

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

DATE & TIME: February 23, 2022 – 5:30
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID: 853 4307 5482
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, Chris Hewitt, Joe Maloney, Kathy Nolan, Laura Petit, Abe Uchitelle, and Eve Walter; Deputy County Executives Johanna Contreras, Chris Kelly, and Marc Rider; Comptroller March Gallagher; Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco; Sam Sonenberg, Office of the Comptroller; Director of Economic Development Tim Weidemann; Finance Department, ARP Administration Nathan Litwin, Ashley Long, and Molly Scott; County Executive Office Laura Nordstrom; Rokosz Most, Hudson Valley One; Kevin Smith, Christopher Cornwell, Steven Rice, and Chris Allen, Residents; Peter Karis, Annie Bergelin, and Bob Anderberg, Open Space Institute; Scott Corcoran, Town Supervisor of Marlborough; Marybeth Majestic, Town Supervisor of Gardiner; Neil Bettez, Town Supervisor of New Paltz; Terry Houck, Town Supervisor of Wawarsing; Mike Baden, Town Supervisor of Rochester

- **Chairman Criswell called the meeting to order at 5:36 PM**

Chairman Criswell welcomed all to the meeting. Deputy Clerk Feaster took role.

Motion No. 1: To approve the minutes and transcripts of the January 26, 2022 and February 9, 2022 Regular Meetings

Motion Made By: Legislator Corcoran
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Levine

Discussion: None

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

Chairman Criswell requested the County Executive present proposed ARPA projects to the Committee prior to the creation of Resolutions for each Project. Discussion pursued on what this process may entail.

Motion No. 2: 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

Motion No. 3: To discuss and approve 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 Corcoran

Discussion: Committee members reviewed the completed ARPA Project Scoring Rubric. Legislator Sperry noted the Project’s focus in the City of Kingston during Round 1 of funding distributions and questioned whether the application required the funds be used in response to COVID or allowed for growth opportunities. Legislator Maloney vocalized concern over geographical focus of the award recipients and the first come, first serve award basis of the program. Legislator Levine confirmed that one of the County’s key priorities in the implementation of this program will be serving minority owned businesses and prioritizing the vulnerable populations.

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 Resolution No. 96 – Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program – Amending Capital Project Nos. 597, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, And 604 Ulster County Recovery And Resiliency Projects – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Finance

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the Capital Improvement Program to reallocate ARPA funding to Capital Project No. 604 for Water Infrastructure in the amount of \$22,424,000.00.

Motion Made By: Legislator Sperry
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

Discussion: Legislator Maloney provided an overview of the proposed Project, stating that it is a municipal matching program for water infrastructure, that it is a work-in-progress, that he estimates the total cost would end up being between \$2 and \$8 million, asking for Legislative input into the final details of the program. Chairman Criswell requested Legislator Maloney review the Committee’s ARPA Project Scoring Matrix to proactively answer Committee questions.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 5: To block Resolutions No. 97 and 98

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. 6: To discuss the following Resolutions:

Resolution No. 97 – Funding Capital Project No. 602 – ARP Infrastructure And Trails – Open Space Institute Land Trust, Inc. As Subrecipient - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution funds Capital Project No. 602 in the amount of \$2,100,000.00 for expansion of Ulster County’s trail networks to serve Ellenville, provide access to scenic views along the Rondout Creek, further complete a 29-mile rail trail from the City of Kingston to the Village of Ellenville, and to provide a direct feeder trail to the statewide Empire State Trail in the Village of New Paltz.

Resolution No. 98 – Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$2,100,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Open Space Institute Land Trust, Inc. – Department Of Finance

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approve the execution of a contract with Open Space Institute Land Trust, Inc. from March 15, 2022 through June 30, 2024 for subaward of American Rescue Plan Act (“ARPA”) funding for the purpose of improving or developing three sections of public outdoor, rail trail corridors for the mental health and outdoor recreation benefit of trail users and the economic benefit of Ulster County and local communities in the County in the amount of \$2,100,000.00.

Motion Made By: Legislator Corcoran
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

Discussion: Vice President for Parks and Stewardship at Open Space Institute Peter Karis provided a detailed overview of the proposed trail

development project, including how the Town Supervisors have been involved, how the trails affect tourism and economic development in Ulster County, and OSI's in-kind donation to the proposal. Town Supervisors Battez, Majestic, Houck, and Baden spoke in favor of the proposed projects, providing reasons for their support.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 7: To block Resolutions No. 99 and 101

Motion Made By: Legislator Sperry

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

Motion No. 8: To discuss the following Resolutions:

Resolution No. 99 – Amending Capital Project No. 597 ARP Housing - For The Purchase & Renovation Of 21 Elizabeth Street Group Home, City Of Kingston – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Public Works (Buildings & Grounds)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends Capital Project No. 597 for the purchase of 21 Elizabeth Street for improvement and continuance of operation as a facility to provide supportive housing as an “Unlisted Action” in the amount of \$700,000.00.

Resolution No. 101 – Authorizing The Acquisition Of Real Property Located At 21 Elizabeth Street In The City Of Kingston, County Of Ulster, In Order To Renovate A Group Home Facility, And Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Execute, On Behalf Of Ulster County, Any And All Documents Required For Said Acquisition – Department Of Public Works (Buildings And Grounds)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the acquisition of 21 Elizabeth Street for the purpose of improving and continuing its operation as a facility to provide supportive housing as an “Unlisted Action”, and authorizes the Chair of the Legislature to execute an agreement, and any amendments thereto, and such other documents as may be necessary to establish the terms and conditions pursuant to which the County of Ulster shall purchase and take title to the property.

Motion Made By: Legislator Sperry

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: Deputy County Executive Marc Rider provided an overview of the proposal, stating that ARPA funds will be used exclusively for the acquisition of the property and the County will bond for the renovation costs, that the City of Kingston and the State are requesting contributory funds to offset renovation costs, and that the building will be used for temporary emergency housing for families.

Disposition: No Action Taken

New Business: None

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

Time: 7:02 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster
Minutes Approved: March 30, 2022

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

DATE & TIME: February 23, 2022 – 5:30
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID: 853 4307 5482
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, Chris Hewitt, Joe Maloney, Kathy Nolan, Laura Petit, Abe Uchitelle, and Eve Walter; Deputy County Executives Johanna Contreras, Chris Kelly, and Marc Rider; Comptroller March Gallagher; Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco; Sam Sonenberg, Office of the Comptroller; Director of Economic Development Tim Weidemann; Finance Department, ARP Administration Nathan Litwin, Ashley Long, and Molly Scott; County Executive Office Laura Nordstrom; Rokosz Most, Hudson Valley One; Kevin Smith, Christopher Cornwell, Steven Rice, and Chris Allen, Residents; Peter Karis, Annie Bergelin, and Bob Anderberg, Open Space Institute; Scott Corcoran, Town Supervisor of Marlborough; Marybeth Majestic, Town Supervisor of Gardiner; Neil Bettez, Town Supervisor of New Paltz; Terry Houck, Town Supervisor of Wawarsing; Mike Baden, Town Supervisor of Rochester

- **Chairman Criswell called the meeting to order at 5:36 PM**

Chairman Criswell: Okay, so I'm going to call the meeting of the American Rescue Plan Act Special Committee to order. It is February 23, 2022 at 5:36pm. Welcome everyone. If you could call the roll, please Amber.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Criswell.

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: Thank you. All present. Alright, everybody, welcome. Welcome to our guests. I hope everybody on the committee has had a chance to look at the minutes. I'm going to ask for a motion to approve the minutes from both the January 26th meeting and the February 9th meeting. Could I get a motion?

Legislator Corcoran: Motion.

Legislator Levine: Second.

Chairman Criswell: And a second. Thank you. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: All opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, minutes are approved. Alright, I just want to give you a little roadmap of how I see tonight going. What I'd like to start out with is for us to do a quick overview of the financial document that Amber has been tracking, do a quick overview of that and see what the original amount was and where we're at to date. Then I would like to quickly go over some dates for meetings that we talked about. We've talked about adding an extra meeting, because I want to explain the strategy for these extra meetings and how they will fit into the way that we're analyzing these proposals. And then I also want to kind of manage expectations this evening for voting. We just received a slew of Resolutions on Friday. So it's clearly, we haven't had a chance to really take in what those Resolutions are about. We haven't had a chance to do any sort of, hear any any pros or cons to them. We haven't had any chance to do any questioning. So, what I'm going to suggest, as we did for the previous meeting is that we will take no action on 96, 97, 98, 99 and 101 this evening. But we will in fact vote on Resolutions 29 and 32. Do I hear any objections from the committee to that plan of action? Great. Okay. So that's what we're going to do again, just want to manage everybody on the calls' expectations of where we're heading tonight. All right. So Amber, if you could walk us through the financial document. I don't know, Committee members, if you have that up, it's the the document that looks like this, if you could please take a look at that. And then Amber, if you could walk us through where we're at.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Okay, so the, the biggest change on this from the last meeting was the addition of the Resolutions that were approved, which was 28, 30, and 31. So you'll see in the Open Project section, those three resolutions were added within that section. And I'm trying to kind of group them with the like costs. So, for instance, um, you would see 30 and 31 consecutively. Well, no, not those two. But anything that was grouped together, intentionally, like for instance, a contract, and the overall project would be side by side. Um, the Completed Section above it is unchanged, and the No Cost section is unchanged. So, the ending value at the bottom for the remaining ARPA funds is \$22,434,654.78.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. And for me, the lesson learned is, is that this money is going to go quickly. So, we started with 34, just a short time ago, and now we're at 22, 22-4. So, and there's a huge list of, of possible projects. So, I just want to raise that as, as a point of information. Anybody have any questions about the financial overview document? Comptroller Gallagher, I see you.

Comptroller Gallagher: Yeah, I just want to note that and we've been working, you know, trying to get on the same page with the finance department on this, but what you're seeing right now does not include any expenditures made under ARPA in January or February. So essentially, you're seeing a two-month lag. So, salaries that were paid for ARPA staff are not in here. We're hoping they'll be a way to track it in a more timely way. But you guys are seeing at least six weeks, if not two weeks, two months behind. And Amber knows that. We're suffering together with that problem. But I just wanted to bring it to the committee's attention. And hopefully, when the Commissioner of Finance is back next week we'll be able to address it in some way. Thanks.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. It would be great to have most up to date information as possible. So we can see what you've really spent. So, thank you for that. Appreciate that. Any other questions from committee members? Yes, Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: Just curious. Um, do we know like about how much that is that's lagging for staff? I know. You don't probably want to say a specific number. But...

Comptroller Gallagher: No, I'm fine with it. It, you know, staff, the ARPA staff alone is around \$30,000 a month. But what I can't tell you is like, if there's pod expendi- either, there could be other things. So, I just think it would be helpful if we could tighten up the gap in timing there. So that you guys knew. Even if we're coming in with estimates, but the way it's being done right now, the journal entries are being made at the end of the month, for the month prior, not for the current month. So yeah, um, you know, so it's not a huge differential right now. But as we start to move through this money, it could be bigger. And that's why I'm bringing it to your attention. And again, we'll come back to you guys, hopefully with a solution. Yeah.

Legislator Sperry: Great. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much for that. Alright, I just want to quickly talk about dates for meeting. So what we talked about was, we discussed having two meetings a month, um, one that was prior to Resolution deadline, and one that was gonna follow. And so what I'd like to

propose, if you could just jot these down and get back to me, and I'll send you this in an email as well, that we look at: Wednesday, March nine; Wednesday, April 13, Wednesday, May 11; and Wednesday, June 15. If we meet on those dates, what my goal would be, is to actually have the information about the upcoming Resolutions in hand at that moment. So Chris, I hope you're hearing this, because I think this will make the process smoother for us. What I'd love is for us to have the Resolutions, even if they're not fully baked at that point, but the bones of the Resolutions in front of us so that we can then be looking at it and asking questions and get doing the back and forth that we want to do with your offices before, that it'll be a week and a half before Resolution deadline. So then Resolution deadline happens. You submit the Resolutions on Friday, then we have an ARPA meeting on Wednesday. Then I think the committee would feel comfortable voting on Resolutions. It's really, really impossible to try and vote on Resolutions that are, that are this important. Getting the information on a Friday, having no opportunity for real back and forth and then asking for votes on Wednesday. That's just really an unfair process. And so I think if we can elongate that a bit, that will, I know that will work for the committee, but I would like to get your input actually. Deputy Executive Kelly and Deputy Executive Rider and Deputy Executive Conteras.

Legislator Levine: Mr. Chairman, could you just repeat those dates again, one more time? I'm sorry.

Chairman Criswell: Certainly. It's Wednesday, March 9, Wednesday, April 13. Wednesday, May 11, and Wednesday, June 15. It gives a full week and a half before Resolution deadline, which is the following Friday. Thank you. So, what do you all think of that plan? It's gonna, it's going to force you to work, work earlier. You can't, your, it won't allow you to drop Resolutions in at five o'clock on Friday and expect us to take action on them on Wednesday. So, we'll ask it's asking you to do work early. And it's asking us to do work early. But I think that that's a better process than trying to come to meeting and expect yeses on things that we haven't had a chance to process.

Deputy Executive Kelly: So, I guess my first question is completely, so it really jumps in the middle of how the whole EO-2 and Resolution process actually works. In terms of how we get Resolutions from departments or from elected officials, so I'm just trying to process that part of it, because then we have the Legislative deadline where we have to get them to the Clerk's office by noon on that Friday. So that's when our deadline is to them. I mean, if we were to float, I guess, non-signed off on Resolutions. Like, they're not official at that point. I guess that's...

Chairman Criswell: Correct. Correct. I mean, you all been cooking on these projects for a long time, you very easily could have easily said to us a week and a half before the Resolution dropped, hey, we're thinking about this purchase, or we're thinking about this type of thing. You all have the plan. So, if you share it with us earlier than we have a chance to have the back and forth.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah.

Chairman Criswell: And then when you actually drop the real Resolution, we know what's going to drop. We've already vetted it and asked our questions. And so going into voting week, we'll be ready.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, I mean, I mean, on the surface, I think that's all fine, just in terms of as long as it's not the signed off formal Resolution, and we're talking about graphics and concepts in a kind of non-formal way. I don't have, I don't have much hesitation on that at the moment. But I certainly want to kick it around with the team and see what holes we may have. But I don't have that.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. I would ask for more than just...

Deputy Executive Kelly: Sorry, I lost you, Pete. Yeah.

Chairman Criswell: A sort of an idea. I would say...

Deputy Executive Kelly: I lost you.

Chairman Criswell: ...bring me something that's-, am I okay, now?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, you are now.

Chairman Criswell: Sorry. Am I back?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. I was just saying, you know, it would be helpful if it wasn't something that was sort of half, half baked, but like three quarters of the way baked.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Oh yeah, yeah, no.

Chairman Criswell: Something that we can work with.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, yeah. Like, and that's what I'm just trying to process to make sure that whatever we kick over, I mean, a week and a half is not a lifetime. I mean, and like you said, like most of these things are certainly topics of priority and discussion. So, I'm just thinking of like the detail and the technical work that goes into a Resolution, a contract, a project. And if I've got a week and a half to do something, and I front load it, I may be giving you that 75% done, and then by Resolution deadline, you're getting 100%. Does that make sense?

Chairman Criswell: Yes. And I think that would be appreciated by that, by the committee.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Alright.

Chairman Criswell: Then we would have a good chunk of it to discuss, to understand. Deputy Executive Rider.

Deputy Executive Rider: Yeah, the only thing I'll add to it, I mean, we don't have a problem getting you the information as early as we have it. Us submitting Resolutions, I think we've seen some unintended consequences of some prior Resolutions. I'll give you an example. We were looking at doing a separate Capital Project this month in submitting it to you for one of the Resolutions that is submitted tonight, for Elizabeth Manor, but because we have this environmental green checklist requirement, that we submit a checklist to you two weeks prior to submitting the Resolution, we didn't have the Resolution ready, and therefore we didn't have the checklist ready two weeks ago. And so that complicated some things. If we're now increase, like, bringing back the time again, are we gonna, can we make sure that we don't trigger like the environmental checklist for all these things, if we're submitting them earlier to this committee, because that work just can't get done earlier than we're submitting it to you.

Deputy Executive Kelly: I think you kind of covered that. Right? In terms of like, we're submitting the 75%. So, I, I mean, as long as you guys clear that up internally for your ruleset. And what we're talking about is, you know, high level, or not even high level, like, nearly complete concepts that we intend on submitting, thought, you know, good faith and everything work. We can work that.

Legislator Sperry: Correct.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Just those others, like the technical nature of what we often submit, we have requirements that we want to obviously meet. So that's it.

Chairman Criswell: Absolutely. Yeah, I think we're, I think we're in sync with that.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Okay, cool.

Chairman Criswell: All right.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Other questions? Deputy Executive Contreras. Do you have any questions on that?

Deputy Executive Contreras: No, I think you covered it. Thanks.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, great. Alright. And committee. Oh, Amber will send out those dates to you as an, in an email so you have them in your inbox. All right, so let's move on to Resolutions. up when we're doing that, I wanted to mention something about the scoring that we're doing. So now that we're using the, this Scoring Matrix. I think it makes sense. If we are scoring Resolutions that have another Resolution that supports either a financial backup or a contract that we just meld those two together. I don't think we have to actually do scoring for each of those Resolutions. That doesn't that doesn't seem to make sense to me so unless anybody has any issues with that, I'm going to say that we'll, we'll put those two together. So, for example, this is Resolution 29 and Resolution 32 will basically be the same Scoring Matrix. Does that

make sense to everybody? Yes? Okay. Great. Alright. So, we're gonna go on to Resolution 29, and 32. If I can group those two, do I need a motion to group those two?

Legislator Lopez: I'll make a motion to block.

Legislator Corcoran: Second.

Chairman Criswell: Great and perfect. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Great. So, we're gonna block those two Resolutions. Amber, can you tell us what you have so far in terms of the combined scoring?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: The Committee average as a whole, the whole rubric is 65.8.

Chairman Criswell: Great. And can you break that down a little bit for us to tell us sort of the different sections and sort of where things landed?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Sure. The average score for goals and missions was eight. The average score for equity distribution was 27.2. The average score for community impact is 24.

Chairman Criswell: Sorry, sorry, when when you say that number. Sorry, when you say that number, can you tell us out of what eight out of a possible what?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Yes.

Chairman Criswell: Is that easy enough to do? Just to give us context.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: I think so.

Chairman Criswell: If that's not easy to do, I'm not gonna force, I'm not gonna make you.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: I'm not prepared for that. I should be.

Chairman Criswell: That's alright. You don't have to do it right now Amber. But, but next time, let's trying to do that.

Legislator Levine: I think I might have that, Mister Chair.

Chairman Criswell: Let's break it down by sections.

Legislator Levine: Mister Chair. I think for the for the Goals / Missions, I think. I think it's a, I think the maximum score for goals and missions, I think is, is 12.

Legislator Corcoran: That's correct.

Chairman Criswell: Eight out of 12. All right, great. So let's go down the list then. If Legislator Levine if you could be our our totals guy.

Legislator Levine: Sure.

Chairman Criswell: And Amber, you give us what the score was, then we can just break it down in that way.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Okay, so the average score for goals mission eight out of 12, the average score for equity distribution is 27.2.

Legislator Corcoran: Out of 36.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: The average score for Community Impact is 24.6.

Chairman Criswell: Out of?

Legislator Corcoran: 37.

Legislator Levine: Plus one, right? Yeah. 37. I think you're right, that's correct. 37.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: And average score for financial management is six.

Legislator Levine: I think that's out of 15.

Legislator Corcoran: Correct.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, I think this is useful information to go through it and see where things land in these different categories. Were there any other notes that were outstanding? That you saw Amber as a collective?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Um, no, but the, um, the time sensitivity of the request and the environmental factors were, there were statements that those considerations were unclear.

Chairman Criswell: Got it. Um, I know, I had a bit of a hard time scoring this because it's a, it's many projects within one project. So, we were being asked to score on something that had multiple possibilities, you know, like, who is it, who is it serving? Or, you know, multiple factors that were, since the money would be going out to many, many different orga-, you know, several different small businesses. You'd have to judge each, many of those questions against each of the specific asks rather than as a whole. So I just had a hard time going through that. Did any other Legislat-, any other committee members have a similar reaction to that?

Legislator Corcoran: No, I took it as a whole so I was okay with it.

Chairman Criswell: Okay.

Legislator Lopez: Yeah, me too.

Chairman Criswell: Alright. So, um, any other Legislators have any comments on this Resolution? Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: Sorry, I'm looking at my looking at my rubric. Um, just a couple of things that stood out to me. And I think that, you know, looking in the rubric and looking at the information that was provided to us, by the Executive's Office, you know, 14 out of the 29 projects previously funded in round one were based in Kingston. So that just shows us that geographically, Kingston was a little bit more of a focus than the county on the whole. And then, you know, the first question in the rubric is, does the request meet the federal guidelines and restrictions for this funding? And we looked, when I looked at the rationale of all of the projects, you know, meets yes, sometimes bends? Sure. And like, there was a lot of different projects on there that I felt were kind of questionable, as far as, I'm not really sure if the funding was helping a small business to react or respond to COVID, or if the business was using this as an opportunity to grow their business. And so, again, like I am all about supporting small businesses in the community and supporting local businesses. But sometimes I thought that the rationale was a little bit of a stretch. And I'm not really sure what the requests for the second round look like. I haven't seen that information, but I'm hoping that it is a little bit more sustainable, and that it's going to be serving the community at large. So those are just the comments that I want to make at this time.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. And I just want to ask Tim, do you have any, any final words before we take a vote here?

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Well, I might, I'm a little, I guess, I have not followed the changes in the rubric. And so, I think that summary would be helpful to get in writing so that I can have some feedback for our team on where it did or didn't meet the mark.

Chairman Criswell: Absolutely.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: But I'll say in response to your comments, Legislator Sperry, appreciate the feedback. You know, I would note that, um, you know, admittedly, 14 out of the 29 were in Kingston. That reflects two facts that I think are important to consider in evaluating the geographic kind of diversity of the applicants is, first that obviously, the majority of our population of businesses is in and around the Kingston area. That's not to say that we haven't made an effort to get out to other parts of the county. And I think that's been pretty successful. And also, to note that this was a program under the CARES regulations that was directed to low to moderate income businesses. And in even more so than just kind of general population, our population of low to moderate income households is concentrated in the Kingston area. So, I think those are two reasons that we see a greater concentration of awardees in the Kingston area. As we've mentioned before, we have and will continue to do effort to get

the word out around the county to businesses about this program, assuming that we do have additional funding to make future awards.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you very much. All right. I'm gonna call a vote on this block, the block. Legislator Maloney, you have a comment before we vote?

Legislator Levine: Yeah, real quick. I don't have a lot of confidence that 50% of eligible businesses for this program would be located in the City of Kingston. But I do think it's imperative that government is going to enter into some type of a bailout or business help venture as this, I really think the approach has to be by industry. And that's the only real way to ensure some kind of fairness. It's the only way to ensure that you can actually be confident that all eligible businesses know about it, because you would be putting forth the message towards a certain industry. Restaurants. But just to do, like kind of a across the board, first come first serve. Find it irresponsible. One of the businesses that got this in my hometown is literally directly across the street from an identical business, like the same exact business. So if they're struggling during COVID I'm sure the other one could be too. So how do you properly One business in the same industry and not the other, what I'm saying right across the street, they're like 50 feet from each other. Same exact business. So, you know, I've been on the record with some issues with this. And I think this is something that, you know, I really believe we could find better uses for these funds.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir. Appreciate that. Um, Clerk Feaster, I think there's an iPhone that joined us. Could you find out who that is?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: User iPhone, can you please state your name for the record. It's star star six to unmute. Okay.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, I'm gonna call the I'm gonna call the vote. All those-, Yes. Legislator Levine. You had a question?

Legislator Levine: Yeah. My apologies, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted, before we, before we took a vote, I just wanted to make sure, guess, get some assurances from from the County Executive's Office regarding just, one of the things that we was mentioned on the rubric is does the project serve underserved, vulnerable populations, helped thus helping build a pathway to an equitable recovery. And I know that Legislator Sperry, you know, was was getting, was asking for the statistics on the MWBE owned businesses that were approved in the last round, and I appreciate the Executive's Office getting us that information, but 66% of the applicants, the awardees were women-owned businesses, excuse me and 13 were, 45% were minority-owned businesses. But my only question would be is there, do we have a, you know, assurances from the Executive's Office that there's going to be a stronger push to market this program and or advertise it to underserved communities to make sure that they have opportunities to, you know, put in for this funding? Thank you.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Mr. Chairman, if I might?

Chairman Criswell: Sure, yes. Please.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Yeah, I appreciate the question Legislator Levine. It's a priority for us. It was a reason for us to apply for the funding is that our priority match the state's funding in the first round, and allowed us to focus this on and provide priority to minority and women owned businesses. And so, I think you can see that that's reflected in the award breakdown. That's definitely disproportionate to our business community in the county. And so I think it represents that, that concerted effort, which we will continue to make, to make sure that those businesses that are disadvantaged to begin with, and that are disproportionately affected by the pandemic, have access to the support.

Legislator Levine: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that commitment. Deputy Executive Kelly.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you. I just, you know, Tim and I have discussed and based on the non for-profit program, I just wanted to kind of throw out there that as part of the non for profit grant program that we're doing, we are gonna have three Legislators and we're gonna have three people from, you know, it'll be myself and two other from our staff. As part of UCEDA, you already have Legislators Litts and Cahill, but they're on the approving side in terms of the contract. But Tim and I have discussed, and we've discussed it internally that we're certainly open to that type of process, similar to the non for profit, just so we have more engagement and more involvement with you guys in the Legislature.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that. I think that's appreciated. All right. Now I'm gonna call for the vote. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Opposed? Abstentions. So this passes, I do want to say that that this was a bit of a struggle. So I appreciate the flexibility on the Executive staff side and we will be passing on our notes to the Stand-, Committee, the standing committee and also to Ways and Means so that they can see what we scored and, and any other notes that we made, and we again appreciate your working with us to address the concerns that we raised about this particular funding. So, thank you. Alright, moving on to Resolution 96. Who from the Executive team can walk us through this?

Deputy Executive Rider: This one is not ours. But I think Legislator Maloney or Petite would be able to do that.

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Maloney. Thank you.

Legislator Maloney: So open up for discussion?

Chairman Criswell: Please. Can I have a motion for discussion for this?

Legislator Sperry: Motion for discussion. Motion for discussion.

Chairman Criswell: Second, please.

Legislator Corcoran: Second.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Alright. Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: Thank you. So this is, Laura and I had been talking about a different, a bit of a different approach. We see we're we're starting to check boxes and looks like close to half the money is gone. And I'm just concerned that we're not going to have quantifiable, provable effects 20 or 30 years from now. And that's okay to have, you know, to have different buckets, as we say. So this is a little confusing the way this had to be written. And I put it in as more of a food for thought. I didn't know if any other Legislators would like to use this approach and add different things that different towns could do, but the way I see it, and I'm and I look forward to talking about this, and obviously, I didn't think I'd have any plans on this being voted on. So I agree. I think we need to go through this over the next month. And I hope to have it vote ready by next month with everybody's input. So whether it gets voted up or down, we have, we have the best Resolution we can. So it went in saying something like 22 million. That was just 22 towns, a million dollars each to go, to go high. I actually think and I'll be talking to Legislators and the Exec's team to see what what they think. I thought it would be appropriate to, and let me first explain what it is. It's a matching funds for water infrastructure. If we're going to put ARPA funds into water infrastructure, which I really believe we should it's the top of my priority list. We're really going to have to work with the municipalities who are much more in the water business. For example, out in Saugerties right now we have three projects that are going, they've already kind of come to the town looking for some help, which I think you get a little uncomfortable one town is going to get something that another town's not so I like the idea of opening up for all towns. It may even motivate some of these different municipalities to take their ARPA funds and do something water infrastructure, maybe it's something better than they were going to do and if they knew they were getting two to one on their money they might. Right in Saugerties right now, we have three projects that are starting one in particular has gotten some help from Senator Hinchey. And they're still a couple \$100,000 short, they have some real issues in Mount Marion. This is a bring in municipal water a little further, a firehouse will get it, 15 residences. There's some real issues out Mount Marion, when you talk to the people out there, it's actually Dean Fabriano's district. It borders mine, but it's part of the Town of Saugerties. And there are people that don't even like to shower in the water, no less they can't drink. There's a lot of talk of cancer clusters, they think it's the water. Getting municipal water further into Mount Marion is a big deal for Saugerties. And we may not have the money to do some of these things. There's two other projects that I talked to Supervisor Costello about that he thought if he was able, if a program like this was start done, he might be able to get all three of those projects done. Real water infrastructure, whether it's equipment, water lines. Esopus and the City of Kingston have some real issues. Lines, clean water lines need to be ripped up and redone. Municipal expansion. This is you know, real water, clean water infrastructure. So the way I see it, and I'll be

talking to everyone about it, but it's food for thought, how do you fairly do it with so many towns, different sized, some towns, you know, I talked to the Supervisor Baden the other day, they don't have municipal water, this is not something for him. So this is, some towns are not going to even apply. Right now there's nine towns in the county that have I mean, just to do it by population, nine towns of 10,000 residents, three have over 15,000, eight have five to 10, two have less than 5,000 and three have less than 1,000. If we broke it down and said 750,000 in matching funds, there'd be an application process, I would need the Executive's help. This would be day to day operations where they come in and help write the criteria and come up with the application process. If you did 750, up to 750 for the three towns that have, or municipalities because the City Kingston, have over 15,000 residents. 500,000 offered to the six that have 10,000 plus, the eight that have five to 10,000 residents, 250. Then you go down to 100 and then 50,000 for the, the Town of Kingston, and Denning, that'd be a total of seven and a half million dollars. So, I look at this as kind of being up to \$8 million, but many of these Towns are not going to apply. Some would, I would, I already know mine would. And do really valuable things with it. We could end up spending probably between 2 million and 8 million. And what you'd get is some, some really good shared-service projects that ensure that we do some, some real water infrastructure. But it's not something the county when we see that box to check water infrastructure, it's not something the county can just go do. It's gonna have to be some kind of a matching funds or I mean, whether it was matching funds or not, I thought matching funds was an interesting way to do it. But I'm open to suggestions. This is a work in progress, but progress that I hoped to get my my colleagues' opinion on and get something in that I hope to get 12 votes out of and put it in. I don't know if there's any other questions I could answer.

Chairman Criswell: I had a question about matching things is have you done? Have you done any research on potential matching funds from state? I don't know how that would work? Is there any state funding for anything like this?

Legislator Maloney: That would probably be up to the municipality on the project. Right now, like I said, Saugerties has \$300,000 coming from the state right now. And they have they have a certain amount of money, and they're already in the process of asking Ulster County for a couple 100,000 to make sure this, this project happens. So that, it was nice timing when I talked to the Supervisor today, I said, well, and I described what happened, he went "oh, well we have two other projects that we really want to do. We're trying to spend some a lot of our ARPA funds on water infrastructure, but if, if, you know, we could really do some things if I had a little more."

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Committee. Any committee members have any questions for Legislator Maloney?

Legislator Lopez: Yeah, I got a quick question. Are you talking about matching funds? I think that's something that you really have to clarify. Because if you're going to sell this thing, as a potential matching fund, you can't do it and have, and not know exactly where those matching funds are gonna come from. Like, if it's coming from ARP that that's one thing, if it's coming from the County, that's another thing. But if we move forward with something like this, it can't be like, alright, well, matching funds is a possibility but you know, you're kind of on your own to look exactly where those matching funds are coming from, whether they're gonna come from the State or our, you know, whatever it might be.

Legislator Maloney: Our ARPA funds. No, we're in the ARPA committee. It's coming from our ARPA funds. Unless I'm misunderstanding the question.

Legislator Lopez: No, no, that the matching funds, matching funds, so I... in addition it's...

Legislator Maloney: Their money. It's the municipalities.

Legislator Lopez: Okay. So...

Legislator Maloney: Wherever they, yes, it would be in there. If they have, we have a not to exceed. So the project, they come with a project, I, we can talk, that, that's something we can talk about. I'm not concerned whether it's Saugerties taxpayer funded 100%, or whether like I said, they get money from, but they come with a certain amount of, of money for the project. And we would match it up to. So if they had...

Legislator Lopez: Gotcha.

Legislator Maloney: ... a \$1.2 million project, however they get the money, we'd be, we would be giving \$600,000 in ARPA funds.

Legislator Lopez: Understood.

Legislator Maloney: And like I said, there's language to this, this is, this is, that, that's where, and this is another thing I really like about this. This is a policy approach strategy. That's the legislative side. And then operations comes in. And they are going to be a big part of, this is what I mean, this is what we just approved with the last one. There's these criterias and an application process. That would be Marc and his team handling that.

Legislator Lopez: Got it. Thank you.

Legislator Maloney: Legislator Uchitelle.

Legislator Uchitelle: Yeah, I might have missed it. And I apologize if I did. But I'm, I am not sure what the connection is to COVID in terms of the resiliency of disproportionately impacted communities or specific COVID response.

Legislator Maloney: Oh, no. This is water infrastructure. I was under the impression that ARPA funds could be used on water infrastructure.

Legislator Uchitelle: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Criswell: All right. Thank you so much, Legislator Maloney. Um, what I'm going to suggest is that we take a little more time with this, we formulate some questions. Can Legislators reach out to you directly, sir?

Legislator Maloney: Yes, I was going to send out some basic questions to the legislature, you know, if they had any, you know, different ideas on how to break down the numbers as far as what we offer each town I thought an easy way was population. It's pretty generally a representation of the amount of municipal water and water projects that you would have from a municipal standpoint. But you have questions like that I'll read something out. But anybody that has anything, of course.

Chairman Criswell: Can I ask, have you seen our scoring rubric that we're using?

Legislator Maloney: I took a look. Yeah.

Chairman Criswell: So, so may I suggest that you actually take a deep look at that and weigh your resolution against those questions, because that's actually what we're gonna do. That would help us out, actually, it would give us a little leg up. If you could help us out with that. That would be, that'd be great.

Legislator Maloney: Okay. I mean it's...

Chairman Criswell: Alright. I'd like to move this along then. Thank you. Um, so it looks like we can block 97 and 98. Is that correct? Those two are, are connected to each other as one is the contract? Yes. So do I have a motion to block 97 and 98, please?

Legislator Lopez: I'll move to block.

Chairman Criswell: And a second please?

Legislator Corcoran: Second.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. And do I have a motion for discussion for block?

Legislator Corcoran: Motion.

Legislator Lopez: Second.

Chairman Criswell: And a second? Somebody chime in and then we can vote on this and move on.

Legislator Corcoran: Lopez did. Lopez is it.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Thank you, Craig. Appreciate that. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Great, okay. Alright, so to speak to this, this grouping of resolutions.

Deputy Executive Kelly: So, I'm going to introduce, I believe Peter Karis is going to do a presentation from Open Space Institute. And I know we have some other members from the supervisors of the affected municipalities who may also want to speak but at this point, I'll turn it over to Peter if that's okay.

Chairman Criswell: Absolutely, thank you.

Deputy Executive Kelly: All right. Here you go.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Thank you, and thank you to the committee for hosting me, I'm just gonna share my screen or I need permission to share my screen looks like.

Chairman Criswell: I think we can do that.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Okay.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Give me just a second.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Okay.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Okay, please see if that worked. Thank you.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: How's that? Can everybody see? Everybody can see me now?

Group: Yes.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Oh, good. Well, good evening, and thank you, to the committee for hosting me. And I'm going to try and be brief and not have anybody do any math from this point. So, I'm Peter Karis and I'm Vice President for Parks and Stewardship at Open Space Institute. I'm very happy to be here to give you a brief presentation regarding OSI's proposal to partner with Ulster County and several of its communities on the renovation of three very active but degraded sections of the Wallkill Valley and D&H / O&W Rail Trails and answer any questions on the proposal that you may have. This picture on the opening slide's actually of one of the projects, just south of an Accord, showing a rock cut with some, some severe degradation. And on the left of this opening slide are the beneficiary municipalities for the three projects we're talking about. Um... For those of you who may not be less familiar with OSI were a long standing regional nonprofit land conservation organization and our mission is described here. We have a deep history of working with government and community groups in the pursuit of land and community conservation, and public access and outdoor recreational projects. We carry out our mission through specialized programs, as noted here, with my focus being on the last: parks and trails. In Ulster County, OSI has been working for over 30 years focusing on expanding parks, trail conductivity, and public access. And I'm sure most of you have interfaced

with some of our more prominent projects, with our most recent addition shown here, the Lake Minnewaska Visitor Center, which opened at the height of COVID in October of 2020. And if you can imagine flush bathrooms at Minnewaska it's now a thing at the new visitor center. These projects listed here represent over \$10 million of capital investment made by OSI through the support of our generous donors and partners. More broadly in the region, OSI is putting more of a focus on Greenway Trails, and the vision of a completed multi use trail network from the Catskills to the Hudson to Delaware. When completed at over 250 miles, it will be the largest feeder trail network into the Empire State Trail. So why focus on Greenway Trails? Well, organizationally, they're really at the nexus of our strengths in direct land acquisition, planning and design, community outreach, and public private partnerships. But in plain terms, they deliver our mission and benefit the public on every level, from public health, quality of life, safety and equity, accessibility, conductivity and transportation choices, positive economic activity to community pride. Even more simply put, people want trails and access to trails close to their home. And during the pandemic, these Greenway spaces provided much needed respite to a weary republic. Look no further than also County's own 2020 State of the Trails Report published by the Ulster County Trails Advisory Committee, which logs and quantifies the value of these special resources. But like many stretches of these old rail beds, the trails need work, from vegetation maintenance to clearance of drainage, to tread repair and resurfacing and safe passage, welcoming trail heads, and signage. To this end, we've identified. I'm sorry, I'll go back one... we've identified three essentially ready to go projects that would have enormous positive impacts on several host county communities. I'll describe those now.

Project Number one is the Walker Valley Rail Trail. The section from New Paltz to Gardiner. It's 5.4 or five miles in length owned by the Town, Village, the Town of New Paltz to Village New Paltz, and the Town of Gardiner, with management by the Walker Valley Land Trust. Their funding request for this project is \$895,000. And this funding would leverage over 2 million already invested in the Wallkill by OSI over the past two years in the northern 13 miles from Kingston all the way through the Village of New Paltz.

Project Number two is the D&H / O&W Rail Trail. From Accord to Kerhonkson. This 3.2-mile section is owned and managed by the Town of Rochester. And it touches the tip of the Town of Wawarsing in Kerhonkson. The funding request for this project is 565,000. And it broken down as the committee will see below.

Project Number three is it also the D&H / O&W Rail Trail stretching from the North side of Ellen, from Ellenville North to the Eastern Correctional Facility. This two-mile stretch is owned and managed by the Town of Wawarsing and the Village of Ellenville. The funding request of about \$640,000.

Division of the proposed funding for the three described projects is shown here. As you'll see, the vast, vast majority of the funding will be used for physical trail improvements with engineering and project management costs contained. And two additional important points shown in this slide: OSI is proposing to contribute \$95,000 of in-kind project management services. So, we also have a financial interest in delivering these projects. And these projects will not happen at least anytime soon without the County's financial support. We've also included

some preliminary schedule for the three projects, with projects one and two happening simultaneously and first, this year, if possible, and project three about a half year behind.

To give everyone a sense of the scale and type of improvements we're talking about, here are some examples from our recent work on the Northern Valley Rail Trail. With restorations of the existing trail alignment, we constructed new trail alignments as required, created safe passage across new bridges and roads. All of this will be included in the three proposed projects. Greenway Trails have proven they provide huge public health benefits, often result and economic revitalization, are accessible and equitable spaces to all, and just plain fun to run, walk, run and ride a bike. But I can tell you from experience, this takes strong partnerships to see these projects through. And in that vein, I'm joined tonight with four of our project partners in this proposal: Supervisor Neil Bettez from New Paltz, Supervisor Marybeth Majestic from Gardiner, Supervisor Terry Houck from Wawarsing, and Supervisor Mike Baden from Rochester, who each would like to offer a few short but supportive comments on how this ARPA funding deployed as proposed would directly help their communities recover from the pandemic. So first, I'll ask Mr. Bettez, Neil, if you could take a moment to speak.

Town of New Paltz Supervisor Neil Bettez: Thanks, Peter. I appreciate the presentation. So, as Peter pointed out, New Paltz, and, among, among others, is, would be a direct benefit of these funds. You know, on one level, that's true. But I also before I get to that, I want to point out that dismisses the point to some extent, these trails are a significant economic benefit to the whole county. It's not all that different than the Ashokan Rail Trail. You know, historically, you know, when we just had the Walker Valley Rail Trail here, you'd go and it was all it was a lot of local people. But in the last two years, I think since the Ashokan has opened, and the Empire State Trail has come through any weekend, you see lots of cars with out of state plates, with bike racks, people go to the Poughkeepsie train station, there are people getting off the train every single day, with bikes, they hop on the Walkway Over The Hudson, and then they come here, they stay here, they shop here, they spend money, they support local businesses, they tend to focus on, you know, where the trails are in a little bit better condition. So, I think it'd be important to, to make that connection to Gardiner so we can spread some of those economic benefits around. And Rochester as well. I think, um, you know, a big part of it is, you know, we're getting this critical mass where there are, you know, it's not just like the rail trail, it's local, there are people that they know, well, like, all the EST is there. And, you know, we're a draw now from people from all over. And so, you know, so I've served on the Ulster County Transportation Committee for a couple of years now, you know, we spend millions of dollars a year on infrastructure- mainly roads. I think it's about time, we embrace, I think what's going to be a big part of our future here in Ulster County, which are these trails.

So, in addition to the economic benefits, you know, there's environmental benefits, social benefits, and health benefits. The environmental benefits, that's pretty obvious. The people get, you get people out of their cars, and you get them walking and riding their bikes. That's the best way to address greenhouse gas emissions, motor vehicles are the largest source locally for the area that we live in. The next is, you know, social and health benefits, you know, getting people out walking is important. You know, I went out today. It was a beautiful day. So, yeah, people get out, but guess where they were, they were on the trails. And there are more people on the trails that, you know, we're lucky here in New Paltz. We have some sections that are just updated

by OSI and some that aren't. People are on the updated sections, because they're safer, especially people with, with different abilities, seniors, people that may be maybe have kids in strollers, if you're a little unsure of your footing. And I think it's, you know, equitable, that we have safe places for everyone with different abilities and different ages to walk. You know, and just kind of the final thing I want to say is the trails over the last two years, they've made all the difference. You know, I've, I've had at least one person tell me, they would not have made it through the last two years without these trails. So yeah, it's fun, on a nice day, we all go out. But I think that they're really important from a, from a mental health perspective. And it, lots of studies have shown just getting people out walking even 10 minutes a day has a huge impact and having safe places where people can do that. Kids, seniors, that's what makes Town's livable. So that's kind of all I have to say. Thank you.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Thanks, Neil. Supervisor Majestic please. You're on mute Marybeth.

Town of Gardiner Supervisor Marybeth Majestic: Okay, um, hi everybody. So, um, Neil kind of covered all the bases. He makes it a tough act to follow. But um, I would just like to share with everybody that the trails are available to everybody. You know, all you need is your shoes, and a willingness to go out and enjoy them. I recently relocated into the Hamlet of Gardiner, and I have been walking. I don't use my car very often. It's a wonderful thing. I can walk to the Town Hall in five minutes. And I've been walking on the trails, and I meet so many people, as Neil said, from different states, different towns. And they've come here because they've heard of how beautiful the trails are. I mean, out by Forest Glen Road, you can walk. And you might even think you're in England. There are sheep there in the pastures and the mountain in the background. It's an incredible draw. It's an economic benefit. It's a health benefit. It's a wellness benefit for all of our community members and our visitors. And it would mean a lot to the people in Gardiner to have our section upgraded. We're recently working on updating our comprehensive plan. And we've had people comment on how great it would be if our Rail Trail was improved, like they are in other Towns. So, I don't want to take up much of your time. Your meetings are long, I'm sure. I thank you for the opportunity to speak. Thank you, Peter. And thank you for everybody serving.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Thanks Marybeth. Supervisor Houck from Wawarsing.

Town of Wawarsing Supervisor Terry Houck: Good evening. Nice to be on this meeting. And I like to thank Bob Vanderburgh and Peter Karis over the years of working with the Town of Wawarsing, as well as the entire state. There is, as Neil said, there is a significant benefit the, you know, to the whole County with the Rail Trails, and we are kind of segmented down here. But the state is in the process of revising the carriage trail that goes from Minnewaska down to the base of the Village of Ellenville off of Berme Road Park. Some of this money that is direct is that the 600 and some thousand that Peter mentioned, is going to apply or be applied to the area from the Berme Road Park across the creek up to O&W and up through the Eastern Correctional Facility which took a few years to get an easement with. A lot of it's been done, but this is going to make it into a real viable Rail Trail. And then from there, OSI has also worked with us on Foordmore Road. We're in the process right now working with Central Hudson, which has taken a while to do that. But then we'll be on our way to the convention connecting to the Town of

Rochester. So, I think this is coming at a great time. These, these funds and as the gentlemen started to say in the beginning is without these funds, it's pretty difficult to get these things done. And the overall goal of doing the entire 28 miles, you know O&W Rail Trail in Ulster County is super important. It's important to the entire county and the regions. The Town of Wawarsing, you know has a proposal, a company from the Bronx, Somerset Partners that has proposing a \$400 million project at the Nevele. They're going to reinvent the Nevele Falls with spa facilities and going all the way up to route 52. They're going to do a boutique hotel, 45 to 55 single family homes, which is very nice property taxes and sales tax, and the farm to table use of the property. So, it's kind of plays right into the outdoors that we're all talking about and the purpose of this meeting. So, from that point, that's what I have to say right now. But thank you again for this consideration and it's very much needed and for the Town of Wawarsing it's coming at a very good time.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Good. Thanks, Terry. And my closer Supervisor Baden from Rochester.

Town of Rochester Supervisor Mike Baden: Good evening, thank you very much for having us here tonight. This particular section of the O&W Trail from Accord to Kerhonkson is really, really important in that it is, the majority of it is on the original area of the original D&H Canal. We, we get quite a few visitors, some people for recreation, we get a lot of people who, who travel this area for historical information. They are very happy to be able to walk that area. Just last year, our Town Historic Preservation Commission held two events. One was coincided with National Trail Day where we had the O&W Arts, Ash Tree Arts Festival, where we had cut down some very badly in danger of falling ash trees and left a portion of them and a significant number of artists came and created art using these ash trees and they still remain. Our goal was to have that again this year. We also in the fall, we had a, a canal day, where we had people telling stories of the canals, Jack Schoonmaker, the patriarch of the Schoonmaker family, told stories about his family's use of the canal. And all this happens because of the trail. So, we have some significant areas that need improvement in drainage, in culvert work. What this funding will do is help us to be able to do that. It will help us with the surface of the trail. It will help us move toward closing up the, what I call the two-mile gap in Accord of the trail. And that gap is the result of land that over the years was turned over to private ownership sadly, back many decades ago, but we need to move forward with trying to resolve that now. While this portion of the trail is not going to deal with that, any improvements we do now will set us up to be able to apply for grants in the future. And so, we thank you for your assistance. We thank OSI. They've been great stewards of the land in Ulster County and in the Town of Rochester. And thank you for your consideration on this.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Good. Good. Thanks, Mike. Well, in closing, OSI is very excited for the opportunity to partner with the County and its residents in this meaningful way. And to bring our thoughtfulness and expertise to the table. We hope that you all see the value in these, these trails bring. And that these projects can become a catalyst for more investment, and a place that we can show others how to get projects done. So, thanks for giving me, us the time to present. We really appreciate it. And I'm happy to answer any questions as best as I can.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much for that thoughtful presentation. Really appreciate that. I'd like to ask committee members if they have any questions. Any committee members?

Legislator Sperry: Thank you for the presentation. I thought it was great. Just wanted to say that.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much. I'll open it up to anybody else who has any questions or comments on this? Legislator Walter, I see you.

Legislator Walter: Thank you for seeing me. Um, so this question may be more for our Executive team. But, you know, I'm wondering about what we do about access to these trails for both our residents that don't have transportation, driving and people who come from other places who are arriving by bus or train. I, you know, I've heard some concerns, especially from our Legislator out in Ellenville, who talks about the challenge of individual, individuals to get to Sam's point. And so, have you contemplated a model if this is the County partnership with OSI that actually incorporates transportation to these trails? Or could you, or would you?

Chairman Criswell: Deputy, Deputy Executive Kelly. Yes.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah. So, I guess, yes, definitely. We are, you know, we would certainly consider other types of weekend express routes. Right now, we are working on a Route 28 one with UCAT. So, we can do a Friday, Saturday, Sunday with seven buses with the bike carriers and everything on it for this type of purpose. We're also engaged in a kind of a round one mark, right? In terms of micro-transit, potential grant opportunity. So that would be another way just to kind of, yeah, I guess, provide more transportation to like, I know the Sam's Point area. I know, some of the other southern parts of the county are off the traditional UCAT routes. But we're certainly open to engaging in that and working with everybody.

Town of New Paltz Supervisor Neil Bettez: And I'll say that right now, you can take UCAT from Poughkeepsie to New Paltz with your bike on there. People do it all the time, and I know people that have commuted from, you know, Kingston to New Paltz one way by bus and then they ride the other way back home or reverse. Right? So, there's, I mean, yeah, I think it's important to improve it in other areas. Everyone should have that. But right now, I know people that currently, they bus one way and bike the other way. So, the other thing I didn't talk about is that I think it's really important to think that the sum of these trails is much greater than the parts. As, as we get this critical mass of trails, you know, if you include Mohawk and Minnewaska, there's already 100 miles of trails there. People are coming from all over the world. I mean, I've been to the Hampton Inn in New Paltz, and someone's walking out of the room with their bike, and they're like no, I came here just for the trails. Right? I think we were on the edge of being known as a real destination. I mean, we're, we've been in the New York Times, and things like that. And so, I'd like to keep building on, on our success. So, thanks.

Deputy Executive Rider: The only thing, If I could just add, Chris brought up the micro-transit. I mean, one of the areas that we're looking at for that micro-transit is the Ellenville area. So, I think, you know, there will be added access, hopefully, to the trails, there.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: This might be more of an economic development thing, but I think another part of it is to get people off the trails and into the communities. And to point them in the direction of Main Street, downtown restaurants, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. So I'm not really sure if this is something that we need to talk more about an economic development, or if Mr. Kelly's gonna start something and finish my sentence. But I love cycling, and I love cycling on the trails, especially since I'm not riding on the streets since I had an accident. But I worked with Jen Metzger and Rosendale when I was on the Rosendale Economic Development Commission, to write a grant to get signage to get people off the trestle, because nobody, people were coming through, and they had no idea how to get from the trestle to Main Street. And now that those signs are there, people know where to park, they know how to get into town. And I think that it would be super helpful for the communities. So that's definitely a conversation that I think we should continue having.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Further questions or comments?

Deputy Executive Kelly: I just, I just wanted to touch on that real quick, if I may, Chairman. Yeah. So, I'll be brief. But yeah, 100%. And I've done work in that respect, when I used to work for the state. And on, we, we own the walkway for the agency I worked for. So, the Wayfinding and the gateway type of signage that allows you to get into the Hamlet's or into the villages is extremely important. I actually have a conversation with that next week with some of the supervisors. So, I'm certainly 100% wanting to engage in that with anybody that's willing. So yeah. Thank you for bringing that up. That is very important.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. So, I'm going to move us along. The committee is going to take some time to formulate questions. Deputy Executive Kelly, can we route those questions to you?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah. 100%.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Thank you very much, everyone, appreciate your time tonight.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for those presentations. Really appreciate that. Thank you. All right. Moving on. I would like to block Resolution 99 and 100. Can I have a motion to block?

Legislator Sperry: Motion to block.

Chairman Criswell: Second?

Legislator Levine: Mr. Chairman, is that, is that mis-, Is that 99 and 101?

Chairman Criswell: Yes, sorry. Yes. 99 and 101. Thank you very much Legislator Levine. 99 and 101. Do I have a second on that block?

Legislator Lopez: I'll second it.

Chairman Criswell: Great. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: And a motion to, for discussion?

Legislator Sperry: Motion to discuss.

Legislator Levine: Second.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. And all in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you. All right, who from the Exec team would like to speak to this? Deputy Executive Rider. Thank you.

Deputy Executive Rider: Sure. And I apologize for the lateness of the, the memo but I think it was sent out through Amber. I saw it in the backup so that, that should probably help answer many of the questions, but we're really excited about this project. For those of you who don't have a background, Elizabeth Manor was a boarding house in the city of Kingston up until about two years ago when there was a fire there. It has since been vacant. It housed about somewhere in the 30 individuals range when it was a boarding house, and the, the owners never basically, you know they didn't really renovate from the fire, and they haven't opened it back up. They just recently put it up for sale. We negotiated the price down and made an offer contingent upon you all approving it of \$700,000. We will transform and renovate the project. We have a, we have an idea on, on the future use but we are not tied into any specific use. I think with the adjacency to the school, there's a real opportunity to use it as a shelter for, for families. But we're open to depending on you know, when we bring in an architect on what would make the most sense for the units. We've had DPW come through, give us an estimate on renovations. I know the Mayor is requesting from the Common Council for them to allocate some of their ARP funds for this project. So, they want to be partner. The 700,000 that we're requested right now be allocated from ARP is for just the acquisition. There's about a million dollars in other funds for renovation, 500,000 from the city. This is potentially a SAM project. New York State Senator Michelle Hinchey is gonna submit that. That would be another 100,000 in funding would leave us up to 500,000 in Capital Project that would be funded through bonds. We believe that as operated as a shelter, or, you know, for other families or individuals, basically the per diems that we pay for shelters would offset the operating costs. We plan on doing an RFP. We've already talked to some of the partners in those fields like a Family of Woodstock, a Catholic Charities, RUPCO, Gateway, they would be the proposers on the RFP separately. There is interest in having somebody operating this as a shelter.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you. Committee members questions? Yes, Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: I just google imaged 31 Elizabeth, 21 Elizabeth Street, right?

Deputy Executive Rider: Correct.

Legislator Sperry: It, does it go, Is it the full block? This is, does it go all the way back to the next... I'm just looking at it trying to figure out how big the, I know, you said it was 35. Is it 35 rooms? Is that what it was?

Deputy Executive Rider: Yeah. I mean, it has a commercial kitchen. It has some shared space. Although we would add a little bit more. I'm trying to pull up the exact, you're looking for kind of square footage?

Legislator Sperry: Kind of and also, I'm just trying to, because what I'm looking at, it looks like a house with a white picket fence. I'm just thinking parking, if we have multiple people, you know, that kind of, those logistics.

Deputy Executive Rider: Yeah. So, if you're on a Google image, I mean, on the right-hand side of the building, there's a driveway that goes back to a very large parking lot. The building itself abuts up to George Washington School.

Legislator Sperry: Got it. That's what I see in the background. Right?

Deputy Executive Rider: Correct.

Legislator Sperry: Okay.

Chairman Criswell: Yes, Legislator Lopez.

Legislator Lopez: Yeah, forgive me if you had mentioned this, but um, that, the market value. Are there comps that justify that market value? That, that 700,000?

Deputy Executive Rider: Yes. And it was listed on the open market at 725.

Chairman Criswell: Did you mention something just about an environmental review?

Deputy Executive Rider: Planning has done the, the necessary SEQR and it's, it's in the Resolution.

Chairman Criswell: Okay.

Legislator Lopez: And of course, that always includes like an asbestos abatement. What years, what, what year was this built?

Deputy Executive Rider: So our offer was contingent, not on just Legislative approval, but also further, I mean, so when I, when, when Peter, when you said environmental review, I was thinking SEQR, but we are doing structural analysis, environmental analysis, we have been provided, I think DPW or will be with any, they, there was asbestos inspections, lead inspections,

that kind of work done by the realtor. You know, the previous owner. So those documents we will have, and we've asked for a 90-day due diligence, which will include all of that work.

Chairman Criswell: Great. Any other committee members have questions? Yes, Legislator Levine.

Legislator Levine: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was wondering if Deputy Executive Rider will just have any offhand information regarding for this, for this property, how many proposed beds might be available? And I know he had mentioned something about potentially having it catered more towards families due to location. So how many? How many families and beds would this be able to serve?

Deputy Executive Rider: Yeah, so without a full renovation, we believe that it, it'll be able to serve somewhere between 27 to 35 individuals, which will, that'll be about 10, roughly about 10 families that we currently send to motel rooms. Family Inn does not have, you know, a large capacity. So oftentimes, we end up, this is for if we go the route of emergency housing and like a shelter, we send individuals out to different various motel rooms. I know. Comptroller Gallagher did a report on this. Oftentimes, we can't find motels in the Kingston area. We have many families that go to Kingston schools, that we are responsible to transport. Oftentimes out to Rochester, Accord, even Greene County. It's not ideal. The locations of the motels are not the greatest as far as access to services, and other transportation. So, we believe this would take 10 families that would normally be served out of the Kingston's school district and have them housed right here, saving both ourselves and the school district transportation costs.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you.

Legislator Levine: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Any other Legislators have questions? Legislator Petit.

Legislator Petit: Thank you. I gotta see if I can get my hand down later. I am. I'm glad to see that. You know, it's going to be made larger. This, this particular building didn't have the best reputation. It was for single individuals. It was temporary emergency housing. And it was located right next to an elementary school. But I'm not sure about how it addresses our housing problem. It seems more like a band-aid and we'd be getting into legacy costs which we would have to address at future budgets. If, if this was permanent, and these families could move in and permanently rent, which I know the County is not a landlord, and that's where we'd have to look at either our LDC or Ulster County Land bank, land trust. And I have the same concerns about the one on Washington Avenue. I think we should be looking at permanent units and, you know, a permanent way to manage them. So, have we taken a look at the legacy costs? As far as the RFP and continued upkeep of units that you know, I've been a landlord, and you may be surprised at what happens to some of these units after they've lived in for a while.

Deputy Executive Rider: Yeah, so we have evaluated that. We requested some initial, just budgetary numbers from one of the partners who would potentially also, you know, respond to an RFP. We believe that as a emergency shelter if we decided to go that route and the finances

being one of the reasons why we would do that. That the state per diem cost which for families is picked up 100% by the state. There's no county share, unlike for individuals, where the county picks up 70% through Safety Net, that the, the per diem cost for shelter would offset the operating costs, including maintenance for the facility and it would include services as well. And so, what we've seen is when we place individuals or families in shelter type systems as opposed to motels, they find permanent housing much quicker than, than when we put them in motels. Also, you know, I agree with you that there is a real need for permanent housing. I think next month we'll come to you for ARP funds for demolishing the, the old county jail, where we have a project that will have 160 affordable housing units. We're working with the Quality Inn for permanent units. There are other projects coming down the pipe that we believe will expand. So, we hear you when it comes to affordable permanent housing. Emergency housing is also in need.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Comptroller Gallagher.

Comptroller Gallagher: May I just ask a question about how long the property has been vacant?

Deputy Executive Rider: For about two years, I believe.

Comptroller Gallagher: And is it zoned for this use?

Deputy Executive Rider: It is currently not zoned for, depending on what we would use it for, I think it had a special permit for boarding house. Again, it's a lot different zoning regulations when it's the County owning it. It's, Dennis could tell you for hours about the balance of public interest test versus a normal zoning issue. So, it's, it's normally a much easier process with the County. I will say with the City being a partner on this project. I don't anticipate any issues.

Comptroller Gallagher: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Do you have any sense of neighbors' reactions to transforming this building into what you're talking about?

Deputy Executive Rider: I will say that, from my perspective, what our plans are for this building compared to what it was in the past is going to be night and day. I have had conversations with Dr. Pat Aleena, the Superintendent of the Kingston School District and he was excited about the project as well.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Anybody else have any questions about this project right now? Legislator Nolan.

Deputy Executive Rider: Legislator Nolan has her hand up.

Legislator Nolan: Yeah, thank you, Chair Criswell. I, a, Deputy Rider covered most of what I wanted to say. But I just want to emphasize the fact that emergency housing for families like this is always going to need to be part of our housing package. And as we're putting together, how we address the housing shortage, this is a critical component. And I've seen the difference. When I,

when I was working in clinics, in other cities, families that could be housed in a really nice temporary situation where the kids were able to stay in school and just a whole host of things work so much better. So, I'm just very excited about this particular transition for that, this property. Appreciate you letting me say so.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that input. Legislator Uchitelle.

Legislator Uchitelle: Yeah, I was just gonna say something similar along the lines of the, the funding availability at the state level, being so heavily weighted towards emergency housing, I think it's something that has to be addressed at the state level. I really want to see proposals in the future as best as we can for permanent housing. And I hope that down the road that we can see that but in terms of what we're able to do, and what we're able to, what we have to consider in terms of the taxpayers as well, I just want to say thank you for bringing us this far on this. And I'm really encouraged that we'll be able to bring it across the finish line. This is one of the types of calls that I get from constituents about you know, losing their, their home, because of you know, the neighbor has bedbugs and the whole thing is condemned, or you know, whatever. There's, there's, you know, I know there has been eviction moratorium, but there are a lot of other ways that you can lose your home. And families in particular have been the ones that are ending up in Greene County and are ending up, you know, very, very far away, because it's not just the, the housing pressure, it's also pressure on the hotels, which just aren't participating in the emergency housing programs. And that's why a family ends up in Greene County, because you just, there isn't availability here. And it's heartbreaking. They're trying to get, you know, their feet back under them, and they are ripped out of their community. So thank you, and I'm really excited about this proposal.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you so much. Yes, Deputy Executive Rider.

Deputy Executive Rider: If I could just add one, one point to that and forgive me I don't have the exact numbers. But you know, we pay a per diem for motels. I think it's average, like \$70 a day per person. For a shelter, it's, it's 105, 111, somewhere in there, which again, allows us to provide these further services. Speaking to what Legislator Uchitelle just brought up. I mean, the state pays something like 470-ish a month for permanent housing. So, multiply those numbers. And I mean, it's not even a week at the motel. And that covers basically the whole month. So, it's just, we don't get the support on the state for the permanent housing. We would love to come to you with all permanent. I mean, I think people deserve permanent housing. Right? Not emergency housing, not transitional housing. They deserve permanent housing. The funding that we have to work within are the bounds of the state and federal government.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you. Marc, can we route all questions to you?

Deputy Executive Rider: Sure.

Chairman Criswell: Excellent. Great, thank you very much. Is there any new business committee members? Any old business we need to take care of? I think we're probably in good shape here. All right. I'm gonna call for a motion to adjourn.

Legislator Lopez: So, moved.

Chairman Criswell: Second, please.

Legislator Sperry: Second.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Great. Thank you again for your focused attention, appreciate it. And we'll send you out the dates and see you at the next meeting. Thank you all. Take care.

Legislator Lopez: Thank you.

Deputy Executive Rider: Good night, everybody.

Legislator Sperry: Goodnight.

Legislator Levine: Goodnight, everyone. Thank you.

Legislator Nolan: Thank you.

Time: 7:02 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster

Minutes Approved: March 30, 2022