

Hudson Housing Authority Board of Commissioners
Minutes of Regular Meeting
March 18, 2026

In attendance: Revonda Smith, Chairperson; Nick Zachos; Sarah Black; Theresa Joyner; Rebecca Wolff; Mary Decker and Annette Young, Resident Commissioners; Jeffrey Dodson, Executive Director

Ms. Smith called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. It was conducted in person and via Zoom teleconferencing.

Minutes

Ms. Decker made a motion to approve the minutes of February 18, which was seconded by Ms. Young and approved by all members in attendance.

Accounts Payable

Mr. Zachos asked about a Visa card charge. Mr. Dodson said there was a Staples account tied to the office credit card, as well as some recurring payments. Ms. Joyner asked about monthly stipends and was told that they were paid to the resident commissioners, a practice that was approved prior to his coming on board. Ms. Black asked about a specific bill and was told that it was for mandatory inspections. There being no further questions, Mr. Zachos made a motion to approve payment, which was seconded by Ms. Joyner and approved by all members in attendance.

Executive Director's Report

Mr. Dodson said he had heard various comments regarding mismanagement of the Housing Authority and wanted to make it clear that none of the alleged occurrences applied to him or the current board. "It's important to me and my reputation. I take those things very personally, very deeply. I am a proud graduate of public housing. I lived there for 23 years. I'm not above anyone. I'm very sympathetic to the plight of people who live here."

He said his vision for the Housing Authority was well thought out and that he came to Hudson with the idea that doing a development project with people involved in every step. The building presented to the public was the same as others across the country. "We have something that will be productive and comfortable for people. They need a stable environment." A decision was made not to move current tenants until two of the new buildings were constructed "because there's no place to put them" due to short-term rentals, gentrification and other factors, he said. Once the tenants of Bliss Towers were moved into the new buildings, Bliss would be demolished and more housing would be built to fill a need.

In the same vein, he said a new website was being developed and should be ready in a few months. The site, he said, would "bring our organization into this century."

Development Update

Mountco Construction and Development President and Principal Joel Mounty said the redevelopment project had the full support of the state, which was "pushing us to close" by the end of the year. The state Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) has posted notice

of remediation because contamination was found in the soil at the basketball court area, the location of proposed Building B.

He acknowledged a slight slowdown with the Planning Board, which has three new members and a new attorney and engineer, regarding design and zoning, but stressed that “development was a fluid industry.” The project had all the elements “to make it adequate and special. Sometimes you’re stuck on an element but at the end of the day, it all works out. We’re the ringmaster in a three-ring circus.”

He said the project was “a breath away” from Planning Board approval but with new members came a learning curve. The introduction of new members also brought “new views.” He was optimistic that both sides would see the same things “and move more expeditiously than has happened with the change in administration.” The target date for closing had been October, but he still believed it would occur before year’s end. If there had been no change in the board, “we’d be talking about a groundbreaking date. Mountco is here to develop the building, but at the end of the day it’s your building. If we can get a few pieces together, I believe we can close by December.”

“I appreciate your honesty,” Commissioner Young said.

Florrie Moreland, a new resident of Hudson, asked if the developer had considered using local labor because it might “get people pushing to get this happening.” Mr. Mounty said various elements went into building, including reaching out to local vendors. Mr. Moreland asked how she could get enough information to help promote the project. She was told to speak with Mr. Dodson.

Ms. Joyner said the project could generate jobs and help small businesses. Mountco Director of Compliance Carlos Espinell agreed and said outreach was something the company had done in the past. Mr. Dodson added that a request for qualifications had been issued that asked for certain qualifications and being a local business was one of them. Mountco Executive Vice President of Development and General Counsel John Madeo said that kind of outreach was required with government financing. “It’s a point well taken. Maybe we need to move the concept out earlier. Maybe it would help the perception of the new administration.”

Ms. Joyner said the project would provide jobs for a couple of years, plus training opportunities.

Ms. Moreland said she knew people who moved “because this community focuses on people who are well off.” She wondered what could be done to make it known that this project was “for the community.” She said she walked throughout the city and spotted buildings that could be rehabilitated however they were expensive too.

Ms. Black said the project was in a tenuous time with local aesthetic and transition. “What can the commissioners be doing to move this along?” Mr. Zachos said the zoning issue was an unexpected curveball in addition to new members that had to get up to speed on the project. The Planning Board’s questions were being answered, and issues were being ironed out. He too asked, “what are the best ways we can advocate for this project?” Ms. Black said the narrative around the city was that the building would not “look historic.”

“We’re doing our due diligence as a Housing Authority of making the best use of the property we own. We have underutilized property here,” Mr. Dodson said. He said board members who are longer term residents should use their connections to help the public “understand what’s going on. There will always be people opposed that’ll throw anything at it to see what sticks. There is a small group who has not acknowledged that there are other humans in this world who deserve housing.” He wanted to see local housing opportunities for cafeteria

workers to nursing assistants. “There’s nothing wrong with our children and our children’s children to have the same opportunity to make memories.” He said commissioners had to come up with a marketing campaign.

Ms. Moreland said there were still people who believed that they would be displaced by “people who can pay more.” She believed the project could happen. “I want them to have the truth”

Ms. Joyner said market rate had been mentioned earlier but Mr. Dodson assured her that the units would be the quality of market rate and affordable.

Ms. Decker asked about a tenants meeting with the developer. Ms. Smith said a meeting was in the works.

Mr. Madeo said it was easy to lose track of “how complicated a project this is. Housing Authorities across the state are going through the same thing. We’re much further along than many other Housing Authorities. We have a target date. The state is lining us up for closing by the end of the year.”

Ms. Black made note that there was only one source of local news that people didn’t have to pay for. Based on that source, the state and quality of the renderings for the buildings seemed to be an issue. Mr. Madeo said some of the concern also came with the proposed closing of State Street, which would remain open in Phase 1 for myriad reasons. He expected a final rendering of how State Street would look from Architect Quincie Williams in a day or two. Mr. Zachos said viewers of a local blog used a link to a website that stripped renderings and made them look bad. The comments on that blog were from a small group of people. Mr. Dodson said the architect’s designs were such that they were used as guidelines for affordable housing projects. “We’re doing what other Housing Authorities are doing.” Ms. Smith added, “and better.” She added that some of the misconceptions about the project could be lack of exposure. People who have not lived in public housing would not know the difference between “what’s here and what’s coming. It will be 200 percent better than what’s here.”

Ms. Young asked if approvals would be granted by the end of the year Mr. Zachos said the Planning Board must be sure that the project met City Code. Ms. Wolff added that the new Planning Board would take it’s time “to wrap their heads around all that’s happened, to the amendments made by the prior Planning Board. It will take them not an egregious amount of time.”

Ms. Black said it was difficult to hear talk of mismanagement from “two executive directors prior” and that it tainted public perception. She thought commissioners could do a better job of self-promotion and promotion of the project.

Mr. Zachos said the process had been ongoing for the past two to three years. Many current tenants had gone through the process before, only to see plans not come to fruition. He said it was important to get people to meetings, especially public hearings. Mr. Dodson agreed and made note that “this is the furthest we’ve ever got.” Ms. Young pointed out that people did not come because there had been “too many promises.” She also said that some tenants felt that Mr. Dodson was “in it for himself.” Mr. Zachos said that was to the contrary. “He’s pushing this through to provide better housing.” He urged people to attend the next Planning Board meeting on April 14.

There being no further business and no public comment, Mr. Zachos made a motion to adjourn at 7:11 p.m., which was seconded by Ms. Decker and approved by all members in attendance.