This --

(Laughter)

I guess I did -- just did quote him.

(Laughter)

This is -- this is such a magnificent day. And this is about as sweeping and magnificent legislative packages I've seen on almost any topic. There are things that this bill fixes that I can

remember thinking ought to be fixed back when I was knocking on doors, organizing tenants a half a century ago. You know, things like the -- the -- the vacancy -- the turnover rent increase. Making the rent laws available to municipalities all across the State, and a whole host of other things. Obviously, a big thank you to -- to Speaker Heastie and the Chair Cymbrowitz and to all of us who have helped to make this happen and all of us outside the Legislature. This is certainly a grand example of how elections do have consequences. We often say that as an expression of sadness, but today it is certainly, as it has been many times this Session, a -- a cause of great celebration and I'm delighted to vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Gottfried in the affirmative.

Mr. Perry.

MR. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today is a historic day. I join my colleagues in expressing gratitude to the leadership of our Speaker in this House and the Majority Leader in the House across the street here. Today, Mr. Speaker, the bad landlords who had a field day for so long, depriving tenants of their rights, freezing them in the winter, no hot water, no heat, have finally been pulled over by the tenants patrol. Many of us ran for office and got elected. We didn't know we were enlisted in the tenant patrol -- tenants right patrol, but it became our duty. And for many years we sat through Session after Session, knowing that something had to be done. We couldn't get it done because it couldn't pass the other

House. Well, what a difference having real Democrats in the Senate makes today.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Please. Please.

Thank you.

MR. PERRY: And, Mr. Speaker, I usually celebrate Good Friday earlier in the year. But today is Good Friday for tenants all around New York. I'm very proud to vote for this, be a part of this historic day. This historic passage of legislation that will protect New York City's tenant -- not only New York City, which is where the war usually occurs, but across the State in any municipality that adopts it.

And, Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to explain my vote and to cast my yes vote.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Perry in the affirmative.

Mr. Rodriguez.

(Pause)

Mr. Abinanti.

MR. ABINANTI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support this legislation, but also to explain some concerns that I have about the Statewide provisions. This debate has highlighted a significant difference in the residential markets in New York City and elsewhere in the State. I am appalled to hear the horror stories of the unscrupulous landlords harassing tenants and working the system to maximize profits at the expense of tenants in New York City. The

New York City tenants deserve the protections that are in this bill.

On the other hand, in my part of Westchester County, the present ETPA is working. We have been fortunate to not hear the same types of harassment and complaints. And there seems to be a balance so that the market is working in Westchester County. But my tenants deserve a renewal, a continuation of the ETPA.

But lastly, I am concerned about the additional burdens that the Statewide provisions will place on those who offer to rent the upstairs apartment, their vacation home, or even their own home when they leave town for a business trip, or when they go across country during the summer and want to rent the House out to a -- a transient. The Statewide provisions will make it much more difficult if they happen to find an unscrupulous tenant who wishes to give them grief, not pay the -- the rent or not move out on time. But by and large, I think this is a good piece of legislation. I do hope in the future we address some of these other concerns. But I think the New York City tenants and the ETPA tenants in Westchester County deserve a continuation, and so I'm pleased to vote for this legislation.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Abinanti in the affirmative.

Mr. Ryan.

MR. RYAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to explain my vote. I wanted to acknowledge and thank the Housing Chair for his great work on this, but also digging in to understand truly the differences in the rental markets in the different

parts of the State and the different tenant protections needed throughout the State. And thank you to the staff, too.

There's one small part of the bill I wanted to highlight, and that's the criminalization of illegal lockouts. An illegal lockout is when you come back home after a dispute with your landlord you find a padlock on your door. You are literally out in the cold, and you could look through the window and see maybe your cat, all your children's possessions. You call the police and the police say they are powerless, this is a civil matter. If you need help, you have to go to small claims court. Well, that is no real remedy. New York City solved this decades ago by amending their -- their civil and criminal code to criminalize this action, and today this bill will criminalize the action of an illegal lockout. It is one small part of this bill, but it will solve a large problem for tenants across New York State.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Ryan in the affirmative.

Ms. Seawright.

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of my constituents in the ever-changing neighborhoods of Manhattan's Upper East Side, Yorkville and Roosevelt Island, I rise in support of this historic legislation where affordable housing is the number one issue. Not a single day goes by, that constituents don't walk into my storefront office on the Upper East Side and talk about a landlord that is harassing them. We're running a free pro bono

housing clinic with a free attorney to help the constituents.

So today is a very special day, and I am very proud to cast my vote in the affirmative. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Seawright in the affirmative.

Mr. Rodriguez.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to take this opportunity to -- to shed light on the issue of -- of importance, which really is preserving affordable housing. Representing East Harlem and the -- the community that I represent, affordable housing is the primary issue, is the primary concern. And while we have a significant amount of public housing - and that's always going to remain a priority - we can't afford to lose not one single unit of rent-stabilized or rent-controlled apartments. And when we talk about the changes that are happening around vacancy decontrol and the units that have already been lost, you know, this is our way to kind of stem the tide in terms of making sure that there remain affordable units, not just in -- in East Harlem, but in -- in other communities that are facing rapidly gentrifying forces and conditions.

So this -- I'm proud to put my vote in the affirmative, most importantly to make sure that we do everything that we can to preserve the affordable housing stock that currently exists not just in my community, but throughout New York State. And I think this -- this bill takes steps towards doing that. So I proudly cast my vote in the affirmative. And again, thank you to the Speaker and to the Chair

of the Housing Committee.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Rodriguez in the affirmative.

Mr. Cymbrowitz to close.

MR. CYMBROWITZ: I wanted to take this opportunity -- I had a statement ready, but wanted to thank so many people. The Speaker, who -- who said, *I want to have the Assembly do the strongest tenant protections for all the residents of New York State*. He said it's important to all of us as a Conference. And I'm thrilled he gave me that opportunity to produce this package, which is outstanding and historic. I want to thank my colleagues from the Housing Committee who helped make this package, my colleagues who participated in the traveling road show who traveled to New York City, Albany and Rochester where we heard testimony from people who were really hurting, who were asking us, begging us to help them. And I think we did that. I also want to mention all the different advocates and landlords that we met with. We met with everyone. Every single stakeholder. Whoever wanted to meet, we met. We wanted to hear from everyone.

Last, the staff. They are the best. They are people who would meet -- have meetings at all hours of the day. I would get phone calls at all hours of the night. And it was worth it. Giovanni did a great job. We thank you.

(Applause)

We apologize for the engine that you left in

Rochester.

(Laughter)

But it was all worth it. To all my colleagues, I thank you. And I proudly vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cymbrowitz in the affirmative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill has passed.

(Applause/cheers)

Thank you.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

Ladies and gentlemen --

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: -- thank you so very much for adhering to our rules and holding down your comments. We would really appreciate it.

(Applause)

To all of you.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, we need to advance the A-Calendar.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On Mrs. Peoples-

Stokes' motion, the A-Calendar is advanced.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: We also need to call on Mr. Otis for an announcement.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Otis for the purposes of an announcement.

MR. OTIS: It's late afternoon on a Friday, and where would you like to be? Democratic Conference in the Speaker's Conference Room when Session ends.

(Laughter)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Democratic Conference, Speaker's Conference Room immediately following Session.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

Mr. Speaker, do we have any housekeeping or resolutions?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: And we certainly do have a lot of housekeeping and a number of resolutions.

On a motion by Mrs. Gunther, page 12, Rules Report No. 147, Bill No. 6260, amendments are received and adopted.

On a motion by Mr. Perry, page 29, Rules Report No. 237, Bill No. 1267-B, amendments are received and adopted.

On a motion by Mr. Perry, page 47, Calendar No. 211, Bill No. 34, amendments are received and adopted.

On a motion by Ms. Solages, page 49, Calendar No. 228, Bill No. 2317-A, amendments are received and adopted.

On a motion by Ms. Hunter, page 65, Calendar No. 493, Bill No. 2880-A, amendments are received and adopted.

On a motion by Mr. Englebright, page 68, Calendar No. 528, Bill No. 6295, amendments were received and adopted.

On behalf of Ms. Walker, Bill No. 6277, Assembly bill recalled from the Senate. The Clerk will read the title of the bill.

THE CLERK: An act to amend the Private Housing Finance Law.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed the House. The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

The Clerk will announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is before the House, the amendments are received and adopted.

We have a privileged resolution by Ms. Solages. The Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 581, Ms. Solages.

Legislative Resolution commemorating June 14th, 2019 as Flag Day.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Solages on the resolution.

MS. SOLAGES: Thank you, my colleagues, and I

will be brief --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: One minute.

We're not finished business yet.

Go, Michaelle.

MS. SOLAGES: Thank you, my colleagues. I'll be very brief. This Legislative Body pauses to joyously commemorate Flag Day, June 14th, 2019, fully confident that such commemoration clearly illustrates the importance of the American flag. And so in the words of President Woodrow Wilson, *This flag in which we honor and under which we serve is an emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and our purpose as a nation. And it is no other character that which we give it to -- to every generation after. So the choice is ours.* And so we, as Americans, stand for our flag and we say Happy Flag Day.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the resolution, all those in --

Ms. Buttenschon on the resolution.

MS. BUTTENSCHON: Today is Flag Day. This annual celebration, as my colleague stated, is to honor the American flag and inspire us to show that support in various ways. One outstanding example today was we were visited by the fourth-grade classes of Hart's Hill School in Whitesboro, New York. They were here today asking questions, engaging with us. So, I sincerely appreciate them being here today on Flag Day to support us, as well as this nation.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

On the resolution, Mr. Ra.

MR. RA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Briefly, I just want to thank the sponsor for putting this resolution forward. You know, it is important that we -- we commemorate Flag Day in terms of just what our flag stands for throughout our history as a nation. And you know, it's great to see, you know, whether it's school children that -- that visit us -- and one of my favorite things in this Chamber is when we have a school group here when they do the Pledge, because they do it so loud and -- and enthusiastically. Or it's those just incredible veterans who visited us earlier today in the Chamber. It's fitting that we take this opportunity to recognize Flag Day and salute our flag and the history of this nation and all of those who have sacrificed so much to get us to where we are today.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

We have similar other resolutions.

On the resolutions, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolutions are adopted.

(Whereupon, Assembly Resolution Nos. 576-580 and 582-584 were unanimously adopted.)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the Assembly stand adjourned until Saturday, June the 15th, tomorrow being a Legislative day, and that we reconvene on June the 17th, Monday, at 11:30 for a conference for Majority members, and 12:00 noon Session on Monday, being a Session day.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Assembly --

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Should I repeat that, Mr. Speaker?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Well, I think we need to repeat it, because people will have to listen.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: So, we are going to reconvene on June the 17th, Monday being a Session day. For Majority members, that is 11:30 for a conference. And for the entire members, it's the 12:00 p.m. Session, Monday, June the 17th.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Assembly stands adjourned until Monday, June 17th.

(Whereupon, at 4:35 p.m., the Assembly stood adjourned until Saturday, June 15th, Saturday being a Legislative day, and to reconvene on Monday, June 17th at 12:00 p.m., that being a Session day.)