

**American Rescue Plan Act
Special Committee
Regular Meeting Minutes**

DATE & TIME: February 9, 2022 – 5:30
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID: 897 2177 0350
PRESIDING OFFICER: Peter Criswell, Chairman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Amber Feaster
PRESENT: Legislators Thomas Corcoran, Jr., Aaron J. Levine, Craig V. Lopez, and Megan Sperry
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Phil Erner, Manna Jo Greene, Chris Hewitt, Kathy Nolan, and Eve Walter; Deputy County Executives Johanna Contreras, Chris Kelly, and Marc Rider; Comptroller March Gallagher; Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco; Director of Internal Audit Control, Sam Sonenberg; Director of Economic Development Tim Weidemann; Department of Economic Development Samantha Liotta; Finance Department, ARP Administration Nathan Litwin, Ashley Long, and Molly Scott; RUPCO Kevin O’Connor, and Emily Hamilton; Town of Rochester Supervisor Mike Baden; Robert Daniels, Resident

- **Chairman Criswell called the meeting to order at 5:35 PM**

Chairman Criswell welcomed all to the meeting. Deputy Clerk Feaster took role. Chairman Criswell spoke about the Committee’s process and requested feedback on the Scoring Rubric that was distributed to all Committee members. Comptroller Gallagher suggested reviewing Treasury guidance concerning equity for consistency. Legislator Walter suggested revising the scaling system based on prioritization. Further discussion pursued on Committee processes and the scoring rubric.

Chairman Criswell and Deputy Clerk Feaster provided a brief overview of the Legislature’s ARPA Tracker which displays the amount of expenditures approved and the amount of funding which remains unallocated to a specific project or expenditure.

Motion No. 1: To discuss Resolution No. 28 – Dedicating Funding To Implement The Ulster County Respite House Policy

Resolution Summary: This Resolution designates \$1,500,000.00 of American Rescue Plan Act funds to implement the Ulster County Respite House policy, allocating the funds for the purpose

of addressing the need for enhanced Mental Health and Addiction Recovery services throughout Ulster County.

Motion Made By: Legislator Lopez
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Levine

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 4
No. of Votes Against: 0

Discussion: Legislator Walter explained why the Project is eligible for reimbursement from American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds, provided an explanation of what the project is, and confirmed that the intent is for the homes to be built outside of Kingston as there are beds already going into Kingston. Committee members unanimously agreed they were comfortable moving the Resolution forward without first scoring it through the Committee's Scoring Rubric.

Motion No. 2: To approve Resolution No. 28 – Dedicating Funding To Implement The Ulster County Respite House Policy

Resolution Summary: This Resolution designates \$1,500,000.00 of American Rescue Plan Act funds to implement the Ulster County Respite House policy, allocating the funds for the purpose of addressing the need for enhanced Mental Health and Addiction Recovery services throughout Ulster County.

Motion Made By: Legislator Criswell
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Lopez

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 3: To block Resolutions No. 29 and 32

Motion Made By: Legislator Lopez
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Corcoran

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry
Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 4: To discuss the following Resolutions:

Resolution No. 29 – Funding Capital Project No. 601 – ARP Small Business And Economic Recovery – Department Of Finance

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Capital Fund in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 to fund Round 2 of the “Ulster County Small Business Assistance Program”. Funds are designated for use as follows: \$850,000.00 for Direct Assistance to Businesses; \$100,000.00 for Program Delivery; \$50,000.00 for Program Administration.

Resolution No. 32 – Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$1,000,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Ulster County Economic Development Alliance, Inc. – Department Of Finance

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with Ulster County Economic Development Alliance, Inc. from March 1, 2022 through February 28, 2023 as a subaward of American Rescue Plan Act (“ARPA”) funding in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 to fund Round 2 of the “Ulster County Small Business Assistance Program”. Funds are designated for use as follows: \$850,000.00 for Direct Assistance to Businesses; \$100,000.00 for Program Delivery; \$50,000.00 for Program Administration.

Motion Made By: Legislator Lopez
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Sperry

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 0

Discussion: Director of Economic Development Weidemann provided a brief overview of communications sent to Committee Members in response to questions circulated. Director Weidemann answered further committee questions. Chairman Criswell asked Committee members if everyone is comfortable moving forward without first scoring the Resolutions with the Committee’s Scoring Rubric.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 5: To discuss Resolution No. 30 – Funding Capital Project No. 599 – ARP Non-Profit, Youth and Community Programs – Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Capital Fund budget in the amount of \$1,500,000.00 to fund a grant program created by the Department of Finance for non-profit organizations who have faced economic impacts as a result of the COVID-19 public health emergency.

Motion Made By: Legislator Lopez
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Levine

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 0

Discussion: Director of Recovery and Resilience Litwin emphasized the Division’s commitment to incorporate specific restrictions and intentions of the U.S. Department of Treasury in the creation of this Program, stating respect for the Legislature and their time to review the Program and the answers provided in response to questions circulated. Legislator Walter asked that Executive staff review the UCEDA board and consider bringing in some members from community groups who might not be representative on the board currently as a consideration for justice. Committee members unanimously agreed they were comfortable moving the Resolution forward without first scoring it through the Committee’s Scoring Rubric.

Motion No. 6: To approve Resolution No. 30 – Funding Capital Project No. 599 – ARP Non-Profit, Youth and Community Programs – Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Capital Fund budget in the amount of \$1,500,000.00 to fund a grant program created by the Department of Finance for non-profit organizations who have faced economic impacts as a result of the COVID-19 public health emergency.

Motion Made By: Legislator Lopez
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Levine

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 7: To discuss Resolution No. 31 – Funding Capital Project No. 602 – ARP Infrastructure and Trails – Department of Finance, Division of Recovery and Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Capital Fund in the amount of \$2,000,000.00 to fund an extension of sewer and water infrastructure under the New York State Thruway in the Town of Ulster to benefit a planned redevelopment of the vacant Quality Inn & Suites hotel site into supportive homeless housing.

Motion Made By: Legislator Lopez

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Sperry

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Discussion: Kevin O’Connor and Emily Hamilton agreed to answer any further Committee questions. Deputy Executive Kelly confirmed that the Project is a completely separate Capital Project from Project No. 602 for Trails development. Town of Rochester Supervisor Baden spoke in favor of the Project. Committee members unanimously agreed they were comfortable moving the Resolution forward without first scoring it through the Committee’s Scoring Rubric.

Motion No. 8: To approve Resolution No. 31 – Funding Capital Project No. 602 – ARP Infrastructure and Trails – Department of Finance, Division of Recovery and Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Capital Fund in the amount of \$2,000,000.00 to fund an extension of sewer and water infrastructure under the New York State Thruway in the Town of Ulster to benefit a planned redevelopment of the vacant Quality Inn & Suites hotel site into supportive homeless housing.

Motion Made By: Legislator Lopez

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Sperry

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

New Business:

Deputy Executive Rider explained a new ARPA project proposal will be provided to the Committee next month in connection to a current February Resolution for CDBG funding.

Legislator Greene vocalized support for the continuance of the ARPA Working Groups previously established as they created a collaborative process for the development of ARPA projects.

Legislator Walter invited Committee members to the Special Meeting of the Health, Human Services, and Housing Committee on March 30th for the purpose of discussing housing.

Old Business:

None

Chairman Criswell asked the members if there was any other business, and hearing none;

Adjournment

Motion Made By: Legislator Lopez
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Corcoran
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 0

Time: 6:51 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster
Minutes Approved: February 23, 2022

**American Rescue Plan Act
Special Committee
Regular Meeting Transcript**

DATE & TIME: February 9, 2022 – 5:30
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID: 897 2177 0350
PRESIDING OFFICER: Peter Criswell, Chairman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Amber Feaster
PRESENT: Legislators Thomas Corcoran, Jr., Aaron J. Levine, Craig V. Lopez, and Megan Sperry
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Phil Erner, Manna Jo Greene, Chris Hewitt, Kathy Nolan, and Eve Walter; Deputy County Executives Johanna Contreras, Chris Kelly, and Marc Rider; Comptroller March Gallagher; Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco; Director of Internal Audit Control, Sam Sonenberg; Director of Economic Development Tim Weidemann; Department of Economic Development Samantha Liotta; Finance Department, ARP Administration Nathan Litwin, Ashley Long, and Molly Scott; RUPCO Kevin O’Connor, and Emily Hamilton; Town of Rochester Supervisor Mike Baden; Robert Daniels, Resident

- **Chairman Criswell called the meeting to order at 5:35 PM**
-

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. I want to call this meeting to order at 5:35. This is the American Rescue Plan Act Special Committee meeting on February 9th, and Amber, could I have you call the roll, please?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Chriswell.

Chairman Criswell: Here.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Corcoran.

Legislator Corcoran: Here.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Levine.

Legislator Levine: Here.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Lopez.

Legislator Lopez: Here.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: Here.

Chairman Criswell: Great. Thank you very much. Thank you, everybody. I want to break this meeting up into two parts. First part, I want to spend just a little bit time on process, because that's been a question that we've all been pondering and I think we need to just have a, a clear conversation about what our process is here, what our charge is as this committee, and then I'd like us to go on and talk about each Resolution, figure out whether we've had the questions answered that we needed and if we haven't, we can ask them now. And then we can move on to making decisions about where we want to head with that. Does that sound good with everybody? Okay, great. So, um, in terms of process, again, my understanding is that this committee was set up to have the first evaluation moment of the Resolutions and, and any ARPA project is then up to us to analyze, ask questions, make some sort of suggestions, reports, and then move that on to the standing committees, the committees of jurisdiction. And in the calendar that got a little bit messed up this time and so I think what happened was it went to the ARP- they went to the ARP committee, then they went to the standing committees, and it just caused a lot of confusion. So what I'm hoping is that we can get that process back in order of what we had originally thought we were going to do. And I think that will help eliminate some of the problems that we encountered in the last few meetings. In addition, I've created a matrix with the help of Amber, thank you so much for that, and have gotten feedback from several people on it. Has everybody had a chance to take a look at it? And I'd love to spend just a couple minutes to have any final suggestions for revisions on that. Because moving forward, I really would like each of these proposals to be weighted against that Scoring Matrix and score it and then present that to the committees. Did you have a question Comptroller Gallagher?

Comptroller Gallagher: Yeah, I, maybe I missed it. And if I did, I'm sorry. But I don't know that I've seen it. Was it in the packet?

Chairman Criswell: No, this-

Deputy Clerk Feaster: In the OneDrive.

Chairman Criswell: It's in the OneDrive. So if you want to go to the OneDrive right now and take a look at it, we can walk through it together. It won't take very long, and I'd love to get your input on it. Yeah, sorry, it wasn't sent out as a separate document. I apologize for that.

Comptroller Gallagher: It's fine. No, no, it's fine. It's fine.

Chairman Criswell: It is in the drive.

Comptroller Gallagher: So the reason I'm asking is that, um, the issue that I just brought to you Chair Criswell, which is that the Treasury guidance requires that the ARPA funds be spent in accordance with equity principles, and it's pretty laid out what those are. And so um, I would suggest that this, this template, the one that's on the OneDrive be evaluated with that in mind. And um the one question on there I don't think is going to meet the terms of the guidance so I would just urge you know, another, an expansion of that equity question into a number of separate questions.

Chairman Criswell: We'll take a look at that and thank you for bringing that up. Other thoughts or suggestions regarding the, the, regarding this as we set it up. Legislator Walter, and thank you so much for your suggestions, much appreciated.

Legislator Walter: I guess the other thing is, when you're looking at it, if you can think if everything is a zero to three, then they're all equally important and to just be sure you feel that they're all equally important. Otherwise, you might scale something. You know, I mean, I did see in one, you have zero to two, but just just know that whenever they're scaled the same, they have the same weight. And if they're scaled lower than they just are weighted lower.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. Is there anything that stands out for you is inappropriately weighted?

Legislator Walter: Um, well, I guess...

Chairman Criswell: Are you taking notes Amber for this? Thank you so much.

Legislator Walter: Yeah. So I think that there's, there's some duplic- duplicatus pieces like, so for example, if um, in the financial management, the, a personal feeling of how they would prioritize it, for example, is scaled the same way, as does this serve underserved or vulnerable populations. But in essence, you know, how the other thing score relate to how things are prioritized to say the same thing with like, Are there county sources of funding available? When it could be that that's a good thing, it could be a bad thing. But it's getting scaled the same way as whether it meets for vulnerable populations.

Chairman Criswell: So maybe a question like that, are there County sources of funding available? Maybe that's not a scoring question.

Legislator Walter: Right, exactly.

Chairman Criswell: Maybe that's just a question that's pulled out of the Scoring Matrix, and put at the bottom of, of the document with just a note section and said, Say yes or no.

Legislator Walter: Right. And the last thing I'll just say is you gave climate impact up to nine. Climate impact alone is scored, scaled, weighted more than any other, anything else because of three questions.

Chairman Criswell: Okay.

Legislator Walter: So, that, I, my suggestion is you have- I mean, first of all, you know, the guidance say nothing about climate. But even if it's just one question, or it's just not a scale-scored one, but just for your information, but by default, having three means it is, it is the most important measure.

Chairman Criswell: I really understand what you're saying, let me consider moving that out also into a non scoring section, but just a "For Our Information" section. And I know some of you just had a moment to look at this so I'm sorry, if you hadn't taken the time to look at it before but I really would like to ask anybody from the Executive team, if they have questions about that, or if this is- yes, Chris.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you. So I guess I'll just echo some of the stuff that both March and Eve pointed out just in terms of reflecting what's in the actual Interim Final Rule. Overall, I, you know, I'm just kind of absorbing this now. And I do think that it is nice to have some objective criteria. So, you know, as objective as possible, I know that there's going to be certainly opinions and everything else. But I do want to reflect Eve's comments in terms of like getting the weighting in check, I think is going to be important here. And in terms of, I think, with many of our projects, and I think one before the committee tonight, in terms of a RUPCO project where we're one piece of a large capital stack with many other sources of funds, that strength in a project that shows viability. I think when I'm looking at a, an application for funds, I'd be concerned if they're using our money for the same purpose of like, you know, like when you talk about nonprofit that they already receive PPE money or whatever, and they want more for the same purpose like that may- I, I don't know how to word it. I guess that's what I'm saying.

Chairman Criswell: So how would I incorporate that into this scoring matrix?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Well I, like, I guess, I mean, pulling like the other county sources of funds available. I think what you're trying to get at is, the question that you posed to me in the past is, is this an ARP, is, should this be ARP specific? Or Should this be considered in an operating or normal way of doing county business? I believe that's the question you were trying to ask maybe?

Chairman Criswell: Correct. And even broader. Is, just in general, is there other funding sources that are that can be applied to this project?

Deputy Executive Kelly: So can that just be a question without a weight?

Chairman Criswell: Yeah, I think we were saying that we...

Deputy Executive Kelly: That's where you want to go with it?

Chairman Criswell: I think, I think we were saying we're to pull that out and just have a little note section on that to talk about about what other fundings are available? Or, you know, is this something, you know that that has other possibilities?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Okay.

Chairman Criswell: Other thoughts on this anything from your team? Deputy Executive Rider.

Deputy Executive Rider: So my main question is, how is this scoring sheet going to be utilized, like coming from my Director of Purchasing hat, right? We do a lot of the quantitative scoring, we score request for proposals this way other things, but like as projects come to you, and we know that we're not going to bring 30 projects all together this month. You had three or four. I guess is there going to be a minimum scoring threshold that you move projects forward, or I could just, just using this linear over time, you're gonna see some projects that may not score as high but have been funded. And then other projects that score higher that- I guess I just am confused how overall this is going to be used.

Chairman Criswell: What the way I'm seeing that, this is really, it's information for the next committee. We've gone through a process of questions we've, we've weighed against, you know that, this list of criteria, and we're passing it on, so that there's something. You know, I've seen this often as a legislator, something will come to our committee, and it's either voted on yes or no, but I have no idea why yes or no, has happened. And I really would like a little bit of back information on that. That's what we're trying to provide to the next committee. Hey, we've looked at these questions. We've looked at this. You know, here's our observations. Here's some notes on it for you to now go and do your own research. So it's really a first pass and information for the first pass to go on to the next committee. Does that make sense?

Deputy Executive Rider: Yeah. And then are you going to score that as a committee, as a whole, or are individual legislators going to score each of these requests?

Chairman Criswell: Yeah, we, we actually haven't decided that yet. So as a committee, we have to decide every every committee member is going to score individually. And then we're going to mix those scores together or whether as a committee, we're going to try and come up with a score sheet. So we have to decide that Committee. And I'd like to try and do that tonight. Yes.

Deputy Executive Rider: Thank you

Chairman Criswell: Deputy Executive Kelly.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you. This is just more of like, kind of a administrative thing. Can we make sure that with all ARPA Special Committee stuff, it goes to the full ARPA team because none of this went to them. So I just want to make sure that when we send out notices or information for these meetings, that they're also included.

Chairman Criswell: Sure.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Yeah, that's absolutely fair. Um, Nate, did I see you had a question?

Director of Resilience Litwin: It was addressed. We just wanted to see that information. So thank you for that. And we will look at it when we get it.

Chairman Criswell: You're welcome. Any other committee members have any questions or concerns? Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: I'm just thinking in the realm of what Marc just brought up as far as the scoring, and obviously we'll talk about it this evening, is, you know, if we want to kind of average out the score amongst the committee, or if we want to just do it individually. But I think that in passing it on to the other committees, especially with providing them with data, if we can kind of break that down into like, medium, low, and high priority based on the scoring rubric, I think that that would be a good amount of information to send it forward to the next committee. Does that make sense?

Chairman Criswell: That does make sense. Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yeah. And just, you know, because there's always caveat to every scoring, you might want to reserve a note section of just a little bit of qualitative information that you might want us to know.

Chairman Criswell: Agreed. Agreed. Agreed. So, so Committee, do we have a preference of do we want to have individual score sheets? Or do we want to take our individual score sheets and pull them all together into one? And anybody who's a statistician can weigh in on this and let me know if there's a, if there's some sort of like best practice in this world.

Legislator Walter: Your n is too small. I wouldn't worry about it. It is qualitative, it is not quantitative.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Yes, Comptroller Gallagher.

Comptroller Gallagher: I don't think you guys want to get bogged down in discussion about individual scores on each of these items. I think it's way, makes way more sense to have them averaged across and just presented to the committee that that would be my, just timewise for you guys, because if somebody has an issue, they want to raise, they're gonna raise it, right?

Chairman Criswell: Yeah, I think that's right. I think what we'll probably do is we'll have each Legislator fill out their score, we'll average it together, and we'll pass it on to the next committee. Legislator Levine, I see you have a question.

Legislator Levine: I was actually pretty much just going to make the comment that Comptroller Gallagher just made, I thought it makes the most sense, in terms of we all take a stab at it. And I think it just comes, you know, well, we'll average it out. And then we can discuss it after the fact, you know, amongst ourselves, but, you know, I think that, that's probably the most efficient way of going about it.

Chairman Criswell: That sounds great. So, yes, I'm sorry, did somebody else want to speak? Okay, so Committee Members, I'm going to hold your feet to the fire a little bit then. I'm going to put a date on it and a time when we need to have these scoresheets in so that Amber can pull them all together and average it so that we can then analyze it as a group. So I just want to let you know that, that's, that's going to be one of the expectations as we move forward here. All right. We're feeling, Yes, Comptroller Gallagher.

Comptroller Gallagher: I know you're gonna move to Resolutions, so I just wanted to ask you one other thing. I wanted to say that we tried to set up a meeting on accounting. It didn't happen because of the storms. But I want you guys to know that, from the claims auditing side ARP, when we claims audit, an invoice coming through county government for payment, we cannot see that it's ARPA. So I want you guys to know that. That's a concern that I have. And we're going to continue to work with the administration and your Legislative Fiscal Analysts on that, but I just, I wanted to raise that point here. Okay. Thanks.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. Thank you very much for that. Is there, is there an easy way for you to be able to see that information?

Comptroller Gallagher: I think there's a few opportunities, and we'll figure out what works best for the finance team and, and give the most transparency. Yes. I, I, we'll be back to you on that piece.

Chairman Criswell: All right. Perfect. That sounds great. Thank you for that. All right. Yes, Amber.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Um, I need to- sorry to interrupt. I need to know the name of Zoom ID "Magic eight" for the record.

Chairman Criswell: Zoom member "Magic eight" could you please identify yourself? "Magic eight" it looks like you're trying to speak but we can't hear you.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Okay, caller 1337. Please state your name for the record.

Samantha Liotta: Hi, this is Samantha Liotta. L-I-O-T-T-A. From the Ulster County Office of Economic Development.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Thank you. Okay, we can continue. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, great. So I want to move us on to, actually, I wanted to have Amber review the financial document that we pulled together. Can you explain the name of that document so people can pull it up from the OneDrive?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: I'm just gonna pull it up myself here. So this is an entitled "ARPA Liability Reconciliation". It looks a lot different from the last time it was presented to this Committee.

Chairman Criswell: There are two. Could you explain which one it is? There's a "Revised Reconciliation" and there's "Revised". There's one that's called the "Revised Reconciliation" and there's one that's just called "Revised". Which one are we looking at?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Um, let me pull from the OneDrive. So there's "Revised" and then, so it's just the "Revised" one. The second one that you can see has a longer title. It's the "Revised Reconciliation of Resolution 333 against the Capital Improvement Program for 2022 to 2027. That spreadsheets just merely is showing the differences between those two things. It serves nothing more than for informational purposes and it won't change over time.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: The "Revised Reconciliation" has been changed so that the Resolutions are not listed in Resolution number order, they are listed by more like their timeline sort of. So anything that was already spent and is complete, and the budget is no longer outstanding, is then wrapped back into the amount of funding that's available. So that you can see a more accurate depiction of what actually is left. And then from there, it's just what's been approved that showing up on here.

Chairman Criswell: So can I ask you to quickly walk us through so that everybody clearly understands what we've actually spent, and where we're at.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: So after the COVID Pays, which are really what's been completed to date, the subtotal of those payments out is 1,985,912 dollars. So that came with, I'm going to call it a savings, it's not really the correct term 246,933 dollars and 78 cents, so you can see that being added back in there. And then "Open Projects" is what I have this extra section called, these are things that are currently being expended down. Those year to date, the life-to-date, expenses will be increased. Hopefully we can do this every committee meeting. We'll, we'll have to develop a timeline for it.

Chairman Criswell: So, So what's our bottom line at this point in terms of what we've actually spent, and what we have left?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: So the approved, so the year, the life-to-date, expenditures are 1.7 million, 1,769,769 and 62 cents. So the approved funding on this reconciliation's right beside it \$7 million. And then the remaining ARPA allocation is 27,434,654 dollars 78 cents.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you so much. Um, Comptroller Gallagher, do you have anything you want to add to that analysis?

Comptroller Gallagher: I think we're gonna continue to refine it over time. And, you know, I think this is a good start with it for sure. So.

Chairman Criswell: Really the goal of this was just to show how how quickly the money's going away. So I really want to make sure that people understand that we've been spending this

money and that we've got commitments to this money, and where we're at. Deputy Executive Kelly, I see your hand.

Deputy Executive Kelly: So also per Legislative Resolution, the Department of Finance is required to report on all expenses monthly, and we submitted our last report on January 31, and we'll continue to do so. Additionally to comptroller Gallagher's point earlier, that's on me. I was stuck in the EOC. We're gonna have the meeting between our finance team, Executive, the Comptroller, and Legislative staff just to discuss how we're accounting for all of this so we are definitely going to speed up that meeting and have it soon.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Are there any other questions about the overall where we stand with the finances at this moment? Okay, seeing none I'm going to move us on to Resolutions. And, and, Amber if I could have you update us on where things stand with each Resolution to the committees that they've gone to. We obviously you know, took no action on any of these Resolutions at our last meeting. But if you could give us an update, please on where the Resolutions stand.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Do you want to do it as we look...

Chairman Criswell: Let's do it one by one.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Perfect.

Chairman Criswell: So on Resolution 28 do I hear a motion for discussion?

Legislator Lopez: I'll move it.

Chairman Criswell: And a second, please.

Legislator Levine: Second.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you all in favor.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you. So alright, let's discuss Resolution 28. Amber, if you could give us a synopsis of where things are at.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: This resolution was approved in the Health Committee and postponed in Ways and Means.

Chairman Criswell: Anybody from Ways and Means here want to talk about why it was postponed in Ways and Means? Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Simply because we support the mission of this committee to make their decisions before we do. So we're looking forward to feedback from this committee. And that would be true for every single one. Just so you know.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Okay, let's have some further discussion on this. Legislator Walter, do you want to queue this up again? I know, I know you did last time, but you want to just give a brief queue up of this?

Legislator Walter: Sure. Um, so again, the implementing the respite houses was approved by the Legislature last year. But without allocating where the revenue would come from, it was always the intention that this would be an ARPA related project. It fits very much into the federal guidelines, in that it serves vulnerable population, it's addressing issues that have been worsened by COVID, namely, mental health and substance abuse. It's a definite need. It meets, it serves the entire county. With eight beds, it serves at least potentially, you know, 400 people a year, but also their family members, which, you know, cannot be numerated- enumerated. And in short, they're basically seven to 10 day beds for individuals with mental health or substance abuse issues, that also provide not only treatment while they're in the beds, but when they are released will continue to provide care navigation should the individual be open to it, so that that person can potentially remain in care outside the rest of the house, there is a hope that ultimately, the state will actually expand these two being up to 30 days, which would be remarkable for allowing people to truly get their self together in order to move into real stable environments afterwards. But for many people, you know, who are going through a mental health crisis or substance abuse, getting them, even just if they have a break from the environment they live in, for seven days can have a tremendous impact on helping them get themselves together. They may have stable housing, but it's unstable in terms of their illness. And this provides them that opportunity to have a more healthier outcome. And I'll just say, lastly, that it's been vetted by community members, law enforcement, judges, many, many people who've all feel strongly that this is very much needed. And the last thing I'll say is, the intent is that this does not happen in Kingston. There are beds going in Kingston, and you even have resolutions related to that in front of you that, that we make sure that these are geographically spread out to assure accessibility across our county as much as possible, and it's a minimum of eight beds at this point. Any other questions I can answer?

Chairman Criswell: Any committee members have questions about this? So before we move this to a vote, I did have one question for the committee. So we're talking about this Scoring Matrix, we have not had a chance to do a Scoring Matrix on this particular project. If we decide to vote on this and either move forward or not moving forward, are we okay with doing that without going through that process? So I'd like to hear everybody's opinion on that.

Legislator Lopez: I'm comfortable moving forward with it. I think this has been vetted. And if passed that of the Health Committee, unanimously as well. So without going through the matrix, I'm okay supporting this.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Legislator Lopez.

Legislator Corcoran: I agree. I agree with Craig. We, I passed this in Health and I agreed with it there and I agree with it here moving forward. So I'm all for it moving forward.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Legislator Corcoran. Legislator Levine.

Legislator Levine: Yeah. I do not have an objection to waiving this, you know, scoring rubric for this resolution. I stand behind legislator Lopez and legislator Corkins some feelings on it as well.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Legislator Sperry. Thumbs up. Okay. I'm going to ask for a vote on this resolution. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Any opposed? Any abstentions? This passes. Yes. Amber.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Legislator Corcoran, we need your video to be on to record your vote. We can record all them all at once at the end of the meeting if you'd like.

Deputy Executive Rider: It's fine. Hi. I'm good. I'm driving, but I'm good.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Thank you so much.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir. Appreciate that. All right, moving on to. I'd like to, I'd like to have a motion to block Resolution 29 and 32.

Legislator Lopez: I'll make a motion on the box.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you in a second on that.

Legislator Corcoran: I'll second it.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. And now a motion to discuss. So the block has passed and a motion to discuss that block.

Legislator Lopez: I'll move it.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Second, please. Second by Legislator Sperry. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. Discussion on Resolutions 29 and 32. Mr. Wiedemann, would you like to enlighten us a little bit more? Thank you.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Sure. Happy to. I think our intent here was to get your responses to the questions that came up during the last meeting. I hope we've done that to your satisfaction. We included a copy of the application form for the CARES one program, which we intend to use, if funding is awarded for CARES two as the application for CARES two with only minor kind of narrative changes just to reflect a separate round of funding. The other question that we received is a question about how the funds that have been received will be used by businesses in a geographic breakdown, breakdown to the type of business, minority ownership status, all of that, which was included in a table that had all of the individual awardees from CARES one with that information, which I'll just point out reflects, as we talked about last time, that there is, although more work to do in terms of geographic diversity and making sure that we've got the word out throughout the county, there is a good reflection of minority ownership 45% of the awardees and CARES one where minority owned businesses, 66% were women owned businesses. And then I think the final question was about or sorry, another question about the, the breakdown of the type and quantity of businesses that have proven need, whether funded or not, and I would appreciate any clarification, but my understanding of the question was that in the pipeline of applications that we have pending, that have been submitted by businesses impacted by the pandemic, that were seeking assistance, we have not done full evaluation of those, we know that those are complete applications. But until we have additional funding to award to them, we don't want to dedicate staff time to doing full evaluation of those. So I sent the evaluation rubric that we use to make that evaluation. But again, until we receive an allocation of funding of some sort to make awards, it doesn't appear to be a good use of staff time to go through that detailed analysis of each of these. So I can't say exactly the, I can't answer the question directly because of that. And then finally, the long term impacts. I tried to address that, I think that for the CARES program, there is a requirement for job creation retention. And so that's one of the impacts, although I'll just admit that these are micro enterprises. Time, times are tough right now and these are businesses that ultimately, we'll have to see how they whether the long term after COVID, but we have been doing as part of our underwriting in the state's underwriting a review of their financial position, and whether they're viable as a going concern. And so we include that in our evaluation of the, of the applicants. And again, it's worthy of note and I provided a couple of links to articles that speak to this, but I think all of us can probably speak to our own experience of it to that this program, again, designed to support low to moderate income businesses and employees and businesses that employ people from low to moderate income households. You know, the research really shows that those are businesses that are disproportionately impacted by the pandemic, and also that, that supporting those businesses creates economic impact in our communities through the multiplier effects of those businesses paying compensation and wages to local folks who turn around and spend it, buying goods and services from other businesses that then can turn around and spread that that additional economic capital throughout their community and so proud to explain the benefits that we see from this in terms of a long term effect.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you so much. Amber, I'm so sorry, I forgot to ask you to give us a summary of where this went to and committee, what happened to it.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Resolution 29 was postponed in Economic Development, approved in Public Works, and postponed in Ways and Means. Resolution 32, no action was taken in Economic Development and was postponed in Ways and Means.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that. Like to open this up to questions. Legislator Lopez. You're muted, sir.

Legislator Lopez: This is a process, just a process question. Does this committee oversee the review process? Or do we only execute, well in part execute what's needed in order to fund the projects?

Chairman Criswell: My understanding is that it's strictly funding the project. That it has nothing to do with the review of the actual applications.

Legislator Lopez: And who does the actual review of the applications?

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Our staff has done the review and I shared the rubric that we use to evaluate the applicants.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, thank you. So can I ask Tim, just a question about the information? When, when did this information come in? In terms of the demographics and the questions that have been answered?

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: I'm sorry, if you could clarify. You mean, when did, when did we provide this?

Chairman Criswell: Yeah. When did when did the Legislators get this information? Well I'll ask Deputy Exec Kelly to respond. He was the one I think sharing the information.

Deputy Executive Kelly: We sent that all over today.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, so I'm just gonna say I find that really problematic. You know, I work a full time job. I haven't had a chance to look at this information at all, not even for a second. So I haven't had a chance to digest it, personally. I don't know if any other Legislators want to chime in on that fact. But I haven't seen it, so. Other Legislators? Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: Yeah, same here. I know that email with this information came in at 11 o'clock. But I was in meetings all day. And I tried to look at it very quickly, before we started meeting. There's a lot of great information here. I'm so happy that you guys shared it with us. The only thing, I mean I would like to look at it in greater detail. I already started highlighting things that are I'm curious about. Um, but again, I, you know, and maybe this is a question that you can answer right now, just like off, you know, the cuff, but do you feel like the people that have filed the applications in the second round are like within the cell, same realm of these folks, like these types of industries? Or are you seeing more like trade businesses? Are you seeing you

know what I'm saying? Like? That's what I was looking for in the question about the demographic breakdown. I don't know if anybody can answer that question right now.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Yep. I can share that I don't believe there's a you know, there's a distinct difference in the applications that are pending and have been completed, but have not been awarded funding. Again, there's, there's over 100 of those, and as I mentioned before, we've done a cursory review to ensure that they've completed the full application, but we have not dived in to do a full evaluation of those. And it's at that point that sometimes clarifying questions arise about exactly the nature of their business and that kind of thing. So there's some uncertainty at this stage. But I think mostly we're seeing a pretty consistent spread of businesses in the hospitality and service industry, you know, as the kind of primary driver here, as you can see from the list that we provided of the current awardees,

Legislator Sperry: And if I can just follow up, um, oh, when you I believe the last time we met, you had said in that first round of applications, I don't remember what the number was for the amount of applications but same again, that you went through and made sure that all of the applications were done, and would be able to be considered for ARPA so that ruled out a certain amount of applications. So what percent, this is a list of 29 businesses that got funded through the ARPA funds. So of the initial applicants, and the ones that got weeded out how many, what percentage actually got funded?

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Good question. I would, my gut estimate and having not done that specific analysis, but just knowing as we've gone through these, that in the, the applications that we've received and reviewed under the CARES, just to clarify, you were saying ARPA, but but these are the CARES, funding, you know, I would say somewhere around 10 to 20% of those, were either ineligible because of the type of organization or when details were provided there were other either issues with the application, or they chose not to provide additional information, and so never really completed their application.

Legislator Sperry: Got it. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Um, committee members, I wanted to ask you again, so we have not had an opportunity to review this in light of our own Scoring Matrix. And I'd like to ask all of you how you feel about any movement forward without giving this a Scoring Matrix overview. Please chime in. Yeah, Legislator Corcoran.

Legislator Corcoran: Well, again, we've had this program going all of last year. I think it's a great program moving forward. I was for it in committee moving forward, but we did get out voted and postponed. Legislators here think they need some more time on this. I'll respect that. But, you know, I don't have a problem moving it forward. I didn't in committee, and I don't now. But again, I'll respect the decision of others that might need a little bit more time.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir. Legislator Lopez.

Legislator Lopez: Yeah, um, is this time sensitive? We held it over in order to give some opportunity for the other Legislators to, to review the information that was, you know, given

them, to them today. I I agree with leg- Legislator Corcoran there. Yeah, this has already been through the process, you know, I was comfortable with it before, I'm still comfortable moving forward with it now. But, um, if not everybody is then if this isn't that time sensitive, then holding it, I don't have a problem holding it over to give them an opportunity, you know, to digest some of the information that was given them today.

Chairman Criswell: Appreciate that. Legislators Levine, Sperry. You, either one. Legislator Livine I'll call on you.

Legislator Levine: Um, you know, unless, unless anybody else has a strenuous objection to it. Um, you know, I think that this would be something that would probably fall under the, you know, the aspect of probably wanting to go through a rubric, at least for me, I haven't had a chance to really go through the information that was provided by the Executive's office this morning. So I would be happy to, you know, put this through the rubric and take further action on this at a later time.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: I concur.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, it seems like we are going to- Legislator-, Deputy Executive Rider.

Deputy Executive Rider: I just have one quick request. And that's that as questions come up by committee members, that, that they are asked through Amber to Deputy Executive Kelly between now and the next ARPA meeting and not hold questions for the ARPA meeting. So that we can try to try to move. I know, I understand your processes. And you want this committee to be the one that acts and we respect that we just ask that we get those questions between now and then. So we have time to answer them and provide the committee those answers between now and then.

Chairman Criswell: That's a very fair request. Thank you. Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. And so I guess just since this is the first time we're going around on this, what is this committee's, what, what message should I bring back to Ways and Means? Because right now, it's postponed to be discussed next week.

Chairman Criswell: I think that the message is, is that Legislators. I mean, we haven't made this decision yet. But it's -

Legislator Walter: Should you postpone it now?

Chairman Criswell: If we do postpone it now, it will give Legislators time to digest the information that was given to them today. It will give us all time to score this via the, our, our matrix and we will then be able to pass that information along to the committees of jurisdiction.

Legislator Walter: But is it your expectation that for next, this upcoming Ways and Means this would be ready for us or are we?

Chairman Criswell: No.

Legislator Walter: Okay? All right. I just wanted to be clear than where you're at now.

Chairman Criswell: Yes.

Legislator Walter: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. So I'm going to recommend that we take no action on this to give committee members a chance to digest the information that was given to them today to come up with further questions and for, to, for us to give us the opportunity to actually score this against our, our set of questions. Are we in agreement on that? Yes. Okay. Thank you very much. All right. Resolution 30. Do I hear a motion for discussion?

Legislator Lopez: I'll move it.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. A second.

Legislator Levine: Second.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Amber, could you let us know where things are at with Resolution 30?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: This Resolution was approved in Public Works and postponed in Ways and Means.

Chairman Criswell: And, does somebody from the Executive team wanted to talk about this?

Director of Resilience Litwin: I'd be happy to, to discuss. Nate Litwin, Director of Recovery and Resilience. And I, I just wanted to start by saying that, I guess, give a broad view of the, the grant and the program that we're trying to do with this. We have made a presentation previously to the ARPA committee about it with a PowerPoint. So I won't go into all those details. But I think probably the Special Committee is most interested in the one question that we received, and apologies for only getting it out today. Definitely noted of the need and certainly respect the time the Legislators need to review this and the fact that you, many of you are working and look forward to getting it out much sooner. We, we partly just wanted to give it as a package and we're waiting for responses from multiple sources. So that's, that's part of this. But we only did have to respond to one question, and I hope it's a one page response. Yep. And so I hope it's clear. It was important to us to start with the regulation. And by that I mean, the the US Treasury

Final Rule, which I know is a lot, large body of work, but we tried to pinpoint the different rules and guidance from the federal government that allow us to create this use of funding. And so I'm not going to read it word for word. I do have it up in front of me. And I, I definitely respect the Legislators' need for time to review it. But certainly we think we've pinpointed that well. We can, I discussed at the last meeting, there's a difference in the federal words of beneficiary versus sub recipient, beneficiary being much. I guess, I guess the heart of who the federal government wants the money to go to. And that is broad discretion. So it can go to many different folks. But certainly nonprofits are specifically spoken to, and that there is a definition for nonprofits. So we have complied with that, in that we're giving to charitable organizations, 501(c)3s, and we're getting giving to veteran services organizations. And when I say giving, it's, of course, after a process, we have submitted our instructions for the grant application, full two applications with all of our questions in those applications. And so to get back to, to the need, and how we've defined the need that we've seen, it's basically looking to provide this grant funding to impacted nonprofits and the impact, it also has a, you know, is a very core terminology in the treasury rules. And it's hard for us to say it because we haven't, you know, we need to put the application out into the community hear back and receive applications from the nonprofit, the way we've tailored everything is to get that evidence of need. And then we've also in our instructions, provided the matrix that we would use to review. And we've asked specific questions regarding sources of other funds that they've used. And we're, when we look at impact, we're looking at two things we're looking at. And this is how we why we have two applications. So we're looking at the lost revenue of an organization. Because certainly, if they have been negatively impacted, and then can show that in a loss of revenue, then that is evidence of need. And that is a reason to fund that based on the rubric, as well as the second application was, was designed with nonprofits who are maybe seeing reasonable funds funding streams in the you know, period of the pandemic, but have seen largely increased need. And so that is where we've created a sapling app application where nonprofits can show an impact in the amount of community need they're seeing, and, and the amount of services they need to provide and receive money in an effort to increase and provide for those services. And we've also tailored our list of services so that we are in line with uses under the Treasury rules. So I hope that's, that helps.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Deputy Executive Kelly, and let's see Legislator Levine.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you, Chair, I just wanted to clarify one point that came up in another meeting that this would be administered through UCEDA, along with the small business. That's that's not the case, this will be administered by the ARP division and Finance. So I think it's an important clarification that this is a separate and distinct program. And not, it's very much different. So I just wanted to highlight that. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that clarification. Legislator Levine.

Legislator Levine: Yes, Mr. Chairman, my apologies if I'm mistaken, but I just want, did the clerk get a chance to give us the latest action on this Resolution?

Chairman Criswell: I believe she did. But if you could repeat it, Amber, that would be great.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: The Resolution was approved in Public Works and postponed in Ways and Means.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Thank you, Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. Um, so it took me a few minutes to process but something that Legislator Lopez said earlier, I thought of for this, but also for the previous resolution is this idea of who is on the group that reviews applications? And so I'm wondering, for votes, and I'm sorry to go back. But for the for 32 like, is there a willingness? Or 29, is there a willingness, or have you already not put into your plan to include like, some community based organization representation in that review group? People who truly have their pulse on what their communities and their businesses in the communities and how to prioritize them. Like, rather than just from the Ivory Tower, so to speak. You know, what, are you will you include? Or are you or are you open to? If not, and then the same for this one, the body of the people who will review them, are we, will there be representation, perhaps even like from the Youth Bureau and DSS and those people who again, have their finger on the pulse of these nonprofits in a much lower, you know, on the ground level?

Chairman Criswell: Great question. Deputy Executive Kelly.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Sure, I'll cover the, so the intent is to do exactly as Legislator Walter said with a non for profit and incorporate folks like from human rights and youth as well as DSS. So there is that intent from us. Absolutely. It's not just going to be some small subset of ARP. It's important to get people that work with a lot of these organizations. And I would say on the UCEDA side, since that's a contract with UCEDA for the separate small business, one, the board does have representation from the public. And there's also two kind of ex officio members, including Legislators Cahill and Litts that also review. So anytime that those grants are given out, and Tim just stopped me when I go too far here, but these are contracts, so they're approved by the UCEDA board. So it's not an agreement with the Legislature. We actually change the nature of that board and how it's made up. So it's not all Executive staff. So it is actually members of the public that are part of this.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that.

Legislator Walter: My follow up, though.

Chairman Criswell: Yes.

Legislator Walter: I appreciate that. I'd also say, though, that when the when the UCEDA board, in its creation didn't necessarily have this project, specifically in mind with recommendations all coming from the Legislature or whatever. And I guess I just wonder if you would, especially because we're talking about, again, vulnerable populations, communities of color, maybe look at who's on the UCEDA board and perhaps consider and discuss among yourself, suggesting to them that they might bring in some members who are from these community groups who might not be representative on that board as just a consideration for justice.

Chairman Criswell: Yes, Tim.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Yeah, I just, I appreciate that feedback. I think that's good advice and feedback. And I think we could certainly incorporate some of that into the UCEDA review process.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. So I want to ask the committee again, are we comfortable waiving our use of a matrix and a scoring on this project? Or do we want more time to be able to actually run this through our, our questions and have any other follow up questions answered? I'd love to hear back from Committee Members on that. Legislator Corcoran.

Legislator Corcoran: Yeah, again, I've heard enough on this. You know, Tim has done a great job, putting it forward. I was for it again last time, was okay with everybody taking another look at this, but not in favor of base tastes and taking every one of these resolutions and table in them every week. Because again, as far as I was informed, we are not the know all, tell, tell on this. It goes to the other committees. And every time we postpone it, it postpones it again for that next committee. So again, if, again I'm feeling comfortable with it, so I'm okay with moving it forward.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Legislator Lopez.

Legislator Lopez: Yeah, I agree with all of that. Yeah, again, this has been vetted. And I'm comfortable moving forward with this and I think get the Executive staff has done a great job in explaining it in the process. And so I am comfortable moving forward.

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: I agree. I feel like I have enough data and I've been able to review the information that came before us before and the information that we received earlier from Nate, so I'm comfortable moving it forward.

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Levine.

Legislator Levine: I agree with my colleagues on this Resolution. I don't have any objection to moving forward with it to a vote tonight, as you know, the information was provided in a timely manner to go over. So no objection.

Chairman Criswell: So we're okay with waiving, waiving the Scoring Matrix on this and going ahead with a vote? Yes, I see nods. All right. All in favor of this Resolution?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: All opposed? Abstentions? Resolution passes. Thank you. And onto our last Resolution to hear a motion to discuss Resolution 31?

Legislator Lopez: I'll move for discussion.

Chairman Criswell: A second, please.

Legislator Sperry: Second.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor, please.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Great. Amber, could you please give us a status of this resolution?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: This Resolution was approved in Public Works and postponed in Ways and Means.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Um, I did see, Kevin. I don't know if Kevin, if you want to say anything to this Resolution, or if you've already said what you want to say to us all? But I want to give you that opportunity if you would like to speak.

Kevin O'Connor: Thanks Peter. We're here tonight, joined by Emily Hamilton is well, happy to be here if there's still lingering questions. Just looking at some of the equitable principles and looking at some of our colleagues around the country that have been in front of us and converting them. Hotels to permanent supportive housing and Vermont noted how COVID had of course, as it has here in Hudson Valley, COVID cause a tremendous up swing and people moving into the area and hous- and just completely has disrupted our housing market to, you know, maybe it's contributing to the homeless problem. So in addition to some of the other things we've pointed out. But, again, I think we've said enough, I think we've provided some information. We've responded to some of the questions we received talked about the green and sustainable initiatives in particular. And if there are further questions, we're happy to respond.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir. I see. I hope I don't get this wrong, but I believe it's Supervisor Baden. Is that correct?

Town of Rochester Supervisor Baden: That is correct. I apologize, I'm...

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir. We have not met yet.

Town of Rochester Supervisor Baden: Yeah, I'm doing a dual Zoom meeting here. So my apologies. I'm also listening in on the reapportionment meeting at the same time. Um, I'm just wanted to clarify. I saw this as listed as part of Capital Project 602, which involved Open Space Institute and trail work. Am I mistaken on that? And if that's the case, then then I don't have any further comments. So.

Chairman Criswell: Could you speak to that Deputy Executive Kelly?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yes, thank you, Chair. Thank you Supervisor for the question. This is because the portion that the county is looking to fund with ARP funds is actually the water and sewer portion. So it fell into that infrastructure kind of bucket that we defined in the initial planning phase.

Town of Rochester Supervisor Baden: Okay, but it is independent of the other trail improvement project that involved the town of Rochester?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yep. This is a separate project, separate altogether in terms of what we're seeking to find in the Resolution.

Town of Rochester Supervisor Baden: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that clarification. It was just confusion on my part. I will say I also sit on the county planning board and, and we did review this project. And I, I do personally stand in favor of it. It doesn't affect my community, per se, but I definitely think it's a good project.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir. Yes, Deputy Executive Kelly, thank you so much.

Deputy Executive Kelly: I just wanted to address and I know, this was an important question for many of the Committee Members and Legislators, just in terms of timeliness. RUPCO, I know it has been engaged in their due diligence process in terms of purchasing the property. And in order to really secure that capital stack, this is part of that. So timeliness is certainly a criteria here to show. I think our commitment to this type of project is important. So I would urge you know, hopefully an affirmative action this evening.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: I want to ask the committee again, how do we feel about waiving the Scoring Matrix on this project? Legislator Corcoran.

Legislator Lopez: I feel the same. Oh, sorry.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Thank you, Legislator Lopez. Go ahead, Legislator Corcoran.

Legislator Corcoran: No, like I said, I think this project is something that helps the entire county. So a lot of times I say I talk for the southern portion, but it's a great project that'll help the entire county. So again, I'm good for moving this forward tonight.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir. Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: I would bet that if we were using our matrix, we would come to the conclusion that this is a high priority project. And I don't want to speak on behalf of my fellow Committee Members, but I do think it's definitely something that we would put up there and want to push forward. So, I'm for it.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Legislator Levine.

Legislator Levine: Yes, I agree with my colleagues. I think that Mr. O'Connor's presentation at our last meeting was very thorough. And he was able to answer some of the questions that we had at the time. So you know, there was a lot of information that was provided ahead of time before, prior to the last meeting. Very informative. And, you know, I think that I agree with Legislator Sperry, this should be a high priority project at this Resolution. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. And I'd like to add just a privilege of the Chair and say that I do also think that this is the exact kind of project that we should be funding with this ARPA funds. I think it's got long term impact that I think, I keep weighing everything against 30 years from now. 30 years from now, will somebody look at this project and say they did a great job by funding this and I think this is a big yes, personally. So I'd like to take a vote on this. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: All opposed? Abstentions? This passes. Thank you very much. All right. Is there any new business that we need to discuss which I think there is actually. I think we want to talk to, Oh, Legislator Levine and then Deputy Executive Rider.

Legislator Levine: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to, while we had him, while we had a moment to ask what the logistics will be of getting the information from the scoring rubric, you know, timelines and the way it should be returned prior to our next meeting.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for asking that question. That's something that the clerk and I are going to discuss probably tomorrow. And we will get that answer to you quickly, because I do want this to be an efficient process. And I want to make sure that we collect all the information we need so that we can hand it on to the next committee, and give them time for just as we want time to get our questions answered, they're gonna want time to look at our scoring and see whatever notes we've, we've submitted. So I want to make sure that we, we set that up, the other thing that we are going to be looking at is the schedule for our meetings. Again, I'm having conversations with Chairwoman Bartels right now. And we will get back to the committee ASAP about what some potential additional meetings will be. Probably, you know, in these first few months, while we're kind of getting our committee up to speed, and while there are a lot of projects in front of us. Deputy Executive Kelly.

Deputy Executive Kelly: So I will 100% own that, you know, the information on on that Resolution should have come quicker. And I want to work on that process in terms of when, you know, when we get the questions and what you know, I think that I've got staff here taking notes as well, I can certainly jump on that quicker. But I want to work out with, with the clerk's office as well so we're all sweating in the same lane so to speak. But I certainly own it, I'll certainly sharpen up and we'll make sure that you guys get all the answers your, you request and, and in terms of the presentations, I'll front load as much as possible with anything we're bringing

forward. So you guys have all the opportunity to ask the questions or to have the experts in the room. So I'll certainly commit to that.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that. And I just want to also remind everybody, this is a learning process. It's a new committee. This is new, you know, all this is new, so have patience with each other, be kind to each other. We're all in this for our residents and for our constituents. And just let's keep that in the forefront as we move this forward. I see Marc Rider, and then I see Legislator Greene.

Deputy Executive Rider: Yeah, I just wanted to speak with, to one Resolution that is in front of the body this month that has a tangential connection to this committee and a misstep on my part on not getting it in front of the committee in a timely manner. As you know, there's the the resolution for the CDBG Grant, \$800,000 for home energy retrofits for individuals, lower to mid income and it's a really important grant and project. We've confirmed that we can accept the \$800,000 grant this month. And even if this committee and the Legislature chooses not to move forward with the \$500,000 in ARPA funds to expand that program, we will not be penalized. But I do think it's an important project and we will come forward next month with that and leave it up to the Legislative body, whether you all decide to appropriate that extra 500,000. It's one of the projects that we worked through the Energy and Environment Committee last year with Manna Jo. And again, it's workforce development, it's green retrofit for people who wouldn't otherwise be able to afford it. And really, really important stuff. But I just, I did want to apologize for the way that it did seem, there was certainly no intent on kind of getting in an ARP project through the backdoor. So.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you and my understanding is that you're adding a "Whereas" to that Resolution to kind of clean it up.

Deputy Executive Rider: Correct.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, thank you, sir. Appreciate that. Legislator Greene. Hi. Welcome. You're on mute.

Legislator Greene: Sorry about that. Um, yeah. My question is still about. There had been committees and the committee that I was on, that had two Legislators, one from each caucus and I think three staffers was for the project that Deputy Rider just cited and it is a really good project. I had some contributions I wanted to make because I thought we were going to be meeting on a regular basis. That stopped happening in the fall and I have been asking about it. Um, I, I don't know, at what point I can raise my suggestions but I think they're important. And they have to do with, you know, the standards that we're using when we're giving away public money. You know, there's one thing to do a retrofit, there's another thing to ensure that it has healthy home air quality standards. And if you do a retrofit and I'm in big favor of, a big fan of deep energy retrofits. My own house is an excellent example. But you have to be careful not to trap mold and mildew and other things that would decrease air quality. And there are some training programs that I think should be specified, not just maybe if we get around to it. So my, my central question is about the subcommittee process. And then also, in this particular case, is there a way of still making suggestions? Not so much about, I heard the discussion about the

800,000 and 500,000, but I'm, about the process itself. We had a very good process going and then it just sort of fell back to the pattern of the Executive branch developing the proposals and bringing them to ARPA, which is a little different than a collaboratively developed process.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Legislator Greene. So one thing I want to clear up is a name. My understanding is that they're not actually subcommittees, but they were working groups. And maybe I got that wrong. But I think that that's what they were clarified, just so that it's clear that they're not actually subcommittees of this committee, but they were actually working groups that were established in the Legislature. And I do know that, I will tell you that Chairwoman Bartels, and I have had several conversations about utilizing those working groups, especially when we have questions that we really need to drill down in and need some expertise on that. So that is in conversation. We have not sorted out reassigning new Legislators to these working groups. So that's a process that has to happen. So I give you my word, I will continue to talk to the Chairwoman about this, this, these working groups. I saw Chris Kelly, and then Legislator Walter.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you, Chair. So I, I hope that we can also be part of that discussion, as we were kind of in the, in these working groups with Legislatures, Legislators on these specific topics. So and we have the ARPA staff that can also serve as a research arm. So we are certainly interested in the collaborative effort, and certainly want to be, if the working group process is reestablished or, or if it's just becomes conversations bipartisan in terms of talking through some of these more granular details and, and really being a working group, right, not scoring, but working through details. I think that we'd certainly like to participate and would encourage us to do so.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, I really do believe the goal is to work as collaboratively, collaboratively as possible. And so I think this is one way that we can certainly do that. Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. Um, yeah. And, you know, the interesting thing is nothing happens in a vacuum. And one, what happens in one committee often has a lot of impact on the other. So I just want to point out that on March 30th the Health Human Services and Housing is having a special meeting just on housing, that we're inviting people from the Executive's office, and, and so like, some of the conversations related to this committee probably will come up in that conv-, in that group. And so if anyone who's on the ARPA Committee is interested specifically in housing, you know, I just want to encourage you on that special meeting on the 30th, where we'll start the discussion. And again, it's inclusive of members from the Executive office. If you haven't been invited yet by Jay, you're about to be but we just got it on the calendar yesterday. And then we, and we specifically made it right after your ARPA meeting so that a if we're in person, we can all just stay and continue that. So if any of you are interested in like having a very specific housing conversation, it'll just be right after your, your meeting on the 30th.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much for that invitation. And I agree with you that as holistically as we can be looking at this as possible is the right way to do this. Alright. If there's no other new business, or old business, I'm going to ask for a motion to adjourn.

Legislator Lopez: Make the motion.

Chairman Criswell: Second?

Legislator Corcoran: Second.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you all so much for your focused attention and we'll see you soon.
Take care.

Deputy Executive Rider: Have a good night, everybody.

Chairman Criswell: Good night.

Time: 6:51 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster
Minutes Approved: February 23, 2022