



# KNOW YOUR RIGHTS: The Taking of the Boat Club's Property by Eminent Domain

## *Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)*

---

### 1. What is Eminent Domain?

Eminent domain is the power of the government to take private property from its citizens. It is also known as “condemnation” or, in some states, “expropriation.”

---

### 2. What Does the Fifth Amendment Say?

The Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution states: **“...[N]or shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”**

This means the government can only take private property if it's for a legitimate public purpose, and the owner must be fairly compensated.

---

### 3. How is Eminent Domain Typically Used?

Eminent domain is generally used to address:

- Abandoned or blighted properties
- Tax-delinquent or contaminated land
- Neglected properties


It is also used for necessary public infrastructure like:

- Roads and highways
- Bridges
- Utility easements

- Reservoirs
- 

#### 4. What Happens on May 16, 2025?






On **May 16, 2025**, the Town will hold its **official public hearing** on the proposed **eminent domain taking of the Boat Club**.

 **This is NOT a routine or informational meeting.** It is the **only** formal opportunity for the public to comment or object. The Town has signaled its commitment to this controversial and unprecedented action — your voice must be heard **now**.

---

#### 5. How is This Taking Different?

This case departs from the typical use of eminent domain in several key ways:

-  **Not a necessity:** A public boat launch is an amenity, not an essential service like a road or bridge.
  -  **Unprecedented history:** The Town has functioned for centuries without government-owned waterfront access, relying on the abundant access available along the Hudson River.
  -  **Faulty justification:** Would it be reasonable to seize a private estate with tennis courts and a pool just because the Town doesn't have public ones? Of course not. The logic here is equally flawed.
  -  **Displacement by design:** This taking recalls the discredited “slum clearance” policies of the 1950s — actions now widely condemned as racially and socially unjust.
  -  **Forced partnerships?** Suggesting the Club enter a public-private partnership to operate a facility it never intended to run for the public is unreasonable and coercive.
-

## 6. Why Should This Concern You?

This proposal sets a dangerous precedent:

- It blurs the line between **public necessity** and **government convenience**.
- It sends a message that no private property is safe from seizure, even without urgent public need.
- It threatens the **longstanding fabric** of community and private stewardship.



**Attend the hearing. Speak up. Protect private property rights.**



**Public Hearing: May 16, 2025**