

Hello Council Members,

Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you before you vote on the HPD request for the tax exemption and the shelter rent tax abatement that Cadman Towers has now by right as a Mitchell-Lama co-op but must be approved when there is a conversion out of M-L.

If this were a one district issue, it would be honorable to respect district member deference. BUT THIS IS a City WIDE Issue.

As soon as the whole City Council votes to grant this tax break to this co-op that wants to leave the M-L program, the 400 or more people on the waiting list lose their chance of a decent affordable apartment at Cadman Towers (but they had no vote in the matter). But also in my co-op and many of the other 84 M-L co-ops in the City there will start up very soon efforts to follow Cadman Towers out of the M-L program. The people who will be hurt are those on the waiting lists and those who enter every lottery with the hopes of getting on the waiting lists. Add the that the pain ad tension that many of the over 60,000 families in M-L co-ops will experience because they now have to fight with their neighbors over going 2 to 11 or staying in M-L. There are these constituents in every Council members district. The fact that City Council members are lining up behind Gale Brewers bill shows this is a City Wide issue not a one district issue but you have been asked to consider it as if it were just one co-op in one district.

This is a City Wide issue. Vote no tax break for leaving M-L social housing, not for this co-op today and not for any co-op with CM Brewers bill.

Be a Housing Hero

Thank you

Jay Hauben, RNA House Cooperator and Board member

DATE: April 16, 2024

RE: 4/18/24 Finance Committee agenda item: HPD application for Cadman Towers tax exemption (T2024-1816)

Dear City Council Members:

We are pro-Mitchell-Lama shareholders at Cadman Towers in Brooklyn. For decades we have fought the attempts of our Board of Directors to privatize and take our development out of the not-for-profit Mitchell-Lama program. We believe that the next generation of working-class New Yorkers should have the same opportunity we have had — an affordable place to live.

Some of us are afraid. During the years we have fought to stop privatization and II-to-XI at Cadman Towers, we have, too often, been the targets of harassment and retribution. This has taken the form of incidents of being shoved, followed, yelled at, and of us being the targets of hate mail. We have also had our characters disparaged in private and public forums including at board meetings and have been the target of social media advocating for our eviction. This is why, until now, we have chosen to allow Cooperators United for Mitchell-Lama (CU4ML) and Mitchell-Lama United (MLU) to assume the leadership role in this present campaign. The below signatories have decided to come forward given the extreme urgency of the matter at hand, but we also represent many others unwilling to take the same risk.

When we defeated privatization efforts at Cadman Towers, our Board turned to the semi-privatization scheme of converting from an Article II Mitchell-Lama to an Article XI HDFC coop. This conversion would dramatically raise the purchase prices of apartments in order to give an undeserved profit to the long-subsidized residents of Cadman Towers, who have had the advantage of decades of large real estate tax abatements and low- and no-interest government loans and grants. We worked hard to defeat this plan also, but, unfortunately, we did not prevail.

Cadman Towers privatizers convinced many shareholders here to go along with the scheme (because we are all worried about escalating capital repair costs) with the claim that this scheme was the only way to pay for these repairs. While paying for repairs is a complex issue, it is simply not true that the only (or even the best) option is to convert. If it were true that the only way to pay for repairs is by dramatically increasing the initial equity payment for an apartment, the board at Cadman could have chosen to do what Penn South did by staying not-for-profit and simply charging more for the purchase. Instead, they chose to only give the option of a conversion plan that includes a windfall profit for current shareholders.

Government funding has been and is available for ML developments, but Boards must seek such funding. We believe our Board could have more aggressively sought alternative sources of funding, such as additional low-cost City and State loans, instead of promoting this never-before-tried plan.

We are 100% behind the efforts of Cooperators United for Mitchell-Lama (CU4ML) and Mitchell-Lama United (MLU) to oppose the continuation of tax subsidies for any development that seeks to

leave the Mitchell-Lama not-for-profit program. Cadman Towers cannot convert from a Mitchell-Lama to an HDFC coop if it has to pay millions of dollars in regular real estate taxes. Essentially, denial of a Shelter Rent tax abatement by the City Council would defeat this terrible conversion scheme. If Cadman shareholders want to 'pull the ladder up from behind them' — making the housing available only to the asset-wealthy and income-poor in order to make a profit on the sale of their apartments — then the taxpayers of New York should not continue to subsidize them.

We ask that you take whatever action possible (abstaining, voting no, tabling the item) that will result in giving the Finance Committee and full Council time for a thorough review of the serious public policy implications for Cadman, and for all the other ML co-ops which will be negatively affected, should you proceed prematurely.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mary Foutz
Christine Fowley
Wendy Levine
Mike Sullivan
Sharon Torres
Catherine Tsuji
Ian Tsuji
Caroline Van Zandt
Mary Wade

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 4:45 AM
To: Testimony
Subject: FW: Testimonial from Cadman Towers waitlist
Attachments: Elected Letter on 2-11 Conversions _ April 2024.pdf; HousingAdvocatesSupportLetter_4_10_24.pdf; 2to11_QuickReference_4_4_24.pdf; Amna Ahmad letter for Speaker Adams.pdf

From: Adele Niederman <aniederman@cu4ml.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 11:37 PM
To: Speaker Adams <SpeakerAdams@council.nyc.gov>
[REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Testimonial from Cadman Towers waitlist

[REDACTED]

Dear Speaker Adams,

We write to you regarding the issue of Cadman Towers attempting to leave the Mitchell-Lama program.

Two of our members spoke with CM Selvena Brooks-Powers on Sunday about this very urgent issue being considered in the Finance Committee tomorrow, Thursday, April 18. CM Brooks-Powers was interested in learning about the issue from them, and said she would flag it, and we believe she meant with your office. We hope you have had a chance to speak with her.

We are concerned that the matter may be passed by the Finance Committee tomorrow. We have spoken to many Finance Committee members and it has been clear to us that they are not aware of all the facts of this issue; nor has all the evidence been presented. We are requesting that they delay a decision on this matter until a full airing of the facts and public policy implications can be held.

We are aware of CM Brewer's bill, currently in the drafting stage, which intends that Mitchell-Lama developments should not be allowed to leave the program to convert to Article 11 co-ops. The rationale for proceeding with Cadman Towers *now* is weak: there is no emergency in taking time to understand the issue, while the harm that will come to the 388 households on the waiting list if it proceeds is irreparable. (The waiting list will dissolve at the moment of reconstitution.) If the plan is to stop this type of conversion in other developments by passing CM Brewer's bill, there is no reason at all to sacrifice Cadman Towers now to this untried, untested, first-of-its-kind conversion.

In addition to Amna Ahmad's testimonial, we are attaching some background materials for your reference, including a quick-reference guide to the issue, a letter of support for CM Brewer's bill from elected officials, and one signed by a large and growing list of housing advocates.

We are available to speak with you further at any time, and will deeply appreciate an opportunity to share more of the salient facts of this issue before any irreversible decision is made.

Respectfully yours,

Adele Niederman, President
Cooperators United for Mitchell-Lama (CU4ML)
www.cu4ml.org

STOP HPD's ARTICLE 2 to ARTICLE 11 CONVERSION POLICY FROM DESTROYING MITCHELL-LAMA COOPERATIVE HOUSING

Deceptively promoted as a way to 'save' Mitchell-Lama (ML) cooperatives, the '2 to 11 conversion' scheme does the opposite. Conversion will destroy ML and push 62,000 apartments out of affordability. NYC then loses deeply affordable and not-for-profit housing units during a dramatic housing crisis.

What is Mitchell-Lama?

- As not-for-profit home ownership, Mitchell-Lama co-ops offer working people an affordable place to live — not an opportunity for real estate speculation. A Mitchell-Lama buyer, called off a colorblind waiting list, pays the outgoing shareholder exactly what they had paid for the apartment — a small equity amount, amortization (amount paid toward building mortgages) and any assessments — **no more, no less**. When no one makes a profit, the housing stays as affordable as possible over time.

What happens with a 2 to 11 conversion?

- In the 2 to 11 scheme the ML co-op dissolves and exits the ML program. At that point, the waiting list is eliminated, In the new Article 11* co-op, the prices for apartments are four or five times higher than they were in ML. These increased prices are no longer affordable to most of the working-class New Yorkers who were able to afford a ML co-op. Instead, buyers of Article 11 co-ops tend to be asset-wealthy and income-poor. This results in the gentrification of these diverse developments.
- The chart below shows average prices at Cadman Towers, a Brooklyn Mitchell-Lama that is working to convert to Article 11. **The profit from the sale of the Article 11 co-op is split 50/50 between the outgoing shareholder and the development.**

Apt. size	Current Mitchell-Lama price	Post-conversion Article 11 price	Difference
1 bedroom	\$ 45,390	\$ 181,872	\$ 136,482
2 bedroom	\$ 60,864	\$ 244,207	\$ 183,343
3 bedroom	\$ 78,301	\$ 287,692	\$ 209,391

Privatization-lite

- Throughout the history of the ML program there have always been those interested in privatizing these developments. Before 2021 the 2 to 11 scheme was unsuccessfully promoted as a "compromise." With the passage of the ML Reform Act of 2021, the risk of privatization was all but eliminated so no "compromise" is needed, but HPD continues to push the scheme, which is essentially a consolation prize for those co-ops who could not get enough votes to privatize.
- Privatizers have attempted to re-brand this 2 to 11 privatization-lite scheme as a capital repairs plan since part of the increase in price would go into the building's capital repair funds. **Were this the real reason for converting to Article 11, there would be no reason to give a profit to outgoing shareholders.**

unFair Housing

- New York has a mandate to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH) by taking "meaningful actions [...] that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities." The 2 to 11 conversion scheme contravenes this mandate and accomplishes the opposite. **Deeply affordable purchase prices, low monthly fees, and supervised waiting lists have made ML cooperatives some of the most diverse communities in the city.** Article 11 conversions cut out the lower half of the affordable-housing-eligible spectrum and have a disparate impact on Black and Hispanic people, seniors, people living with disabilities, and other protected classes.

Subsidies allow ML co-ops to serve their public purpose

- Taxpayers subsidize ML cooperatives through a large real estate tax exemption. Instead of regular real estate taxes the cooperative pays **Shelter Rent Tax** which uses a formula that results in a 70–85% reduction in real estate taxes. Subsidies in mortgages and repair loans also maintain affordability, as does the ML regulation that allows for collection of surcharge payments from those who incomes exceed ML limits.
- Privatizers attempting this 2-to-11 scheme need the taxpayers of New York to continue to subsidize them **at the same level as they received as a Mitchell-Lama** (even though they will no longer operate with a not-for-profit sales structure) by granting the Article 11 cooperative the same Shelter Rent Tax abatement or similar tax exemption.

City council remedy

- The City Council must consider all of the stakeholders related to ML co-ops, and not just the lucky few who now own one of these apartments. Stakeholders include the tens of thousands of City Council Members' constituents who have waited patiently on the decades-long waiting lists for a chance at a truly affordable NYC home, as well as those who *wish* they were on the waiting lists. Stakeholders are also the New York taxpayers whose large subsidies allow moderate-income people to own their own co-op apartment through this long-standing successful decommodified social housing program.
- The Shelter Rent Tax abatement or any similar tax exemption must be denied to any co-op exiting the Mitchell-Lama program under a plan that gives a profit to long-subsidized departing shareholders.**

* It should be noted that Article 11 has historically served a valuable purpose by turning small, dilapidated, neglected rental buildings into limited-profit shared equity co-ops owned by the resident tenants. It is not meant for, and has NEVER been used to convert an already existing not-for-profit co-op into an Article 11 co-op nor for large/multi-building developments.



Letter to the NY City Council: Do Not Subsidize the Destruction of Affordable Housing

We are advocates for fair and affordable housing in New York City. We believe that affordable housing for average wage earners is crucial to the economic, cultural, and civic health of New York.

We ask you to join us in support of proposed NYC legislation* that is urgently needed to preserve more than 60,000 units of affordable and diverse Mitchell-Lama cooperative housing. The proposed legislation would prohibit a grant of Shelter Rent Tax Abatement or similar tax exemption to any Mitchell-Lama co-op that converts from Article II housing to Article XI housing.

Article II to Article XI conversion would raise the purchase price of an apartment by 4 – 5 times, placing it out of reach of a broad swathe of working New Yorkers, while providing a six-figure windfall to the outgoing resident. In doing so, it would discriminate on the basis of wealth and income, with a disparate impact on Black and Hispanic people, seniors, people living with disabilities, and other protected groups.

This legislation is needed:

- Because it is ***contrary to public policy*** to use tax expenditures to make housing more expensive
- Because II to XI conversion ***violates the Mandate to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing***
- ***To protect decades of investment by taxpayers*** in a highly successful housing program
- ***To fulfill the promise made to those on Mitchell-Lama waiting lists*** for a chance at truly affordable housing
- ***To protect future residents' access to the benefits of public investment.***

Signed,

ORGANIZATIONS

Community Service Society of New York
Goddard Riverside
Mitchell-Lama Residents Coalition
NYC Community Land Initiative (NYCCLI)
TakeRoot Justice

INDIVIDUALS BY COUNCIL DISTRICT

*Includes Mitchell-Lama residents,
people on Mitchell-Lama waitlists,
and NYC residents/taxpayers/voters*

CD 2 (Rivera)

Ellen Braune
Carol Kulman
Mina McFarlane
Andy Seville
Ted Reich
Anne Dardis
Richard Heitler
Janet Bryant
Christine Hadlow
Romaine Perin
Pat Russell

CD 3 (Bottcher)

Katy Bordonaro
Stephen Woloshin

CD 5 (Menin)

Anne Abbott
Craig Leibner
Michael Adler
Rima Bien
Susan Berland
Elise Charest
Michael Charest
Judith Cohen
Elizabeth Connolly
William Dunn
Anna Eng
Hilda Giordano
Virginia Gourin
Frances Janczuk
Jean Kessler
Julie Kessler
Marie McMackin
Martha Marvais
Samara Cohen-O'Neal
Charles Gomez
Dolores Gomez
Andrea Hochland
Jean Kessler
Julie Kessler
Maureen Malloy
Eliza Parrilla
Michael Parletta
Elsbeth Reiman

Frank Ross
Howard Weinstein
Theresa Wheeler
Alvin Williams
Sharron Sellick
Denise Sweeney
Barbara O'Connell
Kimberly Ellis-Rogers

CD 6 (Brewer)

Dorca Reynoso
Jason Armstrong
Celeste Carlucci
Joan Cohen
Barry Cohen
John Condelario
Iris Cuevas
Walter Grutchfield
Benjamin Jones
Solange Louis
Preston McCoy
Esther Moroze
Adele Niederman
Paulette Pettorino
Richard Rosenfeld
Varda Rosenfeld
Florence Schreiberstein

Continued on next page →

Continued from page 1

CD 7 (Abreu)

Sharon Adams
Nina Bolshakova
April Callender
Ali Canty
Jessica Coffrin-St. Julien
Irene Farrar
Jacqueline Fife
Lorraine Hayden-Motley
Roselinda Herard
Caridad Muyet
Loretta Johnson
Orundun DaCosta Johnson
Brittney Krone-West
Alexis Morton
Jeannette Myers J
Mercedes Nesfield
Kenya L. Numan
Carmen Neely
Aisha Smith
Jasmin Thames
Brenda Thompson
Wilma Valentin
Linda Adelewitz
Jessica Bloom
Boonkiat Bunyasaranand
Devaki Menon-Bunyasaranand
Pauline Chaparro
Orlando Chaparro
Branden Chu
Walter Cooper
Teresa Dechamps
Gwendolyne Dozier
Jay Hauben
Ronda Hauben
Barbara Jacobs
Miguel Jaraique
Valerie Jaraique
Patrick Jaraique

Lowel Kukert
Al Kurchin
Joseph Melendez
Wanda Melendez
Kelunni Menon
Felix Mora, Jr.
Judy Rogers
Helaine Royo
Shigemi Takagi
Carol Teitelbaum
Robert Whitford
Martí Zlatchin
Alan Barnes
Mary Jane Cahill
Bala Carr
Miguel Felipe
Bilenia Felipe
Arvin Garg
Pamela Gould
Sheila Greenberg
Susan Messina
Elizabeth Steuerman
Maggie Surovell
Joy Waldon
Terry Weissman
Hank Weinstein

CD 10 (De La Rosa)

Eileen King

CD 11 (Dinowitz)

Carol Foresta

CD 15 (Feliz)

Rafael Acosta
Jessica Johnson
Marie Johnson

CD 18 (Farias)

Sandra Edwards

CD 26 (Won)

Barbara Collins

CD 28 (Adams)

Brian Porter

CD 32 (Ariola)

Grace Miller
Cathleen Norton
William Drgan
Ronnie Hickey
Marni Rhyme

CD 33 (Restler)

Heidi Kohn
Efraim Kohn
Mary Foutz
Sandy Foutz
Christine Fowley
Sharon Torres
Caroline Van Zandt
Mary Wade

CD 34 (Gutierrez)

Dealice Fuller
Maria Elena King

CD35 (Hudson)

Michael Blackwood
ZeZlie Blyden
Valerie Brooks
Barbara Conner
Warren Harding
Joyce Stickney

CD 42 (Banks)

Mary de Suze
Pam Lockley

CD 47 (Brannan)

Mark Daitsman

April 15, 2024

Dear Colleagues on the NY City Council,

We are New York public officials who believe that affordable housing for average wage earners is crucial to the economic, cultural, and civic health of New York.

We ask you to join us in support of proposed NYC legislation* that is urgently needed to preserve more than 60,000 units of affordable and diverse Mitchell-Lama cooperative housing. The proposed legislation would prohibit a grant of Shelter Rent Tax Abatement or other similar tax exemption to any Mitchell-Lama co-op that converts from Article II housing to Article XI housing.

Article II to Article XI conversion would raise the purchase price of an apartment by 4–5 times, placing it out of reach of a broad swathe of working New Yorkers, while providing a six-figure windfall to the outgoing resident. In doing so, it would discriminate on the basis of wealth and income, with a disparate impact on Black and Hispanic people, seniors, people living with disabilities, and other protected groups.

This legislation is needed:

- Because it is contrary to public policy to use tax expenditures to make housing more expensive
- Because II to XI conversion violates the Mandate to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing
- To protect decades of investment by taxpayers in a highly successful housing program
- To fulfill the promise made to those on Mitchell-Lama waiting lists for a chance at truly affordable housing
- To protect future residents' access to the benefits of public investments.

Alongside this legislation, preserving the promise of Mitchell-Lama for future generations will require significant capital subsidies to improve the physical conditions of developments that were built decades ago, training and support for Mitchell-Lama board members and leaders, and a stronger commitment from the NYC Department of Housing Preservation and Development to a model that preserves both the historic affordability and the physical conditions of the properties for the long term.

We hope you will join us in working to preserve this extraordinary New York legacy, and to preserve its vibrant and affordable future.

Signed:

Shawn Abreu
NYC Council Member District 7

Gale Brewer
NYC Council Member District 6

Brad Lander
NYC Comptroller

Harvey Epstein
NYS Assembly District 74

Donovan Richards
Queens Borough President

Carlina Rivera
NYC Council Member District 2

* A memorandum of the legislation (CU4ML_BillMemo_4_5_24.pdf, attached) has been submitted by Councilmember Gale Brewer to Speaker Adams, and the bill is in the drafting stage.

April 17th, 2024

Dear Speaker Adams,

I write to share the perspective of someone who is on the waitlist at Cadman Towers, where they are trying to leave the Mitchell-Lama program to convert to an Article 11 co-op.

I've been on the waiting list for about 5 years. I'm an editor and have worked mostly in publishing and media roles in my career.

I am exactly who the Mitchell Lama program is for. It's for regular working people who don't have a trust fund and aren't in finance or some other high-paying industry.

I live in a non-rent stabilized apt, in Kensington, Brooklyn, where I have been for almost 15 years, with my 9-year-old daughter. When I first moved in, my rent was \$1250. Since then, it has almost doubled. And my salary has NOT doubled. The rent goes up every year, by whatever amount the landlord wishes.

What Mitchell Lama represents to me is STABILITY. It is a chance to pay a fair amount for housing that is not extortionate because it's not meant to enrich landlords or speculators.

Not all stakeholders got a vote. I have a major stake in this decision. I'm on the waiting list, I pay taxes, and I didn't get a say in whether the residents could wipe out the waiting list and vote themselves a big windfall profit. What's even more offensive is that as a taxpayer, I would be subsidizing my own exclusion and funding this unearned profit.

When I got a log number in the lottery 5 years ago, my understanding was that it was a promise. That there would be a wait – potentially a long one – but that eventually I would be offered an apartment.

This attempt to take Cadman Towers out of the Mitchell Lama program would break this promise.

The city and state have legal mandates to affirmatively further fair housing that go back to the Fair Housing Act of 1968. Mitchell Lamas are among the most successful examples we have of fair housing in the city. They are more diverse and integrated than anything else here. Many of the units are accessible to disabled people. Many Mitchell-Lamas are naturally occurring retirement communities, where people can age in place and stay in their own homes.

This is what our city and state agencies are supposed to be advancing – making housing more fair and more equal in a way that includes protected classes. What they are proposing will make these buildings more segregated and less diverse in all ways, which is precisely the opposite of what they're supposed to be doing. It's already fair housing NOW. There need to be MORE Mitchell-Lamas. Instead, they're trying to get rid of them.

While this is obviously very personal to my family, it's bigger than me or any individual. There are 388 households currently on the Cadman Towers waiting list. There are 62,000 units in the Mitchell-Lama program. Cadman Towers is the first development where this 2-to-11 conversion is being attempted, and if it's allowed to proceed, every single Mitchell-Lama building with residents who dream of privatizing will be trying to do the same. And it will wipe out the program city-wide, ripping away the promise of decent, permanently affordable housing for those on waitlists and those who wish they could be.

This is being presented to the Finance Committee as a simple administrative matter, but it's so much bigger than that. What happens in this building has enormous public policy implications that could drastically cut the supply of affordable housing in this city, and it deserves detailed scrutiny.

I thank you for your consideration to this very serious matter.

Sincerely,

Amna Ahmad,
Cadman Towers waitlist

amnaia@gmail.com



Memorandum

DATE: February 6, 2024; revised April 4, 2024

RE: Proposed legislation prohibiting Shelter Rent Tax Abatements or any tax exemptions pursuant to Section 577 of the Private Housing Finance Law for Mitchell-Lama co-ops undergoing Article II to Article XI¹ Conversions

Background: In 2011, HPD, with the cooperation of the Real Estate Finance Bureau of the NYS Attorney General's Office, introduced a plan to ease the exit of Mitchell-Lama (ML) co-ops from the Mitchell-Lama program **if they were converting to Article XI co-ops**. Under this plan, in which sales prices increase at least four- or five-fold, there is a flip tax on sales of apartments of which half goes to the current shareholder, resulting in a six-figure profit, and half goes to the co-op to fund capital repairs. In the Mitchell-Lama program, shareholders do not make a profit—they get back what they paid in and no more. This decommodified structure maintains permanent deep affordability.

The current stated rationale for this so-called Article II to Article XI conversion plan is to fund capital repairs. Were this the case, however, the co-op could remain as not-for-profit with **all** the money from increased sales price going towards repairs. The **sole reason** to undergo Article II to Article XI conversion is to give the outgoing shareholders a profit. This profit derives from ML taxpayer subsidies, the largest of which is the Shelter Rent Tax Abatement, which has kept Mitchell-Lama developments deeply affordable for almost 60 years.

Purpose of the Proposed Legislation: This bill would prohibit granting Shelter Rent Tax Abatements or any similar tax exemptions pursuant to Section 577 of the Private Housing Finance Law to cooperatives leaving the Mitchell-Lama program and reconstituting as cooperatives under an Article II to Article XI conversion plan or any other plan in which a profit goes to current shareholders.

Justification:

1. Such conversions are against the public interest. New York's taxpayers have supported Mitchell-Lama cooperatives through generous capital investments and tax breaks. The public's investment in Mitchell-Lama cooperatives far exceeds that of current shareholders. Keeping these co-ops in the Mitchell-Lama program preserves this significant public investment.
2. Cooperatives reconstituted under Article XI would be much less affordable for working families. Mitchell-Lama cooperatives are affordable to a broad band of incomes, ranging from about 40% to 120% of AMI. According to an analysis of II to XI conversion plans proposed by HPD, households with incomes between about 40% and 100% of AMI would be priced out.
3. The reconstituted cooperatives would be much less diverse. New York has a mandate to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH)² by taking "meaningful actions [...] that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities..." Article II to XI conversion contravenes this mandate and accomplishes the opposite. **Deeply affordable purchase prices, low monthly fees, and supervised waiting lists have made ML cooperatives some of the most diverse communities in the city.** Article II to XI conversions cut out the lower half of the affordable-housing-eligible spectrum and have a disparate impact on Black and Hispanic people, seniors, people living with disabilities, and other protected classes.
4. In addition to the current shareholders (who under the rules are the only ones granted the right to vote in these public policy decisions), there are other stakeholders whose interests ought to have been considered but were not. These other stakeholders include the tens of thousands of New York residents on the decades-long Mitchell-Lama waiting lists, all the New Yorkers who applied but did not get chosen in lotteries for the waiting lists, and every New York taxpayer.
5. By prohibiting the granting of Shelter Rent Tax Abatements or any similar tax exemptions pursuant to Section 577 of the Private Housing Finance Law for cooperatives that leave the Mitchell-Lama program under an Article II to Article XI conversion plan, the Council will be protecting the public interest and preserving one of New York's most successful housing programs.

¹ Article II and Article XI of The New York State Private Housing Finance Law govern Mitchell-Lama developments and Article XI co-ops respectively.

² AFFH Fact Sheet - Hud.Gov, www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/FHEO/documents/AFFH-Fact-Sheet.pdf. Accessed 3 Feb. 2024.

I am writing to testify against the proposal that converts Mitchell-Lamas to an Article 11. City Council should not grant a tax exemption to any ML that leaves the Mitchell-Lama program. As a lifelong Harlem resident, the ML program is the only way that I, a middle-income single professional Black woman, is able to afford living and co-owning in the neighborhood I've always called home. Native Harlem residents are being pushed out on all sides and the threat of possible un-houselessness is a constant source of stress.

The ML program was not designed to be a capital gains project. It's supposed to preserve and enhance community for an often neglected, wealth(less) population that need safe and stable homes. Tax benefits should be given to people who help ML communities grow – not those who want to flip units and use the money to abandon their neighbors/hoods. ML co-operators vote, and expect our elected leaders to work for us - not for private real estate investors. ***Do NOT privatize Social Housing!***

Name: Brittny Krone

River View Towers, Harlem, NY

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: MARCE FORK

Address: _____

I represent: CADMAN TOWERS

Address: 101 CLARK ST BROOKLYN

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: ERICA BUCKLEY

Address: _____

I represent: CADMAN TOWERS

Address: CLARK ST, BK, NY

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 04-18-2024

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: ANITA EDWARDS MINGOIA

Address: 101 CLARK ST BROOKLYN 11201

I represent: CADMAN TOWERS

Address: _____

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Marie Carbelo

Address: 101 Clark

I represent: Cadman Towers

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Toba Potasky

Address: 101 Clark

I represent: Cadman

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 0072 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Shelley Holtzer

Address: _____

I represent: Cadman Towers

Address: 101 Clark

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 0572 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Rosy Cohen

Address: _____

I represent: Cooperators United for Mitchell Lama

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 0072 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 4/18/24

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Andrea Hochland

Address: _____

I represent: Ruppert

Address: 1779 Second Ave

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 0072 Res. No. 5072

in favor in opposition

Date: 4/18/2024

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: JAY HAUSEN

Address: _____

I represent: CHYM

Address: _____

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. 0072

in favor in opposition

Date: 4-18-24

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Marni Rhyno

Address: _____

I represent: Rockaway Park, NY 11694

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 0072 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 4/18/24

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Richard Heitler

Address: _____ NYC 10009

I represent: Village CU4ML

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 0072 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Amna Ahmed

Address: _____ Brooklyn

I represent: _____

Address: _____

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms