

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

DATE & TIME: March 9, 2022 – 5:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID: 889 2420 1764
PRESIDING OFFICER: Peter Criswell, Chairman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Amber Feaster
PRESENT: Legislators Thomas Corcoran, Jr., Aaron J. Levine, Craig V. Lopez, and Megan Sperry; and Legislative Chair Tracey Bartels
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Phil Erner, Manna Jo Greene, Chris Hewitt, Joe Maloney, Kathy Nolan, and Laura Petit; Deputy County Executives Chris Kelly, and Marc Rider; Comptroller March Gallagher; Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco; Sam Sonenberg, Office of the Comptroller; Finance Department, ARP Administration Nathan Litwin, Ashley Long, and Molly Scott; Ulster County Trails Advisory Committee, Kevin Smith; Open Space Institute, Peter Karis, Karl Beard, National Park Service; Supervisor of the Town of Shawangunk John Valk

- **Chairman Criswell called the meeting to order at 5:09 PM**

Chairman Criswell welcomed all to the meeting. Deputy Clerk Feaster took role. Chairman Criswell turned Committee members’ attention to the Legislature’s ARPA Priorities List, reading the top 10 priorities. Legislative Chair Bartels suggested using Infrastructure funds for Broadband rather than ARPA funds. Legislator Nolan noted that the list is not restrictive or finite. Legislative Chair Bartels informed Committee members that she may seek to put the top priority, a County land bank, into Resolution form next month. Legislator Sperry reminded Committee members that funding must be consistent with the intend of the ARPA guidelines, even when the Revenue Loss Provision is exercised. Discussion pursued on the Legislature’s Priority List, including the depth at which projects were presented, the response rate, and the potential to add a financial impact for each proposal.

Motion No. 1: To block Resolutions No. 99 and 101

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

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry; and Legislative Chair Bartels

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Motion No. 2: 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; and Legislative Chair Bartels

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Discussion: Deputy Clerk Feaster announced the Committee’s average scores and feedback for the proposed project. Discussion pursued on liens, the amount of back taxes due, and information circulated prior to the meeting.

Motion No. 3: To amend Resolution No. 99 to add a Resolve that states any outstanding liens will be satisfied before purchase:

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Criswell

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry; and
Legislative Chair Bartels

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 4: To approve 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), **as Amended**

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 Bartels
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Criswell

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry; and
Legislative Chair Bartels

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6
No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 5: 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 Lopez
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Petite

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry; and Legislative Chair Bartels

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Discussion: Legislator Petit offered an amendment to the Resolution which adds “and sewer”, making the Resolution applicable to water and sewer infrastructure, and reducing the overall project from \$22.4 million to \$5 million. Legislative Chair Bartels confirmed that the scoring rubric will be completed for this Project at the next ARPA Committee meeting. Deputy County Executive Kelly confirmed that there is a need amongst municipalities within Ulster County for such a project and acknowledging that a survey of this need was completed in the prior year.

Motion No. 6: To postpone 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 Lopez
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Levine

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry; and
Legislative Chair Bartels
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 6
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Postponed

Motion No. 7: To block Resolutions No. 97 and 98

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

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry; and
Legislative Chair Bartels
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 6
No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 8: 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 Sperry
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Levine

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry; and Legislative Chair Bartels

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Discussion: Legislative Chair Bartels noted that the trails in discussion are not County-owned assets, and the use of APRA funds allows the County to complete the work in a very unusual way. Legislator Lopez requested a cost, benefit analysis on revenues generated through public use of the trails. Director of Recovery & Resilience Nate Litwin confirmed that the areas in discussion are Qualified Census Tracts (QCTs) and that he will provide data to the Legislature on this. Discussion pursued on the benefits of the trails on potential future travel usage, on the mental health of residents, and on tourism and local businesses. Legislator Sperry emphasized the importance of the Crash Victims Rights and Safety Act and advocating, educating, and promoting the safety of the trails. Legislator Lopez noted that he was originally going to vote no on the Resolution, but that he appreciates Director Litwin's offer to share additional information with the Committee and he will make his final decision on the floor.

Motion No. 9: To approve 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 Sperry
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Levine

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez, and Sperry; and
Legislative Chair Bartels

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

New Business:

Forthcoming Resolutions:

Brownfields – Deputy Executive Kelly explained that the Brownfields project is for the evaluation of foreclosure eligible properties for which the County has not obtained title due to environmental concerns. Legislative Chair Bartels requested a projection of what extending the project to Phase Two, the environmental clean up, may cost, suggesting that the Legislature may want to consider adding Phase Two onto the project or consider adding these costs into the Annual Operating Budget.

Jail Demolition – Deputy Executive Kelly explained that the County has contracted with Penrose Construction to build several workforce and senior housing units at the old jail but that there is no funding for the demolition, and as such, this proposed project will cover only the cost of demolition.

368 Broadway – Deputy Executive Kelly explained that this is a request to acquire a property to be renovated into a Crisis Stabilization Center and a Mental Health hub. Chairman Criswell commented that this is an appropriate property for this purpose, speaking to the property’s access to public transportation, ease of public access, space, and condition.

Silver Gardens – Deputy Executive Kelly disclosed that this Project is to develop 29 units of supportive senior housing in partnership with RUPCO and Marlboro Associates. Legislative Chair Bartels requested a copy of the real estate pro forma and the low-income tax credit application.

Legislative Chair Bartels informed Committee members that she will prepare further detail on the Land Bank project and the Community Kitchen project in preparation of the next upcoming meeting of the Committee.

Old Business: None

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

Adjournment

Motion Made By: Legislator Corcoran

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Sperry

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Time: 7:08 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster

Minutes Approved: March 30, 2022

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

DATE & TIME: March 9, 2022 – 5:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID: 889 2420 1764
PRESIDING OFFICER: Peter Criswell, Chairman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Amber Feaster
PRESENT: Legislators Thomas Corcoran, Jr., Aaron J. Levine, Craig V. Lopez, and Megan Sperry (arrived at 5:11 PM); and Legislative Chair Tracey Bartels
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Phil Erner, Manna Jo Greene, Chris Hewitt, Joe Maloney, Kathy Nolan, and Laura Petit; Deputy County Executives Chris Kelly, and Marc Rider; Comptroller March Gallagher; Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco; Sam Sonenberg, Office of the Comptroller; Finance Department, ARP Administration Nathan Litwin, Ashley Long, and Molly Scott; Ulster County Trails Advisory Committee, Kevin Smith; Open Space Institute, Peter Karis, Karl Beard, National Park Service; Supervisor of the Town of Shawangunk John Valk

- **Chairman Criswell called the meeting to order at 5:09 PM**
-

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. So this is the March 9th meeting of the American Rescue Plan Act Special Committee. And Amber, could you please call the roll?

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. And Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Here.

Chairman Criswell: Great. Thank you very much. We are gonna take a few things out of order tonight. I know that Deputy Executive Rider has somewhere he wants to go to, and somewhere he has to go to. And so, we agreed to take that Resolution out of order. I'd love to have Legislator Sperry here for this conversation. I'm a little concerned that...

Deputy Executive Rider: If you want to go in normal order, I'm okay. If you want to wait for...

Chairman Criswell: Great. So, you know what I can do, I can pull something else out of order. And just hold on one moment for the Resolution. So, what I'd like to do is actually call everybody's attention to the ARPA priorities results, which was sent out. Committee members, you all got a copy of that. And we'd like, I'd like to just have a bit of an open conversation. Chairwoman Bartels, and I have been talking about this quite a bit, about compiling this. And so, Tracey, do you want to say anything about this right up front?

Legislative Chair Bartels: No, I can, I can let you lead the conversation, then I can, I can add. I mean, and then I'll follow on.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, great. So, this was a, an effort that was pulling together a lot of different pieces of information about priorities that the body was trying to set for this ARPA funding, and it was sent out, it was compiled and sent out to all Legislators, and we got a majority of Legislators responding to it. Legislator Walter then took the responses and put them into a calculation pulling up the top 10, showing the top 20, and then showing the rest. And you can see on that document that there were 45 different categories of potential spending. So, what I thought we would do is just talk through the top 20. And talk about where we're at with, with that type of spending and where we'd like to go with this as a as a team, and we're going to try and have this conversation, I think as a, as a body of where we want to go. Chairwoman Bartels, you have anything to add to that?

Legislative Chair Bartels: No, no, I think that's well said. I mean, just for anyone who doesn't know, the survey was sent out to all Legislators, and the responses were confidential. So, when they came back, they didn't come back with your names, but everyone had a unique, you couldn't respond twice. So, um, so that was ensured as well. So, and I really think that the idea in part was to get a sense, especially with this new Legislative body of where our priorities as a Legislature are, so that in conversation with the ARPA team and the Executive staff, that we could also be prioritizing which projects come forward. And, and when so, yeah. So that's it. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that. And then you'll hear later tonight, when we actually talk about the Resolutions in front of us, if they actually land anywhere on the priorities list. I'll list out where they are on that priorities list. So, you can see if they either made the list, didn't make the list, and if they did, where they stand in terms of the ranking. So, I'm just going to read

off the first the top 10 and then just open the floor to, to a discussion about those. So, number one is seed the creation of a County Land Bank to increase affordable housing stock in every municipality, and specialized programs to address other needs, such as workforce, workforce housing, farmland preservation, and creation. Oh, it got cut off there. It's creation of something. Do, do we know what that last sentence is?

Legislative Chair Bartels: I see “and recreational opportunities”, but I don't have the full either.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, but I think we get the gist of that one though. So, number two is creation of a mental health and recovery center. Number three is establishing a community kitchen to be used as an incubator and educational facility, and number four is developing a public health nursing team, a scholarship program for nursing degrees and, and guaranteed as County- I see some of these are cut off. So, we're gonna have to go through and get these.

Legislative Chair Bartels: I know. None of the others are cut off for me if you want me to read them, only the first few.

Chairman Criswell: Perfect. Yeah, that'd be great.

Legislative Chair Bartels: It said develop a public health nursing, a public health nursing team scholarship program for a nursing degree and guarantee a county job as a public health nurse requiring a time commitment in that job. Redevelop brownfields in County on foreclosure eligible properties for economic development, parks, or housing. Fund pilot pipeline training to employment program in the health sector through partnerships with Ulster County Community College and Ellenville Regional Hospital. Funding to Cornell Cooperative Extension to expand Food Service Programs and food delivery to vulnerable populations. Funding to implement, assess and implement broadband expansion. Funding to seed money, funding for seed money to new black small, small business owners to encourage their entrepreneurship and support them in their first year of business. And standby generators for emergency use during a crisis, all town shall be eligible.

Chairman Criswell: So, those were the top 10. And I just would like to have a bit of an open conversation about these priorities. And, and what we're seeing already coming down the request pipeline, what we've already committed funding to. Open thoughts on these? Yes, Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thanks. Well, yeah, I mean, I'll open it up. I'm just, I mean, I think, as you mentioned, you know, there, there's at least one that's been partially if not fully funded, the mental health and recovery center. And I know that there's, that's a sort of a broad topic. And there, there may be some leeway in terms of that understanding, but, but that one is, at least partially in the works. And then, then I also, I see some duplication, particularly in the public health nursing team and the pilot pipeline training for the health sector. I mean, I think that we could think of those as a single type of a project, potentially. Um, you know, as far as the rest of them, and we can go, I'm not sure how you want to handle it. We could go by, you know, one by one. I know that, there are some that I can speak to in detail if there are questions, because some of those I know were ones that I, that I brought forward, or I know a bunch about and then there

are others that I know less about. But, but I'm, I'm looking forward to learning more about as far as the one other that sort of jumps out at me is the broadband expansion. To assess and implement broadband expansion. I think we're, you know, we're waiting to hear, we're expecting that there's going to be some infrastructure funds, right, directed toward addressing that. So, I don't know, we would want to, I think, think carefully about using ARPA funds for that. I mean, I do think that we want to think about how we can assist the Town's in being ready for those funds in terms of mapping and, and some Towns are further along with that than others. But again, I would want to be careful of utilizing ARPA funds where, where other funds may be in the pipeline for the same for the same types of projects.

Chairman Criswell: That makes a lot of sense. I see Legislator Nolan. And I see Deputy Executive Kelly.

Legislator Nolan: Thank you, um, Chair Criswell. And yes, I think Chair Bartels' comment about the broadband underscores the comment I was going to make, which is that I did complete the survey. And I think it's useful. But I did, I did complete it with some discomfort, because I didn't, I didn't feel that I could actually rank the priorities of all these things in relationship to each other. Because some of them were broad categories of things that would be good to do. But we don't actually have a project in front of us for that particular area. But I still supported the area. And others, there are specific projects, and I'm of the opinion that stimulus money works best if you get it out into the community. So, I tend to favor those projects that have been brought forward, if they're things that we otherwise want to do. So, I did complete the survey and I think it's useful especially for this kind of conversation. But I really glad to hear the kind of consideration of, are there other funds for this particular project area that we as Legislators should make sure we bring forward and not necessarily say that the exact level of priority on this list has determines what ARPA Funding is provided. So, I think it's useful. But for me, it's not completely determinative. And it was a little difficult to know how to fill out the survey in a way that conveyed what I really, what I really feel about the projects that we have in front of us.

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

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you, Chair. So, I do want to echo I guess, both points made by Chair Bartels as well as Legislator Nolan. I am in conversation with ESD, they are the ones that are going to be receiving the Broadband money that came with, I think was like a half a billion maybe that is coming down from the federal government to the state. So that is, I know, there is some discussion in Albany, but that money is supposed to hit ESD. That is where their broadband program office is, so I attended a presentation on that not too long ago. So, you know, I'm trying to find the best way to facilitate a meeting with them to get more interested parties involved, and certainly you will, or interested parties, especially in those Towns with wide gaps in coverage. So, I will come back to that one.

The other one, so just how like, number four, like, and some of the stuff with the Ulster County Community College, just in terms of like the public health nursing staff, we have a full staff coming out of, like we're fully staffed. And I'm not sure that coming out of pandemic, we're looking to add headcount. We did run through a recruiting issue during the pandemic, I think everybody did. And it's, it's still can be tough. But I mean, whether we have one or two vacancies

at any time is not uncommon in any unit. But I guess I need to understand this more, because we're not facing a crisis in that unit currently.

And then just to what Legislator Nolan said, I think this is great. I think this is great, whether it's ARPA or other funds, because what we're doing is surfacing priorities and things that we want to discuss or engage in whether it's now or during budget or long-term planning. I guess, unless 100% answered, and this was truly like, ranked, I, from the Executive's point of view, I certainly have a lot of hesitation about using this as a determinant. In order to pushing projects through, I think we've all said from the beginning, back from June, when we put forward the first iteration of a plan that we may not have all the good ideas right now. Or there may be opportunities that arise that are not on this list or on our mind today that would seem wholly appropriate for ARPA funds. And I just worry that if we use this, too strictly that it'll constrain that part of the process. So, thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Let's see Legislator Erner and then Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislator Erner: Thank you, Chair Criswell. I just wanted to know how I could follow along with the 10 projects you named, and I heard you say the Committee received some stuff, but also the whole Legislature did. I'm just not able to find that.

Chairman Criswell: Um, Amber, are you able to send that over to Legislator Erner? Thank you so much. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thanks. Um, yeah, I mean, I think, first of all, I think it's, um, this this is not meant to constrain or to be a restrictive or finite list. Like that's, that's the, that's the first thing. I mean, it's, it's a, it's, what was circulated was a list of all the projects that had been raised through all the different iterations of conversation, which included a call for projects to the previous Chair that then went over to the collaborative Exec leadership team last time, the previous Democratic caucus and Republican caucuses, lists a second circulation of requests for projects, and anything that also came out of the, the current discussion of what we were calling buckets, and now we're calling whatever. So, so it's, it's not, it's not meant to be restrictive. It's meant to be a starting point, but it's also I think, meant to give us a sort of a place in time in terms of where the where the Legislature's responses on priorities based on these lists. And, and it's certainly not perfect. Like I hear Legislator Nolan's concerns, you know, and I had a couple, as I went through filling it out, there were a couple times where I was like, Oh, I'm not sure how to do this, either. But that said, two things. One, you know, as I see Legislator Maloney here, and Legislator Maloney and Legislator Petit have brought forward projects directly, like there's nothing stopping things from coming, good ideas from coming to the table that aren't on this list from anywhere in. You know, get two sponsors or get it at one sponsor in the Legislature, they move forward. But this at least gives us a sense of where we are at this moment in time.

You know, looking at the, the top of the list, the, the land bank issue, you know, if we're gonna, if we're gonna look at that as one, as one idea, and I, you know, I would suggest that we do, especially since this is the meeting that we're talking about what's coming in for the next, next month. And that's something that I've been very vocal on, and an advocate for. You know, I, based on this, I pretty much intend to bring forward a Resolution committing a certain amount of

funds to the seeding of a land bank, as soon as next month. Now, if we don't get the approval for a land bank, we don't spend the funds, like it's not taking it out. But I do think that as part of our application process to the state, a commitment or a promise, a commitment from the County to invest in a land bank, should we get the approval, would go a long way. And what this response says to me is that there is the support in the Legislature. I could certainly go ahead and ask my 22 colleagues where they're at, and I have spoken to most of them about whether or not they would want to move that forward.

But, you know, looking down the rest of the list, some things didn't surprise me, and some things did that rose to the surface. And so, I think, certainly anything that's in the top 20, we need, we need to have a conversation about and that means also getting answers to the kinds of questions, just going back to Deputy Executive Kelly's comments, the kinds of questions that Deputy Executive Kelly raised. You know, what would a public health nursing team slash proposal for pipeline jobs, pipeline in collaboration with and that's why I say I think those two could potentially be collapsed. If we at the County don't have the need for public health nurses at this moment, we could be creating a pipeline for jobs in collaboration with Ellenville Hospital, Kingston Hospital, etc, knowing that, knowing that we're actually doing more than, than just changing the lives of those people who, who get those, who get those opportunities. So, and that would follow on to the, in the bottom 20. The one in the, in the bottom part of the top 20, the one that has to do with a similar proposal, which has to do with green jobs and scholarships for green jobs. So, I see this as a first step to really fleshing out, and when I look at them, some of them, some of them are probably pretty close to being ready to go. Something like the community kitchen is, that is probably closer to being able to be put into a Resolution form within, within an idea. The brownfields and the end. The commitment to water, sewer is already in Legislature, in in, in Legislative form from Legislators Maloney and Petit. So, yeah, I just I think, I think this is a tool and I think we needed to do it to get our, to get our bearings about where we're at with so many, so many suggestions.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much. I also think it is just a straight up communication tool for the Executive team to see what the Legislative priorities are from, from the body. I don't think that that full communication has happened. So now there's at least a document. I see Legislator Sperry and then Legislator Maloney, and then Deputy Executive Kelly.

Legislator Sperry: Thank you, Chair Criswell. I just wanted to remind everybody what the criteria is for the ARPA spending funds. So, if I may just go through the four points of what we're supposed to be like, looking at where we're, how we're spending this money. Number one is revenue replacement for the provision of government services to the extent of the reduction in revenue due to COVID-19 Public Health Emergency relative to revenues collected in the most recent fiscal year prior to the emergency. Number two is COVID-19 expenditures or negative economic impacts of COVID-19, including assistance to small businesses, households, and hard-hit industries and economic recovery. Number three is premium pay for essential workers. And number four is investments in water, sewer, and broadband infrastructure. So, anything that is coming before us that doesn't fall within one of those four categories should not be getting our spending money. Like we should be looking at other pots in, other pots or buckets in the Legislature to figure out how to fund those projects. That's, that's my personal opinion.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. I do want to mention, though, that we are not restricted to those uses, just, just to be clear, like because of the way that we've now, Amber, what was the, what was the actual process of sending the information about our, I'm sorry, it was our losses?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Revenue loss provision.

Chairman Criswell: Our revenue loss, so, so that basically nullified the requirement that we have to spend it on these guidelines. It basically gave us a broader usage. Am I correct on that?

Amber Feaster: With, there's basically like, four distinct ones, restrictions on that, like you can't pay for debt, um, can, can't pay for pensions. Um, and there's two other ones, too two other restrictions.

Deputy Clerk Kelly: Taxes. You can't decrease taxes.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Decrease taxes, right, or prolonged decrease, prolong a tax increase.

Chairman Criswell: But I do want to support what you're saying Legislator Sperry, about the intent of the funds, because I agree with that as well. So, I have Legislator Maloney. I have Deputy Executive Kelly. And Nate, I'm sorry, I don't know your title so, I'm just gonna call you Nate for the moment. And then I have Nate. And then I see Legislator Greene as well.

Legislator Maloney: I just want to say I have no issue with the surveys, though, it's not an approach that I think is going to be very effective. We end up with things that sound nice, that aren't nearly, nearly complex enough, or multifaceted enough to really go and make this money means something. I mean, we talked about this at the beginning of the term and, and I heard Legislators and the Executive talking last time about ARPA, and making sure we feel in 30, 40 years. And once you go past, in my opinion, once we go past and we are going past three or four projects, you're basically spreading the money so thin that I just don't see where this is going to be a seed that's going to grow, we're going to look back in a couple of years. And I think a lot of it, unfortunately, we'll look at like the Ellenville Million. But um, and as far as the, the survey goes, I know, I'm not the only one that feels that way. I'm the only one willing to say it publicly. But um, that one of the lowest grades of the survey got a unanimous vote minutes later, in the last ARPA meeting for a project that many of the Legislators are not happy with. And then so the survey came through low grades. And we voted it through. And I almost felt like people didn't even quite grasp what the numbers even meant. Oh, and it was the first time we were talking about the results of the survey. And then we pushed through something that we didn't even like. When you take something like the Brownfields, I think that's a great idea. It's something I had talked to Ken about a couple of years ago, and Ways and Means. And we're getting to a point where we're not going to have enough money to really go around and do what we could do. That would be, that'd be one of those one or two things that we could go around, take some properties off the tax rolls, which I don't agree we should leave on there. Because, because there's so much toxicity or something going on with the property that we just want to let it sit there. We should be dealing with that. We're the only ones that are going to deal with that. And that's going to take big time bucks. We you know, and when you talk about broadband, I talked to a Supervisor the other day that, that said that it's about \$15,000 per household. So, I don't even think we had

enough money to begin with to do anything real with broadband. That's going to have to be a state, federal initiative with big time money, which it sounds like it might be soon. But I am a little disappointed that we didn't think bigger and more long-term, but we are where we're at. And I don't like the idea of just going quick and getting the money out there. Heard that point made. And I think we should do our due diligence. We are on a timeline. But I really feel like with this last bit of money that's left and it's going fast. We ought to pick one or two things. And I think that would happen through debate and discussion, several meetings that we could come to something I think it'd be more effective than talking about things that you know, then Chris comes up and says we're fully staffed. This doesn't make a lot of sense and it's one of the highest graded things. I'm not big on the survey.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir. Deputy Executive Kelly, I think you were next.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, I'll just be quick. Just a point of clarification. Was there 100% participation in the survey?

Chairman Criswell: It was not 100% participation, but it was a majority.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Okay. And then just, I guess, he kind of teed it up. Later in the agenda. I was, I got it to Amber late, but we are discussing brownfields as part of the next initiative. So that'll be later in the meeting now.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. Thank you. Nate. What is your title, Nate? You're, you're on mute right now.

Director of Recovery & Resilience Litwin: Unmute. Thank you very much. I'm. So, I'm the Director of Recovery and Resilience.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you.

Director of Recovery & Resilience Litwin: Thank you for asking. You can call me Nate as well. And basically, just thank you, Legislator Sperry for bringing up the four main criteria of the final rule and the US Treasury guidance. I think it is a great place, a great thing for everyone and all the Legislators to know. There is, of course, tons of guidance that comes behind it, but it really starts there. And likewise, thank you, Amber, for the details on lost revenue and government revenue. And just as some general, you know, having looked at the US Treasury guidance, they often tell you, what they really don't want. And that's why there's some specific details that Amber gladly was able to share regarding what you can't use loss revenue for. And then there's this amazing slightly gray area of everything else you can potentially use it for, at least when it comes to lost revenue. And there is a little guidance on what you can use it for. And that is essentially government services, which is a slightly amorphous term. But um, so that's just a little bit guidance in the other direction. And I can share that, based on our last report and what we put in for 2021. There was \$14 million, approximately, it's, I don't know the exact figure, but about that for what we had for lost revenue. So yes, it is there. And it has a different way of being used. And so, it's something to keep in mind, and just wanted to share it.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Legislator Greene.

Legislator Greene: Let me also show my face. Um, yeah, I just want to make a couple of points. And I honestly didn't get a chance to fill out the survey. I looked at it and I have it half filled out and the meeting came around before I had a chance to finish but I want to make a few points. One is I'm very interested in the Reuse Innovation Center. Because it'll divert waste. It'll allow us to, hopefully, site a landfill because so much waste, odor, and everything else will be diverted. And tomorrow night. Legislator Petit and I, and Kathy Beinkafner are speaking at the League of Women Voters and we can put that in the chat. But I am thinking that that might be better funded by Infrastructure funds, Build Back Better. I don't know where that stands currently. I know it was a political football in, in Washington, but I do think we will be getting money. And, and I think we need to balance and, and have some foresight, that if there is a potential project that is best served by ARPA funding, and, we know that there's going to be some form of infrastructure funding, that we ought to take that in, into consideration. And the other thing, I'm not sure where it landed, there was a, a project to provide funding for low- and moderate-income energy retrofits. And I, I was working on that and then never got called back and it's, it's an area that that I have some knowledge about, and I have no ability to put that into an ARPA project. But I do want to say how important that is, again, that I mean, I think that fits more under ARPA than, than under infrastructure. It has the potential for job training. And I just want to say that I am sitting in a house that had a deep energy retrofit a few years ago, some of you may have heard me say this, and I was juggling between ground and air source heat pumps when my boiler went out in November, I've gotten through the coldest part of the winter with two small space heaters. And it didn't, it cost me \$300. it would have been somewhere between 16 and 32 thousand dollars to install some form of beneficial electrification, some, either a ground source or an air source heat pump. And so, we really shouldn't just jump on to new equipment, yay. Rather than think of what is really valuable in terms of both a cost investment and a, and a climate solution. So, I can't stress that enough, it you know, to have been comfortable with two small space heaters through the coldest part of the winter, including the ice storm. You, you can't imagine it until you feel it, and breathe it in, and live it. But I'm asking that as the Legislature, we put a lot of emphasis on retrofitting buildings. And I also think that all public dollars should be evaluated in terms of their climate impact. I've said it before, and I will repeat it until I see it happening. Because I feel like we're living still in a pre-climate crisis mindset. And I wish I didn't have to be the constant bearer of bad tidings. But if anyone read a New York Times article on the melting of Antarctica, in addition to what we already know about the Arctic, and Greenland and so forth. We really are in a crisis, and we're not acting like it. And we've just come out of the COVID crisis, and now we have the war in Ukraine. But the climate crisis is not going away. And I asked each of us to deal with it in a very proactive way, for the sake of our children and grandchildren. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much. I see Legislator Hewitt, and then Legislator Lopez. And I just want to mention before you go, Chris, this is a really great conversation. So, I'm going to put this on the next agenda for the next ARPA meeting. So, we just can continue having this conversation. I think it's really important. So, Legislator Hewitt, please.

Legislator Hewitt: Thank you, Chair Criswell. I just wanted to mention that I am one of the Legislators that didn't fill out the survey, but I'm familiar with all of the ideas, and I'm getting

more familiar by meeting with some of the Legislators that are proposing them. So, I think that I'm hoping the deadline on that survey is not over. And I hope to submit more concepts with constituents. And, so thank you for mentioning that we'll continue the conversation.

Chairman Criswell: Great. Thank you, Legislator Lopez.

Legislator Lopez: Thank you. Um, yeah, I'm looking through the list. And I, I didn't see all the details on the individual proj-, projects. But when the projects are submitted, were they also submitted with, yeah, potential costs of these projects as well? Or is it just the idea?

Chairman Criswell: My understanding is it was mostly just the ideas unless something was actually submitted as a full Resolution. I don't think there's been any backup done. I think it was, you know, we'd ask people to submit as fully as possible. And really, we got a few sentences of what we'd like to get done.

Legislator Lopez: Right. You know, because that...

Chairman Criswell: I think it would be great to actually have real backup for real dollars...

Legislator Lopez: Right, and I agree with that. I think it'll be advantageous to the, to the project in order to provide some numbers because if we're supposed to look at these and choose, you know, the ones that we think would, you know, most benefit the county, um, then, you know, I think right off the bat, there would at least be a handful of them that would be eliminated given the balance of the ARPA funds, so I think that that would, that would, that's pretty, a pretty steep hill to climb here. If we're trying to, our, as a committee, you know, want to pick and choose what we want to move forward with if we have no idea what they're going to cost.

Chairman Criswell: I completely agree with you. And if we just look, I mean, even a top 20 list, a million apiece that you know, to Legislator Maloney's point, where's that gonna, where's that gonna lead us at a million a million apiece. So, I think adding dollars to it is really, really crucial. Legislator Hewitt, I see you and then Chairwoman Bartels, and then I'd love for us to move this along if we can, because we do have Resolutions that we need to get through. So, thank you.

Legislator Hewitt: Thanks Legislator Lopez for bringing that up. Because I didn't vote on the survey, because I thought it was incomplete. The proposals that I put in were shared with you all as one sentence, but I had full budgets. I had paragraphs that I had shared, and that didn't make it into the survey. So, I didn't fill it out, because I didn't feel that there was complete information being shared, although I knew I had submitted complete information.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for sharing that. Thank you. That's important, and we'll look at that. Chairwoman Bartels, you're gonna have the last comment on this section.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. Yeah, I mean, I think, um, Legislator Lopez raises a great point. And I think it's the logical next step, you know, what I would, I would suggest, and what I will endeavor, to be a part of working on is taking at least the top 20. And seeing if we

could assign, you know, estimated ballpark figures for them just to even know, it may be that the top 20 exceed the amount of funding that's left. And, and, and I also want to point out that there's latitude, particularly for the two projects, the Brownfields project, and the water, sewer infrastructure match to local communities, those two projects. There's a tremendous amount of latitude, we could decide to put 2 million or, as Legislator Maloney and Legislator Petit originally proposed, we could decide to put 24 million the balance of all the money to either one of those projects, and let them out, as such, so I think if I think I really do think that the next step is to try to identify dollar figures to these. I mean, there was, if we were to have waited to have full proposals on everything, and that would include, even you know, the Executive's proposals, put ballpark, ballpark numbers in the earliest phase, like back in June, when Deputy Executive Kelly's talking about the initial meetings happened, those were ballpark figures assigned to what was described as buckets. And it was not based on a detailed analysis of the funding, but we have to start somewhere in determining programmatically where our priorities are. And then I think as we assign these dollars, as Legislator Lopez points out, we're going to, we're going to know whether we can move on that, you know, whether we have the funding to move on it, and, and the lack of funding may, in fact, define the urgency of making a decision. And that's sort of where I wanted to impart for us to get to because the alternative is to take projects one at a time as they come. And it affords though first ones, to the first ones to the line, a distinct advantage because there's more money left at that point. So, the next step is to assign dollars, not necessarily firm dollars. And, and, you know, I look forward to having the continued conversation with this committee and with the Legislature as a whole, because, again, any, any, any project is going to need the 12 votes of the of the body.

Chairman Criswell: Excellent. Thank you very much. I'm going to move us along. Clerk Feaster, could I get you to recognize that Legislator Sperry has joined the meeting? I don't think we had that opportunity.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Yes, Legislator Sperry joined the meeting at 5:11.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much. All right, we're gonna move on to Resolutions. Deputy Executive Rider, I'm so sorry. That conversation went longer than I thought it was gonna go but it was a good conversation. So, can we look at-. Can I have a motion to discuss Resolution... Actually, I'd like to have a motion to block Resolution 99 and 101. Can I have that motion to block?

Legislator Corcoran: Motion.

Chairman Criswell: And a second please?

Legislator Levine: Second.

Chairman Criswell: Great. All in favor the Block?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Any, any opposed? Any abstained? Okay. And so that passes. And now a motion to discuss the block.

Legislator Sperry: Motion to discuss.

Legislator Levine: Second.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Thank you. All in favor.

Group: Aye.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Can I just ask.

Chairman Criswell: This is for discussion.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Oh, for the discussion. Okay. Yes.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. You thought I was jumping the gun there?

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah.

Chairman Criswell: No, just to discuss. So, I wanted to talk a little bit about where things are at with the, this Resolution, these two Resolutions. So, in Public Works there was amendment to correct the funding to federal aid. So, there was no bonding on the acquisition. And it was approved as amended. Everybody clear on that? In the initial Resolution, there was a, there was a bond and that was removed. And then in Ways and Means it was postponed. And then, as I did last time, I'm going to ask Clerk Feaster to go over this score sheet that we compiled. Everybody participated. Thank you very much for participating in this. I think it's a really useful exercise as we go through. So, the Clerk is going to talk about the scores, and also to highlight any important comments that Legislators made.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Under goals and mission, this project scored a 9.3 out of 12, which is 78%. For equity distribution, the project scored a 34.7 out of 36, which is 96%. For community impact, 27.3 out of 37, which is 74%. Financial Management, nine out of 15, which is a 60%. For an overall score of 80%. The comments were that it will help to mitigate a portion of housing issues, but not, but it's a drop in the bucket. That it is conceivable that there could be other funds available for funding the acquisition, that there are additional costs associated with the project that the county will bond for, that there are already commitments from the City of Kingston and from the state for renovation costs associated with the project.

Chairman Criswell: Great. Were there any comments on the environmental impact?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: The environmental comments were there that the environment, the plans are really largely unknown at this point in time.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. I'm going to ask committee members first if there's comments and then I'll recognize other Legislators and then other folks on the call. Committee members have, have comments on this Resolution? Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Actually this is just a sort of a general comment on the, on the scoring rubric, which I think is great, and really, extremely helpful. Again, you know, it's a, it's a tool. But um, I just wanted to point out on the financial management portion of it, the, the question about whether or not the project is currently dependent on ARPA money to proceed. You know, the, the result zero. You get zero if it's not at all dependent, and you get, you get a, you get a three, if it's fully dependent, which, you know, can kind of skew the scoring. To the extent that I'm not sure that it being fully dependent or not at all dependent is necessary. It's on a case-by-case basis, whether or not actually that's a good thing. Like I could think of the fact that it's fully dependent as being a reason to fund it, because, but for us, it wouldn't happen. And I could think of it not being fully dependent as a, you know, as a reason to fund it. Because we're, you know, we're only one aspect. So, I just wanted to point out because that one question always struck me as funny in the way that I could skew the, skew the numbers, but it's not specific to this one.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. I did want to mention that the, the commitment from the City was a significant amount of money. It was \$500,000. Is that correct? Yeah. So, it was a significant amount. Anybody else on the committee have comments on this? Legislator Maloney, I see your hand up.

Legislator Maloney: I don't have the agenda for me. This is Elizabeth Street, correct?

Chairman Criswell: Correct. Yes.

Legislator Maloney: So um, I have a couple of concerns. You know, I, I think at some point, the Legislature has to have a conversation with the Executive about, you know, having press conferences before we even approve something. I thought that was, you know, and it goes along with everything else. We asked, it's been asked publicly now twice about back taxes in, in these committee meetings. And it looks like there, unless I'm mistaken about 43,000. On back taxes, I'd love to know about the negotiation. We have a buyer's agent. I don't know how we decide that buyer's agent. We just picked somebody that's going to make \$20,000. Did they negotiate on our behalf? It looks like we're paying almost top dollar for a dilapidated mold infested building that's behind on their taxes. And I've just, did we come in at 700,000? Or was there a negotiation that we started? Did they st-, How did it go? Because it doesn't, it so far, it's looking a little alarming, especially when the Deputy Executives don't know that we're negotiating. Without knowing..., Can you imagine buying a property and not knowing if they're behind on their taxes? That would be insane in the private sector. But we were..., You were asked on public, on public a week ago, publicly and the answer was, an exact quote, not that I'm aware of. You're not you weren't aware that they were behind on their taxes? I'm just concerned, the whole deal.

Chairman Criswell: I'm gonna ask Deputy Executive Rider to speak to that, if that's all right.

Legislator Maloney: Sure.

Deputy Executive Rider: So, in any closing, there's requirements that these kinds of liens are paid. So, I have confirmation from the seller, that, you know, the, the back taxes will be paid prior to closing. Or at the same time through the proceeds of the closing. We're not buying a piece of property with back taxes owed. The other pieces? Yes, our first offer in on this property was 675,000. It was first listed at 725,000. And the counteroffer from the seller at the time was 700,000. And at that point, we accepted.

Legislator Maloney: That's what our agent did for us? We came in at 675. I mean, anybody that that has any real estate dealings in the private sector would have done far more, and not to disclose that to us. So, you did know, a week ago, when you told us not that you're aware of..., Did you know they had back taxes, and I shouldn't have to ask, we should be presented with, with the deal. And what went on. I mean, I'm just, I'm at a loss with, for our County, this is, this is government, and it's got to be better.

Chairman Criswell: So, it looks like Deputy executive Kelly has his hand up.

Legislator Maloney: I have another point after that.

Deputy Executive Kelly: There's a point of clarification. The back taxes aren't owed to the County. So, in the City of Kingston, they handle that process separately. So, that's why we didn't have the information because it wasn't in our financial system showing arrears. So, when we reached out to the City Comptroller, he was able to surface that information after we made the inquiry. So, at the time you asked the question, we didn't have that information. That is accurate. When we do...

Legislator Maloney: But who...?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Wait a second.

Chairman Criswell: Yeah, let him finish, please.

Deputy Executive Kelly: When we got the information. We have it now. In any closing scenario, you settle the past liens and interest whether it's from a municipality or others before you can complete the sale.

Legislator Maloney: Nobody negotiates and makes offers.

Chairman Criswell: Oh, hang on a second. I just, I just want to keep this meeting calm.

Legislator Maloney: So, I and if a taxpayer...

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Maloney, I'm going to ask you to hold decorum here. If you have a question, it goes through the Chair. We're not going to just do a back-and-forth battle here. Okay. So, if you have a response...

Legislator Maloney: I'm completely comfortable with my decorum on behalf of the taxpayer. I represent thousands of people and there's just seems to be...

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Maloney. I am making a very civil request right now.

Legislator Maloney: Yeah, I'm...

Chairman Criswell: Let's not have a back and forth that turns into an argument. If you have something to say please say it now. Thank you.

Legislator Maloney: Yes, I'll continue down this road before making another point. And I don't know how we're going to be the best government we can be, on behalf of the people and make the tax dollar go as far as it can, if we're going to be told that we, if we're going to be told a week ago, they don't know. My point is how do you just would anyone here go and spend \$700,000 on a dilapidated mold infested building, and not know when they make those offers, if there's back taxes owed? That's my point. No one would no one that made this deal would in their private life, but we spend tax dollars differently than we spend our own, which is why many times we're in the position we're in. Secondly, I've been I have some pretty reliable sources that have laid out far more about what we plan to do with this building than we've heard. Movement of people from different buildings to others, negotiations, offline negotiations with not for profits. If it turns out to be true, I have it all documented, several of us Legislators have heard this, if it ends up happening exactly the way we heard, it's just another frustrating lack of transparency, lack of information that the Legislature is getting. And I, and I will be on the record forever on this, that I think it's really a poor, just, just poor management of our tax funds for us to go in and buy a building. And not know, and we have a real estate agent, this real estate agent, I assume it's going to get 3%, it's about \$20,000. They didn't look into, into whether there was back taxes, I have a hard time believing that we could have gotten this building for cheaper, and maybe it's 50,000. Maybe it's 100,000. But we had leverage we didn't even know about. And to me, that's unacceptable. It's unacceptable for us to not be better on behalf of the taxpayer. And I'm sorry, if you don't want to hear it, but the taxpayer wants you to hear it because they want their tax dollar to go as far as it possibly can. And I still I'm at a loss that we didn't know this.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir. legislator. Petit, I see your hand.

Legislator Petit: Thank you, Chair Criswell. So, just to follow up on that, I've been hearing, you know, comments about movements with not for profits in the plans of, you know, taking over once the RFP is put out, but I think, to vote on this, I would feel more comfortable if we had an amendment to add a further resolved, which would specifically lay out that the seller was going to be paying the back taxes. It's something we've done in other Resolutions just so that there's a legacy if we ever have to go back and look and say well, you know, what was the discussion on this but you know, there is room in there for further resolve that the seller will be expected to pay the 43,000 back taxes. And I would like to thank, I don't know if one of the other Legislator wants me to publicly note, but thank the two Legislators that brought this to light that there were back taxes owed on the property.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thanks. Um, so, you know, I, Legislator Petit is, is requesting an amendment, which seems fine to me. But isn't. I mean, I'm sorry, this may be a naive question. But in my previous experience, when you when you purchase a property, it's part of the due diligence of closing that would require that all those liens are settled. Like you, you wouldn't actually close but on, but for a Resolution or not. You wouldn't close if they weren't satisfied first. And someone can stop me if I'm wrong. That's just been my experience.

Chairman Criswell: That's my experience as well. And I think Legislator Nolan is shaking your head as well. As is Legislator Corcoran. Alright, I'm going to actually call this to a vote unless any other committee members have any comments. Any final comments? Any other committee members? Yes. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Because Legislator Petit has raised, you know, has raised the concern of wanting to see it in writing, is there any harm in putting that in, in writing that all liens will be satisfied before closing just to, to have the support of Legislator Petit?

Chairman Criswell: Let's have Deputy Executive Rider answer that.

Deputy Executive Rider: I don't have an issue with that being further resolved. It'll become, it is part of the contact. And, again, as others have stated, we would do a title search, which would uncover any liens. This is very early in the process.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, so...

Legislative Chair Bartels: Legislator Petit, would you like me to bring that forward as a motion in the committee to add the resolve? Okay. So I'll do that. I'll bring forward a motion to add a resolve that any outstanding liens will be satisfied before purchase.

Chairman Criswell: And I'll second that. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Opposed? All right. And can we vote on the resolution as amended? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Any opposed? Abstentions? All right, that passes. Just for point of order, Chairwoman Bartels, are we allowed to abstain on votes in committee?

Legislative Chair Bartels: No, not, not unless you, you can abstain if you have a direct pecuniary interest.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. I wasn't sure about that. So, thank you for that.

Legislative Chair Bartels: And you'd have to state, you'd have to state what the interest is as well.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. Thank you. Well, I'll still call it then, just in case somebody does have a conflict of some sort. All right, thank you very much for that.

Deputy Executive Rider: Thank you, everybody.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Deputy Executive Rider. Sorry, it took so long. All right. So let us move on to Resolution 99. Do I have a motion to discuss? I'm sorry,

Legislator Lopez: I'll move it for discussion.

Chairman Criswell: Sorry. That was 96. Thank you. A second, please. Thank you. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Great. I'd like to ask the sponsor to, if they would like to talk about this at this point? Sponsors. Yes, Legislator Petit.

Legislator Petit: Thank you. Joe Maloney just texted me. He had to hop off for a second. He's at work. Um, so we there has been some discussion, I believe, with the County Executive's office, Legislator Maloney and I would like to offer the following amendments.

Chairman Criswell: I'm Sorry. Legislator Petit. I'm sorry. Can I interrupt you one second? I apologize. But I just wanted to let people know where this stands now with the Committee's. I didn't do that and I'd like to do that before you talk. So, excuse me for interrupting. In Public Works, there was no action taken. In Ways and Means the instance was postponed. And the scoring rubric was not requested to be completed so nobody has scored this yet. And it does list as number 13 on the Legislative survey for ARPA priorities that we just discussed. Thank you Legislator Petit, I apologize for that.

Legislator Petit: No, thank you very much. So, we are offering the following amendments, it would be paragraph eight through 13. After water, we're adding and sewer so it will be water and sewer infrastructure. And we would also offer to reduce the amount that we'd like to put into infrastructure from 22.4 to 5 million.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Since we don't have that in front of us. What I'd like to suggest is that we take no action on this. We see the amended Resolution, and then we pick this up at our next meeting. Is that work for you Legislator Petit?

Legislator Petit: Could, could we get a motion to postpone? I think Legislator Maloney would prefer that.

Chairman Criswell: Sure. Thank you. Do we have motion postponed from the committee?

Legislator Lopez: I'll make the motion.

Legislator Levine: I'll second it.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Any opposed? That motion passes. Great.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Chair Criswell.

Chairman Criswell: Yes.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Can I just ask a question? So will a scoring rubric with the proposed language for the Resolution with the proposed language be circulated for next meeting?

Chairman Criswell: Yes, it will. Great, thank you. I see legislator Levine.

Legislator Levine: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. If, if it wouldn't be too much trouble. If, I was just trying to take a couple of notes here. And if Legislator Petit could just repeat what her, her about her amendment to the Resolution would have been just so I can keep it in my notes. That'd be great. I would appreciate it.

Chairman Criswell: If I have it straight, I think it was adding the word "sewer". Is that correct?

Legislator Petit: Yes.

Chairman Criswell: Water and sewer and then it was reducing the amount to 5 million.

Legislator Levine: Thank you very much.

Legislator Petit: Paragraphs eight through 13. So it will say water and sewer. I believe there was also one added into a resolved and then it would be under capital project 604. It originally said 22.4. It would be 5 million.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Legislator Nolan.

Legislator Nolan: Thank you. Um, do we have \$5 million in water and infrastructure, structure, sewer projects in front of us?

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: I would say that at this moment we, we don't, would be my short answer. But at this at this moment we have unsolicited requests from several communities. You know, I think I mean, I certainly would expect and hoping in my conversation with Legislator

Maloney and with Deputy Executive Kelly, I would expect that if we were to move forward with this project, that it would include some kind of call for projects and it would have to be with that amount of money, or whatever set amount of money, a competitive process. I, for one, will say right now that in terms of my support of it, I would like to see the record argument of a local match. So, you know, these are things that I hope the sponsors will work out in collaboration with the, the ARPA team in the next, you know, prior, prior to the next meeting, and certainly prior to, to the vote on it. I think that this is one, as you saw it scored fairly high on the, the Legislative scoring, but it also, in my conversations with Legislators, and it's, it's, it's very clearly demarked in, in, you know, in the foundational sort of documents of, of ARPA projects that are allowable. So, you know, I think, I hope that's where we're headed to not only have a number attached to the Resolution, but a sense of how, how we're going to go ahead and let, let the idea out to, to all municipalities.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Deputy Executive Kelly, and then Legislator Nolan.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you, Chair, and I 100% want to echo Chair Bartels' comments there. We know there's widespread need in every corner of the County based on all our collective conversations and an informal survey that took place last year. So, there are a lot of worthy projects. And I think that we need to set up an equitable process where everybody has access to the same opportunity here to put their projects forward and score them. I think, the non-for-profit kind of setup that we did, replicating that in some fashion, not to make it over burdensome, but also to hit what the County's policy is and kind of, I guess, yeah, just the policy priorities for the County. When we're talking about jumping into projects here in some of these municipalities, if you talk to some of the Supervisors, a \$200,000, investment from us could make the difference in accelerating a housing project with 150 units in the southern part of the County. That's something that we should all be interested in incentivizing, because that has a broad impact, and the housing stock as a whole. So that's just one aspect. But I certainly, you know, I got an email from the Village mayor this morning, in New Paltz, who has another water issue, running to the school. He's got a lot of them. We can't fix all of them. But I know that there's a lot of people ready with their own financing with their own bonding authority, with their own ARPA funds. They're just looking for that little bit more of assistance to get these projects done. So, 100%, on board with moving that in that direction.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that perspective, Legislator Nolan.

Legislator Nolan: Yes, thank you. Oh, this very encouraging turn for the conversation and it reassures me, because this is water and sewer infrastructure, is an area where there is substantial funding through other sources. And so, I would like us to be moving in the direction of leveraging this money. And I'm also aware that from the call for ARPA projects from last summer, there are already projects that are very specific and have numbers that are ready to go that are, will be coming in front of this committee, and I'm supportive of those, especially when those projects demonstrate that they don't have other funding available to them.

Chairman Criswell: Great. Thank you very much. Um, I feel like we're ready to move forward here. Can I have a motion to block resolution 97 and 98?

Legislator Corcoran: Motion.

Chairman Criswell: And a second place.

Legislator Lopez: Second.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Any opposed? That passes and now motion to discuss the block.

Legislator Sperry: Motion to discuss the block.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. And a second.

Legislator Levine: I second it.

Chairman Criswell: And all in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: All opposed. Okay, that passes. All right. Discussion on resolution 97. Let me tell you where things stand. So, in Public Works, it was approved. In Ways and Means, it was postponed. The scoring rubric we're going to go over right now and it was number 15 on the Legislative survey, survey for our priorities. So, Clerk Feaster if you could give us a little bit information about the scoring.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: This project scored a seven out of 12 for goals and mission which is 58%. A 16 out of 36 for equity distribution, which is 44%. A 23 out of 37 for community impact, which is 62%, and a 7.8, out of 15 for financial management, which is 52%. For an overall total of 54%. The primary comments were that committee members support the trails and the project, but they were unsure if ARPA funding was the most appropriate source for the project. That, they, there were notes that the trails, developing the trails supports health and mental health, um, and that it would not have a negative environmental impact.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you very much. So, committee members, I'd like to open it up to your comments first, and then I'll go out to other Legislators and then other folks on the call. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thanks, I mean, seeing no other committee members, I guess I'll open the conversation. You know, in caucus, in the Democratic caucus on Tuesday, which feels like eons ago, but just, just a day, we had a, we had a spirited conversation about this, and about the very fact that Clark Feaster just raised, the idea about whether or not ARPA funds were the most appropriate for this. You know, one of the things so and it was stated in a democratic caucus, you know, again, it was reiterated the support for the trails, and it was stated, or at least

raised as a prospect of why not use other funds talking about excess, the excess sales tax that we have. You know, I, I raised my concern about that. And today, I, you know, I made some calls, you know, ARPA funds are unique and not, not speaking to the aspects of them that in terms of, of terms of what they're allowed to cover, but they're unique in that we are allowed to fund things that are not so easy to fund in other aspects of County government. The trails that we're talking about aren't County assets, we don't own them. So, making improvements to assets that aren't owned by the County is a very, it's complicated, and in my long tenure here, I can think of only really one time that that's happened or, and now, now a second time, ironically, this month in terms of the Veterans Cemetery. And in both cases, one Kings Highway, and now in the Veterans Cemetery, they required easements that required the County to take a, you know, a, basically an ownership stake in the property in order to be able to make the improvements or to do the work, which strikes me as something that's, in this case, at the minimum, highly complicated, it would take a tremendous amount of time and I'm, and frankly, just to be flat out, I'm just not sure that would happen. The idea of taking, taking easements and taking ownership and in these trails, which is, which is not temporary ownership, you know, is something that I see as highly complicated. You know, I think that these are, I think that these are valuable projects, I, probably based on hearing the rankings, I probably ranked them higher, but I know that even then, then unbalanced for the committee, but I know that the portion of my ranking that was highest was community impact. Um, you know, I, when I think about the, the, the COVID pandemic, and think about what it was like to be you know, locked in my home and I'm very grateful to have a home that was warm and safe with my family. But when I think about that, and I think about what it you know, what it meant to start to get out in those first days of spending time on walking on the trails and seeing people on the trails with masks, but just seeing people and an outdoor space. And I also, we had a spirited conversation yesterday in the Democratic caucus about something again that I'm sensitive to. You know, the trails as a, as a safe means of recreation and transport. Because our roads and this is something as a, as a County, I think we need to have a much more robust discussion about, about our roads more and more are shared use roads. So, we have we have vehicles competing with pedestrians, bicyclists, and electric bicyclists, and people walking baby carriages, and when push comes to shove, unfortunately, we know who's going to win. When so we need to find a way to make it safer for, for the non-motorized transport on those, on those roadways and right now the safest means of, of transport are on these trails. So, you know, I think this is a really, really worthy project. I, I respect my colleagues' concerns about whether or not this is an ARPA project. I just will pause at the question that if we don't do it through ARPA, I'm not sure what other means we could do it through.

Chairman Criswell: Deputy Executive Kelly,

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you, Chair. I think I just want to thank Chair Bartels because she covered 99% of what I was going to say in terms of the financing difficulties. There are certainly creative ways, but this is special purpose kind of funding that allows us to do more creative projects in this realm, and important projects. So, I think that this is a, certainly a proper use of ARPA funds. And if not these funds, then it would be difficult. And I never like to use the word impossible, but I don't know the method yet by which we would participate in these projects. And I think we heard not only, a, Chair Bartels really shared a lot of what I experienced with my family in terms of just the ability to have access to these trails. I live up the street from

the O&W. For my family, that was the respite for two years. And, you know, it wasn't, I'm a, I'm a cyclist. So, I certainly understand the importance of staying off the roads with a lot of the incidents that we've experienced locally. New Paltz, Kingston, just last year, of severe and fatal accidents involving cyclists. So, the more that we can provide these avenues for safe transportation, not just for recreation, but as a means of getting from A to B, I do think is critical. So that's all I have tonight.

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Nolan.

Legislator Nolan: Yes, thank you. I appreciate all those comments. And I guess I was most surprised by the score and route in relationship to the, was it called diversity? Or the, the spread of the funding. Because I have seen these, these two, these three projects as serving communities that don't often get these kinds of fundings and for this kind of infrastructure. So Accord and Kerhonkson are in a section of the County where I don't think there have been very many of these kinds of projects. And I'm aware of efforts in Sullivan County, to work in the O&W and bring the trails up. I think there are some initiatives that are going to develop other parts of the trail nearer to Ellenville and serving Ellenville. With this kind of access, I think as important as it is for Gardiner going south. I'm from New Paltz. So, I do see this as bringing funding into parts of the County that may not otherwise see this kind of a funding. And the Ulster County State Of The Trails Report mentions the, but not only the physical health benefits, but the mental health benefits of trails, and usership was up from 200 to 300, 400%, during 2020 and 2021. And clearly, that was a mental health benefit for people. Um, somebody said to me just today that they didn't feel like there was nowhere to go. They knew that there was somewhere they could go. And it just made them feel like not everything had been taken away from them. So, I see the direct connection of this project to COVID more than I do with almost anything else on the list.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Legislator Sperry, and then Chairwoman Bartels. And Nate.

Legislator Sperry: Thank you, Chair. Um, I have stated this before in other meetings that as somebody, as a cyclist who used to ride on the road, who got into a really bad accident on the road, who no longer feels comfortable riding on the road, I ride the trails now. And I ride all of the trails, top to bottom whenever I can, as often as I can. And I truly believe that these trails, not only saved our community, but people ever, like days, every, you know, weeks, days, months after COVID hit, you could go on any trail and there was people from New York City, Connecticut, New Jersey, all, you know, upstate, downstate, all over walking our trails, meeting up with their friends and their family, right. Like, that was a safe place. And, you know, I know, I'm the one that said before, these are the four criteria for ARPA funding, right. And if I had to categorize this, I would definitely say that, you know, during COVID, this was the thing that drove our economy. It brought people from all different areas, and they were spending money in restaurants, you know, in, in place, in, in our communities. So, well, the rating of this on our scorecards was lower, because it's hard to kind of finesse it. I do truly believe that, if there's no, no other pot to pull the money from that, you know, we should really highly consider using the ARPA funding to support it.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. So, Chairwoman Bartels, I think I saw you next and then Nate, and then Legislator Levine, and Legislator Lopez.

Legislative Chair Bartels: I'd like to let Legislator Levine and Lopez go first since they haven't spoken and I'll speak after. Thank you Chair.

Chairman Criswell: Great.

Legislator Levine: Go ahead, Legislator Lopez.

Legislator Lopez: Okay, thank you. Um, I've got a couple issues with this. Number one that I don't necessarily feel as it's, that, that the trails are, are an appropriate use of the ARPA funds. You know, it just, I don't know, it just doesn't sit right with me for what they're intended for. And the other thing is, and to speak to a Legislator Sperry's point is that, um, the trails are always sold as a, as a big revenue maker for, for the County. And being from, yeah, I represent Shawangunk and Wawarsing. So, Sam's Point is right up the road for me, and I had a beautiful weekend, you know, Craigmere Road could have, you know, a quarter mile of cars parked on both sides. And after people are done using the trails and hiking, you know, they'll go out and eat. You know, they'll go across them into Ellenville. They'll go to Gabby's. They'll go to, you know, Aroma Time. And yes, that brings revenue into local businesses, or they'll come over to Walker Valley area. Yeah. They'll go to Third & Company, another great restaurant. Now I'm plugging them here. But yeah. But as there ever been, like a real cost benefit analysis that's been done to know what the actual revenues are, that are coming in? And if not, is that something that you would consider for this project in particular?

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Legislator Levine.

Legislator Levine: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, you know, my, my only concern about this would be if this was a project that we're going to be supporting, and, you know, I would be inclined to be supporting this because I think they're, the benefits far outweigh the negatives. My only, my only point on this would be I think it's important that we try to make sure that this is something that is going to be able to be used by all parts of our County, all socio-economic classes. You know, we need to be making sure that people on the lower end of the economic spectrum who might not have access to vehicles that can, you know, bring a bicycle or, you know, drive to the trailhead to walk or to hike or to or to bike, you know, that they, you know, that we're making sure that they have access to this and, and that we try to incentivize people to use, use the trails for, for health purposes and for recreation. So, whether that be you know, working with UCAT to make sure that underserved communities have opportunities to get out there and use these facilities. I think we just need to be making sure that that every member of our, of our County, every resident of our County has the opportunity to partake in, you know, in these in these trails, because I think we need to be making sure that again, with looking, looking back at what, you know, one of the basic tenants are of the ARPA, of the ARPA rules are as you know, underserved communities and I want to make sure that, you know, underserved communities in our County will be able to take part in this. So, thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Nate, please. And then Chairwoman Bartels, and then I see Lopez and Sperry are your hands just up still? Okay.

Director of Recovery & Resilience Litwin: Thanks to Legislator Levine for his comments, because I think these are public trails and as the Director of the ARPA team, I think I can bring in, or I hope to bring in, more information to fill in some of these concerns and some of these gaps, and there's two broad tracks that could be taken. One is that we work within the ARPA funding parameters. And I get that this could feel a little more uncomfortable, but I think the, one of the first points I want to hit is that this does hit a lot of areas. So, it's not like very obvious that it just hits one area of economic impact or those things, but it does, yes, it's some of the economic impact. It's some of mental health. It hits, I think it hits diversity and equity. And I think I can provide some data for that. I think it hits some low income. I know it hits a Qualified Census Tract. And I'm, I'm not just making that up, it can easily be looked up that New Paltz is a QCT. And that is a definite... QCT's are just basically, because the data is so there from the government's point of view, they are an impacted community. And I know it is New Paltz that's the QCT, but we're looking at a lot of students that are, don't have as much income, and I'm sure are probably using these trails. So those are just some broad things. I don't feel like I need to insert myself or direct this completely as a discussion. But I really just want to bring some of our ability to this conversation as far as just data and how this can be looked at. You know, I realized scoring is a tricky tool, but that's just also one approach. So, another thing I can add is that I think I shared some of the slay apprehension regarding this project. Just because it's slightly different. It fills all these different things, but it's not like on point directly for one particular use of ARPA. So, I did, and I haven't shared this, but I certainly can. We did do a OSI trails, like a community analysis, is the way I turned it. It basically it was a fairly quick, but I could certainly flesh it out, look at poverty rate for the County at, versus poverty rate for Gardiner, New Paltz, Accord, Kerhonkson, Napanoch, Ellenville. I was able to find it in my emails and bring it up tonight but I realized it's not for the benefit in front of all of you. I do not mind sharing that. I'd love it if people looked at it, because I do think I found some broad trends, which may help everybody feel a little better when they look at it. We are, these are public trails, which I think is worthy of consideration for equity, which is a broad goal of ARPA. And we are linking communities that are, when you look at demographics, are less diverse, with communities that are more diverse. You're also linking communities that are wealthier with communities that are less wealthy. And that income doesn't always fit. You know, QCT is obvious. But in other areas, it doesn't fit perfectly with the standard of low income, but it's significant. And those are linkages that are being created. And I just think that's worthy of consideration. And I'd be glad to provide that. The other thing is, just, just a mention that so, that's within ARPA, but then we have talked a bit tonight about one of those four pieces, which is the Ulster County's lost revenue. And so that's where there's \$14 million that we put into the last report. And that is just a broad indication of government services. So, if there's still discomfort, loss revenue can also be used, and I'm just making that point. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Nate, thank you very much and I think that the committee and the Legislature as a whole would really appreciate that data analysis. If there's something you can pull together, we'll make sure that's distributed. So, thank you for that. I see Legislator Hewitt, and then I'm going to call on Kevin Smith and then Legislator, Chairwoman Bartels. will then Barthel We for me.

Legislative Chair Bartels: It's okay, you can go Legislator Hewitt.

Legislator Hewitt: I just had three points to make. Two I made yesterday. Two I made yesterday in the caucus. One is if, I think it's important that these public spaces have equal access, and by working with nonprofits like Wild Earth, we can create the education that helps these trails connect with the forests around these trails. And in ancient cultures, like in Japan, they have forest bathing, because the health benefits of getting out into nature are well proven and documented. And the final point is these gas prices aren't going to go down. We have to get used to a future where gas prices are high. And these are transportation corridors for our locals, in addition to for tourists. Just like Legislator Sperry was just saying, this is a way of life for people. We're gonna have a pedestrian and bike future and these corridors, the safe corridors that are not dominated by automobiles are important. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Kevin Smith, Ulster County Trails Advisory Committee: Thank you, Chair. I actually think the Legislators have hit almost every single point I was going to make. I could substantiate many of them. We have very good data. It's in the State of the Trails Report. It's more national data than, than specific, right here to Ulster County, but it's very strong. I can give you anecdotal data that businesses like Bistro To Go on Route 28, Maryann and Richard Erickson said they had to actually add staff during the pandemic, because of the Ashokan Rail Trail opening. I can tell you as a steward of the Ashokan Rail Trail that I had dozens, dozens of people tell me that they don't know how they would have survived without having access to the trail as a, as literally a refuge during the shutdown. And lastly, I would just point to Ulster County's Community Health Improvement Plan the last two updates of that plan call out the trails and identify them as a key component of the County's commitment to improving the health of our residents and including of all socio-economic backgrounds in all geographic areas that they should all have convenient, ready, access where they live and work to these great shared-use facilities. Thank you so much. Appreciate it.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Chairwoman Bartels. I think you're gonna have the last word.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thanks. I'm glad I'm glad I got to be last. You know, I just want to say, you know, first that it's always, for me the trails, the, the trails as economic drivers, to me has, has been an arguable but never been the compelling case. For me, it's always been about the health, wellbeing and safety of our residents. And about the environmental impacts, of the positive environmental impacts, especially when you think of them as transit corridors as, as Legislator Hewitt brought up. Um, you know, I want to just reflect back on a comment that Legislator Levine said before I, before I lose it. Um, you know, that the idea of utilizing UCAT. We now have electric buses to get to these trail heads. What a great idea to, to work as a County to coordinate getting to the trail heads, getting people to different trail heads and getting them back in their lane and electric bus to their home communities. Because something that I've always appreciated about the trail community and their members here today is that, despite the fact that these trails are owned by many different entities, and stewarded by many different entities, and in different states of repair, a-la, the project before us today, I've always had the sense that the trail community sees the trails as an inter-connected, as like a living being of interconnectedness, that that there's no competitiveness in terms of ownership. It's not like, Oh, that one's mine, and that one's yours. There's this sense that it benefits the whole to make one

part better, which is why I think these projects in individual locations have much larger reaching impacts, because each little aspect that we improve, then feeds into the next part and the next part and the next part and, and that, that is a that's like the circle of life back to everything we've been talking about, about equity and getting into every community and allowing access. So, I'm not going to forget Legislator Levine's comments and, and Legislator Levine, I'd love to work with you to, to, to run with that idea because I think you're onto something. And yeah, and I just, I appreciate all the comments this evening.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, Legislator Sperry, did you have something you wanted to say?

Legislator Sperry: Yes, I just... thank you. I just wanted to add, and I'll keep it quick. You know, we are sending a letter up to the Governor's office about the Crash Victims Rights and Safety Act. And I would really, really love to see more of a collaboration, you know, between the City and the Trails about advocacy. As somebody who almost died riding their bicycle, I really would like to feel safe again riding from my house to a trail, you know? And we know that there's been some crashes and some deaths since we laid down more trails locally. And that it's not that that doesn't have to happen. And it shouldn't be happening for us to be educating people and advocating on collaboration with the trail. So, if we're supporting the expansion of trails, I would like to see more of a collaboration and advocacy and education, and also getting people safely to those trails. So, thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. This has been a great discussion. And really, I really appreciate the holistic view that we're talking about serving our community on so many different levels. So, with that, I'd like to call the vote on this, on this Resolution. All in favor.

Group: Aye.

Legislator Lopez: I, if, If I could just say a quick, if I could just say a quick word before. Yeah, I was actually, I was gonna be a no on this, but I appreciate Nate's offer, to, you know, provide additional information. And I will take that into consideration between now and our floor vote. And I'll make my final decision there. So, thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. So, all in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Opposed? Thank you. So are you voting now Legislator Lopez.

Legislator Lopez: I'm a yes.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. Thank you very much. All right. Did you collect all the votes Clerk Feaster? All right, this passes again, thank you for that robust conversation. I, I too, was swayed. I had concerns going into it about the use of ARPA funds for this. And, Nate, I think you, you sold me there with the cobbling together conversation. I see how different aspects of it do add up to, to support the use of ARPA funds. So, thank you for that explanation. And really, please do send the full Ledge-, send us information so we can pass that on to the full Legislature about

your findings. And also, Kevin, if you have anything else that you want to add to it, if you could send that to the Legislature. We'll be happy to have that. And also, Peter, I don't know if you have anything that you want to add to the mix. But if you do, we'll forward that on to the rest of the body.

Peter Karis: Will do. Thank you very much.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. All right. Moving on. So, we have 1, 2, 3, 4 forthcoming ARPA funding requests that we're going to try and get through very quickly, right, Deputy Executive Kelly?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yes, Chair.

Chairman Criswell: All right. Thank you. If you want to step in and talk about. So, what we have on queue right now, just so everybody knows. I don't think it made the agenda. But we have a conversation about Silver Gardens, about the jail demolition, about 360 Broadway, and the Brownfields. So, if you could take it away.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yes, sir. So, I'm going to start with Brownfields. Since that was brought up earlier this evening. Amanda, for, our Deputy Director of Planning is taking the lead on this. So, I'm not going to go too far. But what the idea of this program is, is to look at the different properties that are current, currently foreclosure eligible in the County, but we have not taken title or foreclosed upon them because they have what were perceived to be in, serious environmental issues. So, this program would take a look at those properties and do kind of a two-phase review. And really, what we're trying to do here is investigate not only the paperwork and all the titles and the different history of the property and what was on there, but also then take that one step further and begin to do some testing and analysis on what the contamination is. We're not, so once we get to that stage and we have those findings, the idea is that we'll have a property with full disclosure records, and we'd be able to then sell those to interested parties or find a way to get them to a private entity. So, I'm going to let Amanda, when, I'm not sure what the timing is, but when should I get them ready to present on this?

Chairman Criswell: Yeah. So, this is going to be for all the things that you're presenting tonight. First of all, let me just thank you for helping get in a pattern now that we'll be able to have information well ahead of time. We'll be able to send questions to you before it gets the Resolution for this is exactly where we should be. So, thank you very much. So, the sooner you get us this information, the, the faster Legislators can look at the information, formulate questions, get that to you, have a bit of a back and forth, which will help you then inform the Resolution itself. Then we'll get the Resolution, be able to look at that and probably have further questions, but we'll be way ahead of the game. So. So the question is, as soon as you can get it.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Okay. So...

Chairman Criswell: And again, it doesn't have to be it doesn't have to be full Resolution form. So really, you know, as close as you can, but I think, give us the general concept. Definitely

dollars, any backup that you have about it, you can probably anticipate what our questions are going to be.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yep. Absolutely.

Chairman Criswell: You know, look at the scoring, look at the scoring rubric, and try and answer as much of that as possible.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Okay. Comptroller. I'm sorry, Comptroller.

Chairman Criswell: Yeah. Comptroller Gallagher, do you want to...

Comptroller Gallagher: I just wanted to mention that I think Legislator Ronk raised a very similar idea.

Chairman Criswell: You just went on mute.

Comptroller Gallagher: Legislator Ronk raised an idea very similar to what Amanda Lavalle is proposing here. So, I would suggest just circling back with him because he was talking about using funds for exactly this purpose.

Deputy Executive Kelly: This is in collaboration with Legislator Ronk, has been the whole time. So, he's got. So, part of that is he's got a substantial parcel within his district that is a dump. And this is not uncommon. In a lot of people's districts. I would suspect there's 30-something that have been identified as potentially prime. But I think they're still looking through the whole list. We have an estimate. And that's one thing that I'm trying to beat up with them a little bit more in our original plan. We looked at a million dollars for the overall prog-, program to do these investigations. I think it's coming in lower. So, what I had today was closer to, it would be in two trunks of kind of like 350 each program. Each do it in two phases at 350 a piece, but I'll let Amanda, she's got this one. So, I'm gonna let her speak on it when it's when we get time to present. Great, thank

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thanks. Yeah, you know, I've asked for I spoke with the Commissioner of Finance. I think this is a really, a worthy project. I've spoken, spoken with the Commissioner of Finance to get a list of the eligible properties and try to have an understanding, you know, where they're at, in terms of failure to pay taxes, you know, that's something I think we need to remember that in the absence of doing this, we continue to, we continue to make the Town's and the schools whole, while these projects at, idle. So, we have a vested interest, not just in having the, you know, removing the blight, but of getting these things back on the tax rolls. One thing that I'd like to just raise for Deputy Executive Kelly, and let me know, by extension for Amanda Levalle is, you know, I love in terms of the budgeting, you know, I'm, I'm less, it's great to have a specific number. But what I'd really like to understand is what we think those numbers are going to get us. Like, they'll get us the phase one, the initial studies, but I'd love to project out and get a sense of, you know, do we as a Legislature, want to potentially commit

some more funds to, to actually resolve some of the problems, not just to get that, you know, that first phase done. And what that would cost? Like, again, we may say no. We may say it's overwhelmingly. We may say we're gonna take them one by one, you know, on and just put it, make it a part of the annual budget. I have no idea, but I just would like to be provided options. You know, and I, and it goes without saying that I understand that it's at this point, they're estimates. So, I get that too.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Fair enough. Yeah. No, I think that's all fair. I think, you know, it depends on the nature of what's been on the property. When you get into like, petrochemicals and different things associated with old gas stations. Those are particularly nasty and expensive. Junkyards, depending on what they've held there over-time and how responsible or irresponsible they've been, is also going to be a big question there. So, yeah, I'll follow up with Amanda.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah.

Deputy Executive Kelly: I'll certainly pose the question. Yeah, that works.

Legislative Chair Bartels: And I think she'll probably be able to speak to us too. I mean, I would expect that in certain cases, they'll be, once identified, there would be potential outside funds, EPA, other funds, potentially available.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah. Big Oil Spill Cleanup, etc, Brownfields, there's a lot of different ways to go at this one. And really the thing that's been holding all of this up, well, the bigger part is not doing the work. Right? Is not spending the money to do the investigations. And now we have this opportunity, which is both. I think this is a great opportunity here.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yep.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. And I just want to mention, Legislator Nolan's conversation about using these funds for leveraged funds. I think it's really, really important that we, we add that into our conversation as often as possible. So, thank you for bringing that up Legislator Nolan. Alright, Deputy Executive Kelly, that was great. We'll looking forward to getting information on that. Where do you want to go next?

Deputy Executive Kelly 1:41:07

Jail demolitions. So, we have the jail property up on Golden Hill, which has been semi, probably three quarters vacant for quite some time since we built the new jail. We're in contract with Penrose Construction to do 160 units of affordable, of workforce and senior housing there. And what this would do is clear the site, because the funds that they access through the different affordable housing programs do not fund demolition. So, what these funds would do is fund the demolition so we can get the project going. And they're currently in a SEQR process with the City of Kingston.

Chairman Criswell: And just to note, that is number 11 on the priorities list. Of our ARPA Priorities List.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yep. And we'll make sure that when we actually present the Resolution, that we also give a more comprehensive briefing on the Penrose project, because I do realize that a lot of people aren't probably aware at this point. So, we'll make sure to include that.

Chairman Criswell: Great. Thank you so much for that. All right, moving on. Where do we go next?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Legislator Lopez has his hand up.

Chairman Criswell: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see you, Craig.

Legislator Lopez: Oh, there we go. Okay. The demolition was never included in the contract?

Deputy Executive Kelly: No.

Legislator Lopez: In that project?

Deputy Executive Kelly: No, the demolition cost wasn't included in there. And when they started doing their, their process, I know they do a lot with HCR at the state level. This is not a covered part of the project. The construction, and other portions are.

Legislator Lopez: Okay. All right, I wasn't aware. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Um, next up is 368 Broadway. So, this is actually executing on an approved ARPA project. So, in October of 21, the Legislature approved a project to fund \$3 million for a Crisis Stabilization Center. We have a, we've been looking and we've now identified a property that will accomplish both Crisis Stabilization and the idea of a Mental Health kind of community care hub, where we're looking to co-locate our Department of Mental Health, along with a lot of the different services that over time, we've become semi-disconnected, we've become more of those contract managers. And we think that it is important to be more connected with the people delivering the services, so we can get a better feel of how those programs are going and also just have that synergy. The other really important part of this is that Crisis Stabilization Center. I think everybody knows, everybody has strong feelings. If they don't, they should have. The fact that we lost the mental health beds out of WMC. So, we are trying, and we've been coordinating, and in discussions with the Legislature who have really also been driving this issue. So, I commend all of you, especially Legislator Walter on this. But this is executing on that vision. This is filling a real critical need. So at least for people in those real times of crisis, they'll have that 23-hour option until we get them a safer space. So, thank you. We're excited about that one.

Chairman Criswell: And I wanted to mention that Legislator Walter and I, and Legislator Bartels did a walkthrough of this space. And I personally thought it was a really appropriate choice. The location seemed like a very good location. A lot of access to public transportation. Very close access to the hospital if needed. There was certainly a good amount of room on, on

each of the floors. Very good access into the building. And they seem to, building seemed to be well kept up. Legislator Bartels you want to add anything to that? And then I see you, Legislator Earner.

Legislative Chair Bartels: No, I think you've, I think you've summarized that. I mean, for me, it's just very exciting to be in a brick-and-mortar space that and to imagine it as the realization of, you know, the proposal, which I think is going to fill a real critical need. We know that, you know, people in in crisis, there is nowhere locally for stabilization, and that, that presents real, immediate, you know, life threatening issues for families on a daily basis. I know people who have, who have, you know, waited and waited and had to drive to Westchester and beyond, to try to get help and services. So, you know, this, this is going to change a lot of lives, and it's gonna do really good work. And so, it was just very exciting to imagine, to imagine it built out. And it's, the building's in, it's, it's closer to realization, it's not gonna, it doesn't involve a lot of imagination is what I would say, in being in the space.

Chairman Criswell: There's also just some other very easy purchases, great parking, there's access to food resources, right around. So, there's, there's a lot of good things about it. Legislator Earner.

Legislator Erner: Thank you. This appears to be in District Six. How could I get a tour of that site?

Deputy Executive Kelly: We'll, we'll do it. Shoot me, shoot me a text or give me a call tomorrow and I'll make sure that Marc can facilitate a tour for you.

Legislator Erner: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Great.

Deputy Executive Kelly: You're welcome.

Chairman Criswell: All right. Thank you. If you would like to send us more information on that. That would be great.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah.

Chairman Criswell: We can have questions ready. And if any other Legislators want to jump on that tour, I highly recommend doing it. If you go into the space, it will make a big difference. You'll be able to see what we're talking about. So, if you're interested, if you want to send a message directly to Deputy Executive Kelly, I think that would be great.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, absolutely.

Chairman Criswell: All right. That takes us to Silver Gardens.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Silver Gardens. Okay. So, this is a project that is RUPCO-led with a partner, with a local developer out of Marlborough. So, this is kind of, I know we've talked about the, there's a lot of different housing needs. So, we did the RUPCO Quality Inn Project. We supported that, which is 81 units of supportive housing. Then we're looking at doing the Elizabeth Manor Project, which is to move people out of a lot of these hotels / motels into a safe space with services connected. That Elizabeth Manor project actually takes about a 10% chunk out of the, the people that were typically locating in those motels, so it is substantial. This project hits a different lane in a different location. So, this is geographic diversity. We're going into the town of Lloyd, and this project is 57 units of senior housing. 29 units, Nate? I believe 29. I'll stick with it.

Director of Recovery & Resilience Litwin: Yes.

Deputy Executive Kelly: 29 units are supportive housing. So supportive housing meaning that is for chronically homeless individuals. And in this scenario, it is chronically homeless seniors. So that, the exciting, there's multiple exciting parts of this project, which is why we're putting it forward. It's geographically diverse. So, we're not just in the Kingston, Town of Ulster area. We're starting to get more into that southern end of the County. The other part is the demographic. We all know the challenges that seniors have. And then you're dealing with a population that has exponentially more challenges and securing a safe space to live long term. This is long term housing. The other part, and this is the lane that I know, I wish she was on. I really do. Legislator Greene is not on. But this, what we're looking to fund here is geothermal wells in support of the project. So, this is going to be one of the most environmentally sustainable projects, I think, in the senior housing realm in the state. At least, that's the angle that they're pushing for. So, what we're trying to do here is kind of show our interest in promoting the Green New Deal. And, you know, that, that seems to be a lane that we haven't hit. But it's also hitting that real critical need of more diverse housing and long-term housing choices.

Chairman Criswell: Can you talk a little bit about the partners to this project?

Deputy Executive Kelly: So RUPCO is 51% owner on that. Does, is that what you mean?

Chairman Criswell: Yes.

Deputy Executive Kelly: So yes, so it's RUPCO is the 51%. And then the other one is, I believe it's Marlboro Associates, which is Richard Gerentine is the lead on that project, who is a former member of the Legislature and he's been involved in this industry for quite some time.

Chairman Criswell: And my understanding when I spoke to, to Kevin O'Connor was that this was a bit of a, like, based on the same kind of idea of Landmark Place kind of model. Is that correct?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, yeah, that's correct. That's the supportive housing model. I think that goes along with that, where you will have the connected services within the same location. One thing I also wanted to point out, and this is something that I know Richard's projects, for his other projects, right now, there's over 300 person waiting list just to get in there. I think when

we're trying to demonstrate need, that's kind of, a, he does, he deals in the senior housing realm. So just to know that within the local community, there is that need. I think, yes, it's 57, it's gonna have an impact. But it shows that even post ARPA, there's a lot of work to be done. So, it's not something that we can just walk away from when, when, you know, the money spent, I think there's going to be a lot more projects that we have to, at least be engaged in, in helping facilitate.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. I see Legislator Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. Yeah, I think there's no doubt that the project fills a need. And, you know, I hope that we see many more projects like it county-wide. You know, I looked through, I looked through the background that was provided, and I've spoken with the developer some about it. Um, you know, one thing that I want to bring up and this is, you know, it's similar to the discussion we had, with regard to the trails is that this mechanism of direct funding, but for ARPA, we wouldn't normally be allowed to do. So this is unique, and in my tenure here, to make a direct contribution to private project, I understand that it's a not for profit, but there's substantial developer fees involved. And, you know, and it's, it's, so, so I want to first point that out, and to that end, I did not see in the packet, the, the real estate pro forma, or the low-income tax credit application, which I would like to request just so that I can understand the financial arrangement. And to that end, I'd also like to, you know, suggest that we may want to have a conversation, al la, the, the demolition, at the former jail site. My understanding of our participation in that demolition with Penrose is that we are going to have an equity stake in the project in the form of, it's not something that we have any controlling interest, it's minor. But if and when the project gets sell, sold, we get that money back, again, not with interest. It's a, it's a, I forget what it's called, but it's a, it's basically a sales certificate that happens on the sale, and we get that money, but we have a stake. And, and again, this this project, my understanding of why the request is in and why the urgency, is that the local match is a critical component in lining up the rest of the funding, which, as a Legislature, I do think and I'm I really, I am going to be looking into the Westchester model, which was a, my understanding is that it was a local law that was passed that allows them to bond for these projects. And that's how they fulfilled their local share. And in the last round, got the funding for the project. So, this something I do think, as a Legislature we need to talk about, but I also, with regards to this individual project, I would want to have a conversation about our share potentially being contingent upon an equity share, or upon a reduced developer fee. Because this is just one, you know, there are other projects happening around the county. And I think it's important that, you know, we, we, and there's a lot of pressure on this money, as we've discussed all day today in terms of the, the amount of projects coming. So, in recognition of the, you know, the unique nature of the project, I think it's, it's really important. I of course want to see it happen. But I also I also want to facilitate a conversation for protecting the, you know, the County's interest in it, and that the first step would really be looking at their real estate pro forma and that application to understand the finance because again, there was a narrative that discussed the deferred developer fee, but it was, you know, it was a five, five-page narrative. It wasn't an official document. It was, it was a narrative.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, I think That's all fair. And I think you hit on a really good point in terms of understanding when you're accessing homing community renewals funds for these projects. It's highly competitive. And we're in a region where we're competing with Rockland,

Westchester, and others. So, when everybody's putting their projects forward for funding on these, when the committee's see the local share, a local government is participating financially within the projects that strengthens the application substantially. So, on the other parts, all fair. Certain, certainly I know the team is ready, they keep sending us documents. So, we will certainly share everything. And they're, they want to be an open book on this. So, I think all fair questions. I just want, I just wanted to ask. So, I have these four, when should I get them ready to actually make a presentation to the ARPA committee as that first step? What date would that be?

Chairman Criswell: I think our next meeting date would be appropriate. Which is the...

Deputy Clerk Feaster: 30th.

Chairman Criswell: 16th.

Deputy County Executive Kelly: Do you want to do it the day of...

Deputy Clerk Feaster: The next meeting, I'm sorry. The next upcoming meeting of the committee is the 30th. And that has been moved to five o'clock.

Chairman Criswell: That's, that's not our next upcoming meeting. Is that correct?

Deputy County Executive Kelly: That's what's on the Legislative calendar.

Legislator Nolan: That's on the County's calendar, is March 30th. Is on the County calendar.

Chairman Criswell: Oh, yes. Sorry, I'm sorry. I'm looking at it. I did a very complex calendar for myself, which actually added all the Legislative sessions and all the Resolution deadlines. So, thank you.

Deputy Executive Kelly: All good. I'll make sure that everybody's primed. But I'll get the flow of information going in between now and then. And I think we should answer questions or even collect questions, so we can answer them in the presentation.

Chairman Criswell: Perfect. And do we want to get all those questions to our Clerk? Who's going to then feed them to you? How do you how do you want that to happen? What's the most efficient way?

Deputy Executive Kelly: I'm open. I mean, I think in terms of collecting them, in an organized manner, I'm going to rely on Nate to facilitate. So if Amber wants to work with Nate, and then I'm not a block here.

Chairman Criswell: I think that's great. Because I think if one Legislator has a question, other Legislators will probably have a similar question. So rather than, you know, going one and one and one, let's try and organize in a way that we can consolidate like questions, that type of thing.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Perfect.

Chairman Criswell: So, um, Amber if you and Nate could sort of figure out a process for that. But Legislators for now, if you could feed your questions to Amber, that would be terrific. All right, great. Legislator Bartels. Did you have one other thing you wanted to say? I thought I saw your hand.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, thank you. Um, I was just gonna also say that, um, I'll attempt to ask for that next meeting, have more detail on the land bank ask, and potentially the community kitchen project, which I'll work with Deputy Executive Kelly on, on both of those as well and, and the ARPA team.

Chairman Criswell: That's great. Thank you so much. That's a great segue for me to actually go into my very complicated schedule that I have in front of me. But, but I really did want to get us into this rhythm, which I think we are in now, which I mentioned before, where we're looking at things we've got plenty of time to then get them into, see them, ask questions, get them in before Resolution deadline. So, we're in this process of having vetted something, then we can have, have a vote on it, and then move on to the next. So, if anybody wants to see my complicated schedule, I'll happily send it to you. But I think you'll get the gist of it right now. And I do appreciate all the Legislators doing the scoring in a timely manner so that we can compile it and then report it back out at the committee meetings. All right. Thank you, Deputy Executive Kelly. Is there any old business that we need to cover? Seeing none, I think I'm going to ask for a motion to adjourn unless there's any other. All right, a motion to adjourn, please.

Legislator Corcoran: I'll move.

Legislator Sperry: Second.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Again, thank you all for your focused attention. Really, again, a very, very good evening of discussion. So, thank you very much.

Time: 7:08 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster

Minutes Approved: March 30, 2022