

**Ulster County Housing Development Corporation**  
**Regular Meeting Minutes**

**Date & Time:** July 12, 2022 2:00pm

**Location:** Meeting ID: 878 8838 2523

Dial by your location

+1 646 931 3860 US

**Attendance:**

Hayes Clement, Chair

Marc Rider, Deputy County Executive

Tracey Bartels, Ulster County Legislative Chair

Ken Ronk, Ulster County Legislative Minority Leader

Dennis Doyle, Dir of Planning

March Gallagher, UC Comptroller

Phil Erner, UC Legislator District 6

Richie Williams, Asst UC Attorney

Laura Nordstrom, Director Research & Operational Programs (Recording Minutes)

**1. Approval of Minutes**

Motion No 1: by Ronk, Marc Rider 2<sup>nd</sup>,

5 in favor, 0 opposed

**2. Public Comment:**

March Gallagher: Observed that all of the information was on the website, and she really appreciates that, thank you.

**3. Communications and Announcements:**

Doyle: Climate Smart Communities APPLICATION IS OPEN FOR AFFORDABLE LOW INCOME HOUSING. Resolution currently before the legislature for the County to apply. Moving through the questions, related the Penrose Project. Key eligibility is the definition of Public Housing, does the Low income qualify as

Requested from DEC and has not received response back yet

If resolution passes, will submit application to cover costs of solar, ground source heat pumps to enhance the energy efficiency. It is a matching program, and Penrose is currently engaged in the GHG analysis for the application.

Bartels: Question in regard to this, because it is municipalities that are eligible, the more relevant question is whether the County is able to apply. And the requirement of the match, as stated in the committee the demo of the jail could be considered part of the match. Or if it is NOT permitted to be continued, and how the match would otherwise be paid.

Doyle: Correct, will not ask legislature to pay the match if the Demo will not count. 2<sup>nd</sup> opportunity may be the cost of installing the existing system. Out to the grant source right now. Resolution makes it so they CAN apply, not that they will apply.

Bartels: Is Dennis the point of contact for Elizabeth Street?

Rider: NO, that is for Marc Rider.

**4. Committee Reports: None**

## 5. **New Business:** County Tax Auction

- a. Doyle: Somewhere between 8 and 9 parcels pulled from auction, made available to UCDC to create a homeownership program. Submitted to legislature, held in committee with questions regarding interested parties relative to the parcels pulled. Suggested an RFP (Expression of Interest) The corporation is doing this since the County will be the owner of the parcels. Looking for comments from Board members prior to its release so the comments can be incorporate. Sets up that you have to apply for a minimum of 3 parcels. The thought on that is to not have 5 different entities involved in rehabbing the parcels and instead to break up into 2-3 private or non-profit developers rather than individuals. Additionally ensures they give their expertise, qualifications, etc. for the parcel. Based upon the landbank methodologies.
- b. Rider: Dennis and Marc had conversation with HRC and its potentially possible that funding that was received and set aside for land banks has now been opened up to municipalities and on-profits. Which means we could partially fund rehabs.
- c. Clement: Do need to respond to the RFI(interest) in order to remain 'on file'
- d. Doyle: People can still redeem parcels, so currently 8-9, one parcel pulled for potential use as a respite house in line with the county effort. Asked to not include as available until that decision is made. Only those surplus by legislature will be looked at. Requesting public hearing on those parcels and if multiple expression of interest. Process is cumbersome, but as requested by legislature.
- e. Bartels: Highlighted area in the proposal with walk through at Jail,
- f. Doyle: some properties may have liability issue sand will not permit for walk throughs of structures, properties are a go. Highlighted for this reason. Will include the additional info on the structures/ properties and will include a picture library available in the request.
- g. Bartels: Anything that would allow a potential proposer to have more information to make a proposal is preferable, so if safe and feasible allow for access.
  - i. In proposal, definition of affordable 125% of AMI, and cost of ownership being no more than 30%.
  - ii. Doyle answer: 30% is a standard used for every housing effort (from banks to governance) 125% generally accepted standard for home ownership. Rental affordability is below 80% AMI for moderate to low income. Due to anticipated costs of rehabbing and back taxes, want to have a feasible project so expanding the 125% AMI allows for people who will be able to afford a mortgage.
  - iii. Bartels follow up: Do other homeownership programs dip lower.
  - iv. Doyle: Without the gap financing that is not feasible for homeowners in this scenario. 125% is a MAXIMUM not the required amount.
  - v. Purchasing sale agreement and development agreement, both with parameters for claw back if there is a sale that. 1<sup>st</sup> step is to gauge interest for moderate -low income. Want these folks to be able to build equity as homeowners.
  - vi. Clement: As the legislature allocates parcels for disposal, can the legislature stipulate what the AMI should be case by case on an ongoing basis?

1. Doyle: Short answer yes, we hope to set up a process which allows this to occur multiple times a year. Do not want to do this in isolation of the folks that are trying to sit in and do rehab work. If we rate it at 125%, we shouldn't go back and cap at 80% (it is the goal but shouldn't hold as limitation)
2. Doyle will provide what the 125% looks like.

Any other formal comments in next day or two to Dennis.

Motion No 2: by Rider, to approve the draft EOI as presented with changes to section 11 as noted (about the jail), Ken Ronk 2<sup>nd</sup>

In-Favor: 5

Opposed:0

Old Business: Penrose/Golden Hill

- Planning board tomorrow night to discuss SEQR
- Last month jail demolition approved by legislature
- Bids came back, leg with updated \$ is before leg this month.
- On track to be completed by end of year if approved

Draft easements relative to subdivision that the City is currently looking at. One or more will have to go back to legislature because it is on Golden Hill Drive and needs easement because not on parcel and they need to get to route 32. Should go in this month or next month to the legislature. 'Package of easements' similar to the nursing facility because splitting up a infrastructure.

Hayes: Reception to project from planning board?

Dennis: Well served by staff, both in board members and the engineer, supportive of project and diligent in details. Allowed County to address the concerns of the neighbors, including the stormwater, traffic data, made determinations requiring separate consulting firm review the traffic study, including addressing adding a traffic signal. City did a good job with their review an relying on their consultants to require signal and deal with proposed easements. Engaged relative to open space committee and engaged them, committee asked the county to declare the remainder of Golden Hill as open Space (County elected not to – under advisement with planning board now) rezoning is still necessary. Anticipate tomorrow night the city planning board will have the SEQR decision with respect to the subdivision and site plan, conditional to rezoning. Should be in good shape to move forward from a planning angle of the product and can move forward with finding the necessary money to fund it.

Hayes: SEQR?

Dennis: Sustainability checklist component is part of the County review for projects as well, not sure if the city is using this.

Recycle 30% by weight. Tomorrow night will garner many answers in respects to SEQR.

Doyle addition: Financing mechanism for Pennrose is changing in terms of ownership pattern, may need to renegotiate or resign purchase and sale agreement. (Facility needs to be majority owned by non-profit given the funding source) Clarification for Bartels- this is not Pennrose changing ownership, it is the individual facility. Same management structure would exist.

Hayes: Conflict Question with County Attorney, has submitted a disclosure form regardless.

Richie: reviewed relevant statutes- conflict of interest is not under public officers' law or UC code of ethics, rather it would be by ethical standard of UCDC itself and there are no conflicts detected based on prior board membership of Hayes Clement on Family of Woodstock.

Clement: Drafting conflict of interest policy? [Rider suggested Williams – who stated he will discuss with County Attorney Johnson on that]

Next meeting: Tuesday August 9, 2022 at 2pm.

Will be via zoom.

Adjournment; 2:45pm

Motion No 3: by Bartels, to Adjourn, Rider 2<sup>nd</sup>

In- Favor 5

Opposed: 0

Respectfully Submitted, Laura Nordstrom, Director of Research and Operational Programs.