

New York State Homes and Community Renewal

2010 Mid-Hudson Regional Report
Dutchess, Orange, Putnam, Sullivan and Ulster Counties

ISSUES ADDRESSED:
*WORKFORCE HOUSING, EXTREMELY LOW- INCOME HOUSING
AND NIMBY*



Prepared by the Office of Policy and Research
April 2011

Introduction

Through focus group meetings held across the State from 2007 through 2009, New York State Homes and Community Renewal (HCR) identified common affordable housing and community development issues and needs which warranted further examination. In 2009, these meetings led to reports for the North Country, Finger Lakes and Western New York Regions which examined the issues of manufactured and mobile homes, the preservation and rehabilitation of owner occupied and rental properties and small rental developments.

This report examines three affordable housing and community development issues facing the five counties that comprise the Mid-Hudson Region (“the Region”): Dutchess, Orange, Putnam, Sullivan and Ulster.

These three issues are:

1. Workforce Housing;
2. Extremely Low- Income Housing; and
3. “Not-In-My-Backyard” (NIMBY)-Related Opposition

The information contained in this report is a distillation of the comments, observations and opinions of the participants that attended the Mid-Hudson Region focus group meetings.

Executive Summary

Affordable workforce housing is needed throughout the Mid-Hudson Region. Many entry-level workers, both hourly and salary, cannot afford existing market rate rents or the rents of some state subsidized developments. The age and deteriorated condition of much of the housing stock limits the opportunities of new and current residents when trying to find housing that is safe, decent and affordable.

In select areas of the Region, local employers try to assist their employees in finding affordable housing by offering incentives to purchase homes or providing housing directly. Most of this activity has been done by hospitals, colleges and universities. While other employers have expressed an interest in employer-assisted housing, current economic conditions have become an impediment.

Addressing the housing needs of extremely low- income residents is difficult, in light of the low rents that owners are able to attain from this population and the need for supportive services. Collaboration across all levels of government and with social service organizations is needed in order to meet this increasing need.

Meeting participants felt that three aspects are crucial to the long term success of extremely low-income housing: (1) the provision of rental assistance and/or operating subsidies; (2) supportive services, such as financial fitness education, child care, transportation, job skill training and case management; and (3) avoiding the concentration of extremely low-income populations in a single development or municipality.

NIMBY-related opposition to affordable housing is coalesced around negative perceptions such as increased school taxes, lowered property values and not wanting “those people” brought into the community. In addition, the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR) process was said to have become the most common regulatory construct seized upon and employed by those opposing the development of affordable housing.

Opposition to affordable housing tends to evaporate in the face of completed developments. Upon completion, communities see the product as successful and desirable. The promotion of and education about the benefits and reality of affordable housing is warranted.

Workforce Housing

Key Points:

- *There is a need for affordable workforce housing; particularly for entry-level workers.*
- *NIMBY-related opposition hinders the development of workforce housing.*
- *Local hospitals, colleges and universities have been at the forefront of employer-assisted housing. Current economic conditions prohibit other employers from offering such assistance.*
- *The term workforce housing was defined in varying ways during four focus group meetings held in the Mid-Hudson Region, including the following:*

Dutchess-Putnam Counties: Housing for people who are employed.

Orange County: The term is used to pitch new housing developments.

Sullivan County: Affordable housing for professional level workers, as well as low-wage workers.

Ulster County: The term is a matter of semantics; a new way to describe affordable housing.

Participants across the Region stated that there is a need for affordable housing for the local workforce, particularly entry-level workers. In Ulster County, this was referred to as housing for those earning up to 40 percent of area median income (AMI) for renter occupied units and up to 120 percent of AMI for owner occupied units.

Meeting participants in Orange County stated that many young professionals just entering the workforce cannot afford the rents in some state subsidized developments. One meeting participant illustrated the need for workforce housing by analyzing the change in the percent of young adults aged 20 to 34 who lived with their parents in 2000 and 2008. In Orange County in 2000, 39 percent of young adults lived with their parents; as of 2008 this percentage had grown to 55 percent (the biggest county-level increase in the Region). This participant believed there is a direct correlation between this percentage, low vacancy rates, high rents and the lack of multi-family rental units.

Meeting participants in Sullivan County said there is a need for workforce housing in the Village of Liberty. They said market rate housing takes care of itself, but the development of new workforce housing was needed because of the age and condition of the existing housing stock. A large percentage of the housing stock is over 25 years old and there are many absentee landlords who do not adequately maintain their properties. Some participants in Sullivan believe that there are different housing needs for each industry in the County. Rehabilitation of existing housing is needed for the agriculture industry, since the workforce needs to be near farmland; new construction, possibly employer-assisted housing, is needed near the health care corridor along NYS Route 17B for the health care industry; and new construction near transportation corridors for the tourism industry.

Examples of Workforce Housing in the Mid-Hudson Region

All of the focus group meetings in the Region were attended by both for-profit and not-for-profit developers who have experience in developing workforce housing. In the City of Kingston, Ulster County, where a workforce housing project was developed six years ago, the developer labeled the project workforce housing in order to show local officials and community residents that those living in the development would be employed. The development was intended for residents at 40 to 60 percent of AMI, and some units were set aside for single parents and veterans. If the development had not been built, public housing would have been the only affordable housing option in Kingston.

In Orange County, a participant discussed four workforce housing projects that they had developed for residents whose incomes range from 40 to 130 percent of AMI. The participant said developments which serve several income bands are an easier sell to communities, because they do not concentrate low income tenants. In order to bring workforce housing development to the Town of Wawayanda, the developer worked very closely with the Town to draft the legislation to create a floating zoning designation to accommodate the affordable housing development. They also partnered with a local not-for-profit organization.

In Dutchess County, one participant shared their experience with a successful intergenerational workforce housing development in the Town of Poughkeepsie, where some units were set aside for seniors and others for families. The income target for this development was 60 percent of AMI and below.

A representative from the Habitat for Humanity of Greater Newburgh said that they consider the housing that they develop to be workforce housing and they tend to target families between 40 and 60 percent of area median income (AMI).

Employer-Assisted Housing

Employers throughout the Region have expressed an interest in employer-assisted housing, yet very few have made a financial commitment for such developments. Local hospitals, colleges and universities have been at the forefront of employer-assisted housing in the Region.

In the City of Newburgh, Orange County, a not-for-profit organization partnered with St. Luke's Cornwall Hospital to create a first time homebuyer program for employees desiring to live near the hospital. After completing first time homebuyer training, program participants were eligible for grants up to \$27,000 and opportunities to improve their Fair Isaac Company (FICO) score. Similarly, Mount Saint Mary College provides subsidies for any employee who purchases a home within the City of Newburgh. It was said that the success of both programs is dependent upon the ability of potential owners to find housing in good condition in safe neighborhoods. Meeting attendees said it is difficult to sell homes in inner-city neighborhoods due to the negative perception of neighborhood safety and poor performing schools.

A not-for-profit organization in Ulster County used resources from the New York State Affordable Housing Corporation to administer a first time homebuyer program that was tied to an employer-assisted housing program. Employers had to provide a minimum of \$5,000 towards the purchase of a home. All \$500,000 that was targeted for this program was expended.

Meeting attendees also shared stories about prospective employer-assisted housing in the Region. SUNY New Paltz, in Ulster County, is in the process of creating workforce housing opportunities for its employees as is the Center for Discovery in Sullivan County.

NIMBY and Inclusionary Zoning in the Context of Workforce Housing

Meeting participants representing developers said they often face NIMBY-related community opposition when attempting to develop workforce housing. They said it can be challenging to educate communities on workforce housing due to negative perceptions and an unwillingness of some communities to embrace change.

Several meeting participants said that affordable housing is a huge political issue for many communities in the Region and local officials walk a fine line between the types of developments that they support. While some local opponents of workforce housing agree that there is a need, they prefer to see this type of development in the Region's urban centers instead of in small towns and villages.

Some attendees stated that many local leaders are resistant to outsiders or the unemployed moving to their communities. One participant suggested targeting those who work in the community, current residents and the children of current residents who desire to return to the community. Several developers stated that they need the ability to offer a "local preference" in order to gain local support for workforce housing developments. They believe that developments with some type of local preference and which are intended to serve a wide range of incomes are more likely to draw support from the community.

Attendees across the Region shared that many communities are concerned about the impact workforce housing will have on their school taxes. A proposed development in Putnam

County was retargeted to senior tenancy after town officials were persuaded that the project would raise school taxes due to an influx of children.

Extremely Low- Income Housing

Key Points:

- *It is difficult to address the housing needs of the extremely low- income in light of the low rents that property owners are able to attain from this population and the need for supportive services.*
- *Concentrating extremely low- income units is not desirable. Scattered site developments should be integrated into surrounding communities and neighborhoods.*
- *Sullivan County did not experience the housing or economic boom seen in other counties of the Region, and has limited capacity to address the needs of its extremely low- income residents.*

Meeting participants throughout the Region stated that the ability to provide affordable housing for the extremely low- income has become an increasing problem. Several participants from Dutchess and Putnam Counties stated that responsibilities to the lowest income populations have been relinquished by government at the state and federal levels. They believe that local municipalities and developers cannot address this growing issue alone. Collaboration across all levels of government is needed.

One meeting participant illustrated this growing need by comparing the number of available renter occupied low- rent units (rents equal to or less than \$600) in the 2000 U.S. Census and 2008 American Community Survey (ACS). During this timeframe, the Region saw a loss of 23,776 low- rent units.

Table 1 illustrates the affordability of renter occupied units in the Mid-Hudson Region. The data is based on information found in the National Low- Income Housing Coalition's *Out of Reach* 2010 report, which demonstrates the inability of low- wage employment to provide stable, decent housing for low- income families.

TABLE 1

AFFORDABILITY OF RENTER OCCUPIED UNITS IN THE MID-HUDSON REGION (NATIONAL LOW- INCOME HOUSING COALITION <i>OUT OF REACH</i> 2010)				
	2 Bdrm Fair Market Rent*	Rent Affordable at 30% of AMI**	Housing Wage***	Mean Renter Wage****
Dutchess	\$1,128	\$626	\$21.69	\$13.01
Orange	\$1,128	\$626	\$21.69	\$10.56
Putnam	\$1,359	\$467	\$26.13	\$11.78
Sullivan	\$907	\$431	\$17.44	\$9.09
Ulster	\$1,001	\$526	\$19.25	\$7.25

* Fiscal Year 2010 Fair Market Rent (FMR)[HUD, 2010; revised as of March 11, 2010]. FMR is defined by HUD as "...the 40th percentile of gross rents for typical, non-standard rental units occupied by recent movers in a local housing market."

** Annual Income at 30 percent of AMI and not spending more than 30 percent of income on housing costs.

*** Hourly wage necessary to allow a household to rent an apartment at the FMR while paying only 30 percent of its income for housing costs (assumes full-time, year-round employment).

**** Based on 2008 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics data, adjusted using the ratio of renter to overall household income reported in the U.S. Census 2000 and projected to April 1, 2010.

Rental Assistance and Operating Subsidies

Property owners find it difficult to manage developments targeted to the extremely low- income due to the limited rents that they are able to command. A meeting participant from a not-for-profit organization in Dutchess County said they have clients, particularly those with mental illness or substance abuse problems, who cannot afford monthly rents of \$300. In Sullivan County, there are many residents who lack year-round incomes due to the seasonal nature of much of the local employment. Additional resources in the form of rental assistance or operating subsidies are needed in order to make developments which serve the extremely low- income financially feasible.

Participants from Dutchess and Sullivan Counties shared that their Departments of Social Services assist struggling clients in obtaining affording housing by paying their security deposits. The participants also shared that they had provided vouchers to families that wanted to live in scattered site supportive housing. This assistance enabled the children in these families to live in an economically integrated setting.

Attendees across the Region expressed their need for additional Section 8 Vouchers. In Sullivan County, one of the poorest counties in New York State, there are 350 names on the Section 8 wait list. Over 200 have incomes of 30 percent of AMI or below. In Ulster County, a not-for-profit organization had their Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher authorization increased by 900 over a nine year period, and they continue to have a wait list. Participants in Ulster County said vouchers are a key resource to serve the housing needs of the extremely low- income. They believe that use of the vouchers is more cost effective than the creation of new affordable

housing, given the difficulty many developers face when trying to make developments for this population financially feasible.

Table 2 below illustrates the number of HCR’s Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers authorized and leased in the Mid-Hudson Region.

TABLE 2

HCR SECTION 8 HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER DATA FOR THE MID-HUDSON REGION		
County	Number of Vouchers Authorized as of June 1, 2010	Number of Vouchers Leased as of June 1, 2010
Dutchess	1,115	1,034
Orange	2,444	2,384
Putnam	540	536
Sullivan	652	618
Ulster	1,397	1,361
Region Total	6,148	5,933

Supportive Services

In addition to low rents, another factor that contributes to the management difficulties of these properties is the need to provide on-site supportive services. Table 3 below illustrates the number of families that are enrolled in HCR’s Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) Program in the Mid-Hudson Region. The FSS Program helps Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher tenants by providing opportunities for education, job training, counseling and other forms of social service assistance, so that these families may obtain the skills necessary to achieve self-sufficiency. Although the FSS Program appears to provide significant benefits, attendees attributed low enrollment to the five year contract requirements that must be fulfilled in order for families to obtain full benefits.

The FSS contract requires that the family comply with the lease, that all family members become independent of welfare and that the head of the family seek and maintain suitable employment. Possible sanctions for noncompliance with the FSS contract are termination from the FSS Program, forfeiture of the FSS escrow account, withholding or termination of supportive services and termination of housing choice voucher assistance.

TABLE 3

HCR FAMILY SELF SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM DATA FOR THE MID-HUDSON REGION					
County	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Dutchess	131	114	118	157	154
Orange	132	133	157	163	177
Putnam	51	35	43	49	41
Sullivan	43	45	56	60	59
Ulster	51	68	66	70	86
Region Total	408	395	440	499	517

Mixed Income Housing

The major concern of many meeting participants is the concentration of extremely low- income individuals and families. They believe that housing for this population should be in mixed-use/mixed-income developments in varied communities and neighborhoods. Participants in Orange County shared that municipal leaders are reluctant to support large developments where most of the tenants are at or below 30 percent of AMI. Similar sentiments were expressed in Sullivan County, however, attendees there also stated that tax credit investors are not interested in mixed income developments since units above 60 percent of AMI are not eligible for tax credits.

Although it is believed that scattered site developments are difficult to manage, participants across the Region agree that this is another preferred development model for the extremely low-income. Attendees shared that HCR should consider revising its funding process so that developers may find ease in developing scattered site projects. Participants from Putnam County said the provision of supportive services in scattered site housing has been very effective.

Special Needs Populations

Meeting the needs of the growing homeless population in the Region was a concern shared by many participants. In Sullivan County, homelessness, based on a point-in-time count, was up 40 percent between 2009 and 2010. Local organizations are looking to create emergency shelters but are facing capacity and financial issues.

Ulster County participants reported over 500 homeless individuals, based on a point-in-time count; most of them in the City of Kingston. There are four homeless shelters in the City of Kingston which respectively target (1) homeless families; (2) single individuals with mental illness; (3) run away youth; and (4) victims of domestic violence.

A for-profit developer who has properties in several counties across the Region shared their experience in trying to provide affordable housing for some special needs populations. They

have partnered with the State Office of People With Developmental Disabilities (formerly known as the Office of Mental Retardation and Development Disabilities – OMRDD) to provide housing options for its clients. Their focus is on transferring those with multiple sclerosis and traumatic brain injury from nursing homes into Project Based Section 8 developments.

Participants in Dutchess County shared the unique manner in which they provide housing for special needs populations. The County DSS has found it cost effective to purchase rooming houses where tenants share common areas. In a typical rooming house, one-half is used for emergency housing and the other half is for those looking for a more long- term and stable environment. Not-for-profits are able to surpass zoning restrictions due to their ability to take advantage of the zoning grandfather clause; permitting the continued use of the rooming houses as such.

Homeownership for Extremely Low- Income Households

Attendees in Ulster County shared their experience with the Section 8 Homeownership Program. One not-for-profit organization in that County has assisted over 30 families, the second highest in the State, in purchasing a home through the Program. This organization combines the Section 8 Voucher assistance with low interest rate mortgages through the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The success of the program has been attributed to pre- and post- purchase counseling.

Table 4 illustrates the number of homeownership closings in the Mid-Hudson Region where Section 8 Voucher assistance is available and being used to help families obtain a home of their own.

TABLE 4

HCR SECTION 8 HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER HOMEOWNERSHIP DATA FOR THE MID-HUDSON REGION	
County	Number of HCV Homeownership Closings from August 1, 2000 to June 1, 2010
Dutchess	6
Orange	27
Putnam	0
Sullivan	2
Ulster	36
Region Total	71

Economic Development

Unlike other counties in the Mid-Hudson Region, Sullivan did not experience a housing or economic boom. According to the 2006-2008 ACS, Sullivan has the lowest median income and

median value of owner occupied homes, as well as the highest percent of individuals below poverty level compared to the other counties in the Region.

Table 5 sets forth these statistics for all of the counties in the Region.

Table 5

MID-HUDSON REGION 2006-2008 ACS DATA MULTI-COUNTY COMPARISON TABLE (Select Indicators)			
	Median Household Income	Median Value of Owner Occupied Units	Percent of Individuals Below Poverty Level
Dutchess County	\$69,500	\$334,900	8.1
Orange County	\$69,900	\$320,200	10.2
Putnam County	\$88,600	\$430,300	6.3
Sullivan County	\$48,900	\$189,300	15.8
Ulster County	\$56,800	\$243,600	11.7

Meeting participants in Sullivan County said that current economic conditions are a result of an economy that was based on the resort industry. They stated that owners of these resorts blocked other industries from entering the County, and as a result there is now a lack of employment diversity. In addition, they opined that Sullivan County does not have the proper infrastructure and shovel-ready sites that would attract employers who would pay a living wage.

NIMBY-Related Opposition to Affordable Housing

Key Points:

- *NIMBY-related opposition to the development of affordable family housing has skewed its siting to the cities of the Mid-Hudson Region.*
- *The SEQR process has been used as a tool by those who are intent to stop the development of affordable housing in the Mid-Hudson Region*
- *NIMBY-related opposition to housing development is not confined to affordable housing but extends to market rate as well.*

Participants in the Mid-Hudson Region discussed the NIMBY-related opposition they encounter when pursuing the development of housing, both affordable and market rate. Participants said there is a particular coalescence of opposition to affordable housing that is derived from perceptions of how such housing will impact the need for local services, and the related effect upon property taxation.

It was said that NIMBY-related opposition results in most affordable family housing being built in the cities of the Region while a preponderance of the affordable senior housing is developed in the suburbs and rural areas, since age restricted affordable housing encounters much less NIMBY-related opposition than affordable family housing.

Attendees in a number of sessions recounted affordable housing that succumbed to misinformation brought forward and reported as fact. A number of instances were recounted of

proposed affordable family housing that morphed into senior housing in order to survive the NIMBY-related opposition and delays that it fermented. Some participants saw a direct link between the availability of information on the Internet and the effectiveness of NIMBY campaigns against affordable housing in the Mid-Hudson Region.

One attendee with experience in affordable housing development stated that both time and money are needed when developing affordable housing, or NIMBY-related opposition will be successful in delaying or halting a project. One participant recounted an experience where two lawsuits were brought against an affordable family housing development built in Kingston. The first suit was brought by a neighbor over the removal of trees at the development site and the second was brought by a Town supervisor regarding that development's Payment in Lieu of Taxes Agreement. The costs of these lawsuits reached \$40,000.

Attendees throughout the Region said the approval process surrounding SEQR requirements has become the most common regulatory construct seized upon and employed by those opposing the development of affordable housing, replacing zoning challenges. Some attendees expressed concern regarding how SEQR-related delays in development timelines can affect funding decisions that are made by HCR. Participants said that adopting finite timelines in the SEQR process could ultimately enhance the financial viability of affordable housing development.

Attendees asked whether the State has considered creating a statewide housing needs assessment similar to the three-county regional housing needs assessment completed by the Planning Departments of Dutchess, Orange and Putnam Counties with Economic & Policy Resources, Inc. It was contended that studies which present a quantification of need could be used by developers. Such studies, derived from objective data, could also be cited by developers to counter NIMBY-related opposition to a documented affordable housing need.

One affordable housing developer explained that he commissioned a study to ascertain his proposed development's impact upon the community, specifically school enrollment. The study confirmed his belief that most of the expected residents in the completed development were already city residents and would therefore have a negligible effect upon the school enrollment. It was believed that this finding had a favorable impact upon the municipal approval process, and the development ultimately passed.

One attendee explained that research presented to support completed affordable housing developments and counteract NIMBY-related opposition must be of a local nature. It was shared that studies that document the positive effects of affordable housing have little or no traction against NIMBY-related opposition unless the study is specific to the locale in which the proposed development is located. In a similar vein, a participant who successfully developed affordable family housing in Dutchess County hired a local public relations professional to assist in successfully countering NIMBY-related opposition to affordable family housing.

A number of participants recounted the irony that accompanies affordable housing and how opposition evaporates in the face of completed developments. A participant said that once affordable housing is completed, communities typically view the finished product as successful

and desirable. Attendees believe these circumstances create an opportunity for HCR in the promotion and education as to the benefits and reality of affordable housing.

One participant shared his observation that NIMBY-related opposition to affordable housing is muted and not nearly as vehement when the development includes the removal of a structural eyesore that is part of the community tableau. Additionally, it was noted that when an affordable housing development entails the mitigation of an environmental hazard such as a brownfield, local governments can be inordinately forthcoming in the development process.

There is a comprehensive planning process established in all communities of Ulster County and all have at least initiated the inclusion of affordable housing components in their comprehensive plans as of five years ago. Most communities provide for multi-family housing or offer a density bonus for affordable senior housing.

Mid- Hudson Regional Report Resource List

Workforce Housing

- Dutchess, Orange and Ulster County Planning Departments' *A Three-County Regional Housing Needs Assessment: Dutchess, Orange and Ulster From 2006 to 2020*
<http://www.co.dutchess.ny.us/CountyGov/Departments/Planning/tcrhassessment.pdf>
- Harvard's Joint Center for Housing Studies' *Strengthening our Workforce and Our Communities Through Housing Solutions*
http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/publications/markets/workforce_housing_report.html
- Housing Policy.Org's Employer-Assisted Housing Page
http://www.housingpolicy.org/toolbox/strategy/policies/employer_assisted_housing.html
- Housing Policy.Org's Workforce Housing Page
http://www.housingpolicy.org/getting_started/what.html#What+is+%22workforce+housing%22%3F
- National Association of Home Builders - Workforce Housing Page
http://www.nahb.com/reference_list.aspx?sectionID=681
- Urban Land Institute J. Terwilliger Center for Workforce Housing
<http://www.uli.org/ResearchAndPublications/TerwilligerCenterforWorkforceHousing.aspx>
- Urban Land Institute's *Land Use Policy Forum Report: Challenges to Developing Workforce Housing*
<http://www.uli.org/ResearchAndPublications/Reports/~//media/Documents/ResearchAndPublications/Reports/Workforce%20Housing/DevWorkforceHousing.aspx>

Extremely Low- Income Housing

- Corporation for Supportive Housing's *Developing and Managing Supportive Housing*
<http://www.csh.org/html/developing.pdf>
- Fannie Mae Foundation's *Section 8: The Time for a Fundamental Program Change?*
<http://content.knowledgeplex.org/kp2/cache/documents/71105.pdf>
- Joint Center for Housing Study's *Subsidized Housing and Employment: Building Evidence about What Works to Improve Self-Sufficiency*
http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/publications/rental/revisiting_rental_symposium/papers/rr07-6_riccio.pdf

- National Low- Income Housing Coalition’s National Housing Trust Fund Information Page
<http://www.nlihc.org/template/page.cfm?id=40>
- National Low- Income Housing Coalition’s *Out of Reach 2010 Report*
<http://www.nlihc.org/oor/oor2010/>
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Office of Policy Development and Research’s *Worst Case Housing Needs 2007: A Report to Congress*
http://www.huduser.org/portal/publications/affhsg/wc_HsgNeeds07.html

“Not-In-My Backyard” (NIMBY)-Related Opposition to Affordable Housing

- American Planning Association’s *Zoning as A Barrier to Multi-family Housing Development*
http://www.huduser.org/Publications/pdf/zoning_MultifmlyDev.pdf
- Center for Housing Policy’s “*Don’t Put it Here*”: *Does Affordable Housing Cause Nearby Property Values to Decline?*
http://furmancenter.org/files/media/Dont_Put_It_Here.pdf
- Harvard’s Joint Center for Housing Studies’ *Overcoming Opposition to Multi-family Rental Housing*
http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/publications/rental/revisiting_rental_symposium/papers/rr07-14_obrinsky_stein.pdf
- Harvard’s Joint Center for Housing Studies’ *From Hurdles to Bridges: Local Land-Use Regulations and the Pursuit of Affordable Rental Housing*
http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/publications/rental/revisiting_rental_symposium/papers/rr07-11_pendall.pdf
- Knowledgeplex’s Land Use and Housing Planning Page
<http://www.knowledgeplex.org/topic.html?c=236>
- The Housing Alliance of Pennsylvania’s *Addressing Community Opposition to Affordable Housing Development: A Fair Housing Toolkit*
<http://content.knowledgeplex.org/kp2/cache/documents/68549.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Office of Policy Development and Research’s *Why Not in Our Community? Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing*
<http://www.huduser.org/Publications/pdf/wnioc.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Regulatory Barriers Clearinghouse
<http://www.huduser.org/portal/rbc>

Mid-Hudson Region Meeting Participants

Kingston - Ulster County (June 29, 2010)

Steven Aaron, Birchez Associates
Michael Berg, Family of Woodstock
Dennis Doyle, Ulster County Planning
Richard Gerentine, Marlborough Associates
Stephen Hack, Ulster Savings Bank
Jeremy Kane, Town of Saugerties Planning Board
Guy Kemp, RUPCO
David Muchnick, Housing First!
Barbara Murphy, Pattern for Progress
Kevin O'Connor, Rural Ulster Preservation Company*
Anne Patnode, NYS Rural Housing Coalition
Roberto Rodriguez, Ulster County Department of Social Services
Blair Sebastian, NYS Rural Housing Coalition

Newburgh - Orange County (June 30, 2010)

David Church, Orange County Planning Department
Chuck Darden, RECAP, Inc.
Tony Figueroa, RECAP, Inc.
Madeline Fletcher, Pathstone Community Improvement of Newburgh
Deirdre Glenn, Habitat for Humanity of Greater Newburgh
Courtney Kain, City of Newburgh Department of Planning & Development*
Tom Lane, Orange County Office of Community Development
Ramona Monteverde, Safe Harbors of the Hudson
David Muchnick, Housing First!
Doug Olcott, Community Preservation Corporation
Larry Regan, Regan Development
Edna Rivera, HOGAR, Inc.
Larry Wolinsky, Jacobowitz & Gubitz, LLP

Monticello - Sullivan County (July 13, 2010)

Luiz Aragon, Sullivan County Div. of Planning & Environmental Management*
Ethan Cohen, Sullivan County Div. of Planning & Environmental Management
Kathi Hitt, Sullivan County Div. of Planning & Environmental Management (conference call)
Joan Kern, Knock Out Hunger
Jonah Mandelbaum, Warick Properties
David Muchnick, Housing First!
Glenn Pontier, Sullivan Renaissance/Gerry Foundation
Laura Quigley, Center for Workforce Development
Daniel Sturm, Town Supervisors Association
Heinrich Strauch, Liberty CDC
Shari Trust, Rural Sullivan Housing Corporation
John Van Etten, Recovery Center
Pam Winters, Village of Liberty Code Enforcement Office

Mollye Wolahan, Community Development Resources, LLC (conference call)
Dena Wood, Pathstone New York

Poughkeepsie - Dutchess and Putnam Counties (July 15, 2010)

Bob Allers, Dutchess County Department of Social Services
Jackie Brownstein, Mental Health Association of Dutchess County
Ken Kearney, The Kearney Group
Michael Piazza, Jr., Putnam County Department of Social Services
Larry Regan, Regan Development
Kathy Rubin, Wilder- Balter
Anne Saylor, Dutchess County Department of Planning*
Gail Webster, Hudson River Housing

*Meeting Host