

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

DATE & TIME: March 30, 2022 – 5:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID: 850 5625 6619
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, Eric Stewart; Deputy County Executive Chris Kelly; Sam Sonenberg, Office of the Comptroller; ARP Administration Nathan Litwin, and Molly Scott; Director of Planning Dennis Doyle; Amanda LeValle, Planning Department; RUPCO, Kevin O’Connor, and Emily Hamilton

- **Chairman Criswell called the meeting to order at 5:07 PM**

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

Motion No. 1: To approve the minutes and transcripts of the February 23, 2022 and March 9, 2022 Regular Meetings

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

Discussion: None

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

Deputy Clerk Feaster provided a brief financial overview of ARPA expenditures and allocations to date.

Motion No. 2: 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 \$5,000,000.00.

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

Discussion: Legislator Maloney described the proposed amendments before the Committee and confirmed that the proposed project for the Town of Marbletown does fit within the scope of the Water and Sewer Matching program proposed. Legislator Corcoran spoke in favor of the proposal and the opportunity it presents to the local municipalities. Legislative Chair Bartels disclosed that multiple municipalities have already submitted requests under the proposal, emphasizing that the project may become competitive quickly. Deputy County Executive Kelly briefly explained the pre-application and scoring methodology currently being considered.

Motion No. 3: To amend 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 \$5,000,000.00.

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

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. 4: To approve 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, as Amended

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 \$5,000,000.00.

Motion Made By: Legislator Levine

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Corcoran

Discussion: Legislator Levine commented that he would like to see projects in severe need prioritized. Committee members agreed they are in support of a \$5,000,000.00 commitment.

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. 160 – Dedicating ARPA Funding For The “The Ulster County Land Bank Development Corporation” – Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Operating Budget in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 to dedicate American Rescue Plan Act funds for the empowerment of the Ulster County Land Bank Corporation to perform its duties.

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

Discussion: Legislative Chair Bartels provided an overview and explanation of the process for applying to establish a land bank, including a history of Ulster County's exploration of doing so, and an overview of some of the successes surrounding County land banks have had. Legislator Levine confirmed that this was the top ranked priority on the Legislature's ARPA Priorities List.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 6: To discuss Resolution No. 161 – Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program – Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 633 - Marbletown Water Infrastructure Expansion – ARP Infrastructure – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 633 - Marbletown Water Infrastructure Expansion in the amount of \$1,500,000.00 and amends the 2022 Capital Fund accordingly.

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

Discussion: Legislator Stewart provided an overview of the proposed project, emphasizing that the request is for only a small portion of the project's overall costs which the Town will cover and that the final project will result in the construction of affordable housing and the ability to construct more, higher density housing. Legislator Greene spoke in support of the proposed project, disclosing that she has canvassed neighbors and the project is accepted and welcome.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 7: To discuss Resolution No. 162 – Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program – Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 634 - Grady Park Construction, Town Of Marbletown – ARP Infrastructure And Trails – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 634 - Grady Park Construction, Town Of Marbletown in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 and amends the Capital Improvement Program accordingly.

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

Discussion: Legislator Stewart provided a detailed overview of the proposed project, including the project's specifications, where it is in the planning process, and what the Town of Marbletown and the D&H Canal Society plans for its future.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 7: To block Resolutions No. 163 and 164

Motion Made By: Legislator Corcoran
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Sperry

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. 8: To discuss the following Resolutions:

Resolution No. 163 – Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 631 – A Geothermal System For Silver Gardens Senior Housing Development – ARPA - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 631 – A Geothermal System For Silver Gardens Senior Housing Development in the amount of \$600,000.00 and amends the 2022 Capital Fund Budget accordingly.

Resolution No. 164 – Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$600,000.00 Entered Into By The County – RUPCO, Inc. – Department Of Finance

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with RUPCO, Inc. from April 20, 2022 through October 1, 2024 awarding funds to the subrecipient for the purpose of aiding in constructing a portion of the Silver Gardens Senior Housing Rental Development in the amount of \$600,000.00.

Motion Made By: Legislator Corcoran
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Sperry

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: Senior Project Manager at RUPCO, Emily Hamilton, provided a detailed presentation of the Silver Gardens Housing Project, including an overview of the quantity of units, other funding sources for the Project, and the impact that ARPA funding has on the project. Mr. O'Connor and Mr. Gerentine answered Committee member questions.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 9: To discuss Resolution No. 165 – Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 629 – ARPA Brownfields Redevelopment – Planning Department

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 629 – ARPA Brownfields Redevelopment in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 and amends the 2022 Capital Fund accordingly.

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

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Discussion: Deputy Director of Planning Amanda LaValle presented a slideshow defining what a brownfield is, providing examples of known brownfields in Ulster County, and explaining how brownfields can be remedied by the County. Legislator Maloney requested confirmation that the eligible, not foreclosed on, potential brownfields list included in the presentation is the most

recent and most accurate version available. Legislator Maloney also requested confirmation of all individuals involved in the foreclosure decision-making process. Chairman Corcoran disclosed the role that each Town Enforcement Officer plays in the brownfield identification process.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 10: To discuss Resolution No. 166 – Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 632 – Crisis Stabilization Center, Purchase Of 368 Broadway – ARPA - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 632 – Crisis Stabilization Center, Purchase Of 368 Broadway in the amount of \$2,000,000.00 and amends the 2022 Capital Fund Budget accordingly.

Motion Made By: Legislator Levine

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Sperry

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Discussion: Director of Recovery & Resilience Nate Litwin provided an overview of the building, the County’s Policy to establish a Crisis Stabilization Center, the plans for the building, and the anticipated future costs associate with its acquisition. Legislative Chair Bartels spoke in favor of the building, stating that the location is ideal and the building is in good shape, requiring little renovation work to achieve it’s intended end purpose.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 11: To discuss Resolution No. 167 – Adopting A Negative Declaration For The Demolition Of The Former Ulster County Jail Located On Golden Hill, And Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 630 - Demolition Of Jail Golden Hill- ARPA – Department Of Planning

Resolution Summary: This Resolution determines that the demolition of the former Jail located on Golden Hill is an Unlisted Action that is a discrete action that can be considered separate and apart from the future actions, including the construction of affordable housing at the site, and that as such a segmented review is warranted and determines that approval will be no less protective

of the environment nor will it commit the Legislature to any future course of action and that is approval will not have an adverse impact on the environment, adopts a negative declaration, and amends the Capital Improvement Program to fund Capital Project No. 597 – ARP Housing – Jail Demolition in the amount of \$1,500,000.00.

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

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

Discussion: Director of Planning Dennis Doyle explained why the demolition costs are being requested from ARPA funding, disclosed that the ending results will be the addition of more affordable housing units, and answered questions.

Disposition: No Action Taken

New Business: None

Old Business: None

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

Adjournment

Motion Made By: Legislator Levine
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Lopez
No. of Votes in Favor: 4
No. of Votes Against: 0

Time: 7:37 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster
Minutes Approved: April 27, 2022

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

DATE & TIME: March 30, 2022 – 5:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID: 850 5625 6619
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, Eric Stewart; Deputy County Executive Chris Kelly; Sam Sonenberg, Office of the Comptroller; ARP Administration Nathan Litwin, and Molly Scott; Director of Planning Dennis Doyle; Amanda LeValle, Planning Department; RUPCO, Kevin O’Connor, and Emily Hamilton

- **Chairman Criswell called the meeting to order at 5:07 PM**
-

Chairman Criswell: Good evening, everybody. I'm going to call the meeting to order. This is the American Rescue Plan Act Special Committee meeting. It is March 30, 2022. And it is 5:07 pm. I hope everybody's doing well. I'm going to keep us moving along for this meeting tonight. I unfortunately have a hard stop at 6:25 and I hope that we are finished by then. If we're not, Legislator Corcoran has graciously agreed to continue on the meeting. But like I said, I hope we're finished at that point. I think we probably all hope we're finished at that point. So, I will, I will move us along as quickly as possible. Has everybody in the committee had a chance to look at the minutes and the transcripts of the February 23rd and March 9th meetings and if so, can I have a motion to approve those?

Legislator Corcoran: Motion to approve.

Legislator Lopez: I'll second.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. All in favor.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Any opposed? Thank you. The minutes pass. All right. Let me talk a little bit about how I think tonight is gonna go down. What I'd like to do is do a little bit of a financial

update to tell you where we're at. And Amber and I will do that together. Let you know, you know, again, the, the total number that we had and what we've approved so far and give us the bottom line of how much is left to spend. And then with your approval, what I'd like to suggest is, since we did not get a lot of information on the majority of these resolutions, that we're going to take no action on them like we've done before. So, what I'd like to suggest is that we vote, we'll hear the score for 96 and vote on 96. Because we've, we've gotten a lot of information on that. And then I'd like to suggest that we take no action on all the other resolutions. That will give us time to take in the presentations that we're going to see tonight. We'll have a chance to ask them questions about that, get some information. It will also give us a chance to score all those resolutions. And what I'd like to do is have a goal of scoring those resolutions by Sunday evening. That way, if we have all those resolutions scored, we can get them to Amber. Amber can then distribute them with any of our comments to the committee's. Committees can have those for their committee week. Then we can go ahead at our next meeting, and we can vote on all those resolutions that we haven't been able to vote on. That will bring us in before session so it will sort of catch us up and we should be in good shape at that point. So that makes sense to everybody? Any questions on that? Methodology? All right, hearing none, then we're gonna move forward. So let us move forward with financial update. Amber, if you could just give us sort of the high level of kind of where we're at, what we've approved so far as a body. I know that there are a couple of things that we've approved that are not fully realized in terms of, of the full cash amount. So, if you can let us know about those, and then just give us a bottom-line number of where we're at, that would be really helpful.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Sure, so as of the March, the March 16th session, resolutions approved have been included in the ARPA tracker that was distributed for this meeting's meeting materials. The total allocation left, unspent is \$18,634,654.78. Um, there. There are a couple of things here, like Chair Criswell was mentioning, the crisis stabilization center. Right now, we have a budget estimate of 3 million in the tracker. The acquisition of the property is 2 million. Then the estimate for total staff is in here. Obviously, that's over the course of the three-year period of time. So, those are just a couple of the pieces that are like moving targets.

Chairman Criswell: That's great. Thank you. Any committee members have any questions about where we're at with spending at this point? Okay, it's going quickly, everyone. So, especially with this slew of resolutions that we have in tonight, depending on where they all go. So, just to be aware of that fact. All right, so what I'd like to do is ask if we can have a motion to discuss resolution 96.

Legislator Corcoran: Motion.

Chairman Criswell: A second, please.

Legislator Lopez: Second.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Great. We received an amended version this morning. So, do we need to vote on this before we discuss it?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: A motion to approve the amendments as presented.

Chairman Criswell: Do we need to do that before we discuss the resolution?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Um, well...

Chairman Criswell: Let's have that be part of our, let's have that be part of our discussion actually. Is the amendment. And then we can actually go on and vote on the amendment. So. All right. So, I'd like to. Yes, Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: I was just gonna say we need to move the, we moved the resolution for discussion, but we don't need to move the amendment yet. We can...

Chairman Criswell: Perfect.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Just discuss it and then when we're ready to move it, move it.

Chairman Criswell: Perfect. That's great. So, so I think I had a first and a second, all in favor of discussion.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Great, any opposed? Great. Thank you very much. I'd actually like to call on Legislator Maloney to see if there's any update you want to give us on this. I know that there was a lot of work that was done on it since it was last presented. So, if you could just give us some highlights of what, what has transpired and kind of where it sits right now.

Legislator Maloney: So, um, there was a couple of things, last things to hammer out and one of them, I got the impression talking to both the Exec side and Legislators, including the Chair, that they wanted it to be a matching fund, which is how it was originally written. So, we had to talk about what that number would be. The amendment is at 33% for the county share. That's what the Executive was really comfortable with. I think the intent is to make sure that that the municipalities are coming forward with projects that they really were going, or you know that they're invested in it. They're not just going and finding something and treating this like a grant that's going to run out if they don't use it and coming up with projects that really means something to them. That they, that they're prepared and wanting, wanting to do. The, I think Shawangunk and Saugerties have presented. I know Marbletown has to and I haven't had a chance to look at that. But what they're coming to us with is, this would be, this would, they would be happy with how this is written. I think it serves what they're asking for. There's also a cap we had, you know, with 20-something municipalities and potentially up to 12 or 15 of them coming to us, I think we have to have a cap, an original cap, to make sure everybody gets a fair shot at getting a decent project. And so, the cap number we came up with was 500,000. And the 33% number, I think it was originally written at 50%. I'm open to discussion on that. That's a

pretty simple discussion on where everybody wants to be. But so, this is, in my opinion, you know, we've, there's been a lot of discussion, a lot of minor changes and tweaks, it seems to be written in a way that the towns that have been looking for some assistance are going to be happy. Like I said, it's going to fulfill what they're asking for. So, I think this is pretty close to being vote ready. I'm interested in hearing, you know, I have talked to a lot of different people and their opinions have gone into this. But I'm interested to hear where everybody's at.

Chairman Criswell: And there was also a change in the actual total dollar amount, right?

Legislator Maloney: Yes. I thought we had talked about that.

Chairman Criswell: Yeah. And I just want to make sure that's clear. It's clear to everybody.

Legislator Maloney: Yes. And it's, it's, it's at about 5 million. And if you kind of figure that, you know, 10 municipalities coming to us with five, you know, it's I think it's a good number, this could, I think we could quickly realize that maybe where we have a million leftover and we, and we, it goes back in after we're, we're comfortable that all the towns that have come to us have gotten what they needed. Or if we wanted to do another round and let a town that had a second project in the hopper go for it. That'd be a discussion for the committee. And talking to Chris Kelly today, he, he told me that that the Executive side was very comfortable with that amount. So.

Chairman Criswell: Great. Thank you so much for that update, and also for the amendments that we made. I think that they're great. I just want to give a little bit of a history now on, on where the resolution was. So, it went to Public Works where no action was taken. Went to Ways and Means. It was postponed. It lands at number 13 on the Legislative Survey Priorities, the ARPA Priorities List. And, this is interesting, there are eight projects on the Legislature's, our priorities list, that might fall within the confines of this actual proposed project. So, there's a lot of interest in this. Um, any Legislators have questions or comments on this at this point?
Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: The, just a quick note, that the Marletown resolution that Eric and Laura have in, I think that would completely fit into what we're doing here. So, if that was postponed, you could potentially put that back up. And this was passed, you could put that, keep it, postpone, it goes back in next month, because we are going to be voting. That's how I probably carry the Saugerties one that's in. I'm sure Ken or somebody will carry the Shawangunk one that's in, and then ARPA will probably be voting, assume, to approve the, each specific municipal project, so that that resolution, as written might not really have to change much. If this is passed, it just goes back in in a month or so. And then we...

Chairman Criswell: It would just have to talk about this as the umbrella funds where it's coming. Right? Yeah. I saw a Legislator Corcoran. Did you have a question?

Legislator Corcoran: No, not a question, just a comment. Basically, I got, I like the meat and bones of this resolution. I like the opportunity for all Legislators and municipalities to have an opportunity to grab that that. So, that's a good thing. Like I said, the Southern tier sometimes gets

left out, and I will constantly speak for that. But this is a good opportunity for everybody to kind of take a shot at this. So you know, I scored this high in the rubric. And again, I believe it's a very good resolution. So that's my two cents on that.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir. Any other committee members have questions or comments? Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. Yeah, I would just concur. I think this is a, it's a project that in my conversations with Leg...-, a large amount of Legislators, there seems to be a consensus on this. And I think this is a good way to handle it, rather than having the ARPA committee tackle individual requests from all across the county. Creating a program whereby those projects could be evaluated with a with a matrix and a scoring system, understanding that there's going to be a level of it that's competitive because of the, whatever the financial figure, not the individual cap, but the big cap is. And I know that, I know that the ARPA team is working on putting that together. So, I think that's something that we can look forward, hopefully, to seeing in my conversation with Deputy Executive Kelly, before the final vote on the floor on this. I'd say that the one thing, I'm really happy with the amendments. I wanted to make sure that there was a match, and I'm happy with this, this level of match. I think we and I do think that this is, is time sensitive, you know, in looking at the rubric or something that occurred to me, just to the extent that communities are making decisions about their own ARPA funds. And if we are providing a portion of a match against their ARPA funds, you know, we want to do, we want to at least make that available as soon as, make it known that that's available as soon as possible so that they can move forward with those, those decisions. The one thing I think that we're going to need to make a final decision on is the, is at least the, the first level of the cap, are we talking about allocating X amount of millions to this project? And I think the, the number that's currently on the table is, is 5 million. And I'm looking forward to hearing what all my colleagues think on that front.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Other Legislators, any other Legislators want to speak to this? Yes, Legislator Stewart.

Legislator Stewart: Actually mine is, I guess more of a question. So, so, basically, what we're saying is that we're, the, for example, the two resolutions that I'm putting forward tonight, if the committee deems that it's not appropriate to deal with in this committee, but rather, let me rephrase that. I guess what I'm asking is, it's my understanding that there's a chance to like, basically get two bites of this apple, is that correct? I mean, it can either go through the resolutions as they're written now and be voted on eventually, or we can apply for the money that comes from the, that goes to the various individual communities.

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Maloney, do you want to speak to that?

Legislator Maloney: I, if I'm hearing the question correctly, you're saying that there's two ways to do this. And we can do it, you know, first come, first serve, piecemeal it through with all the towns and / or create the, you know, this pool and then go from there. I think a lot of the Legislators I talked to really thought the, I think the Executive agreed that they prefer to do it

through a pool. I mean to what Tom was just saying, this really ensures that it's fair that everybody gets an equal, in every, every town is going to...-

Legislator Stewart: That each municipality is well represented in the eventual end.

Legislator Maloney: And there is going to be a criteria. Chris is going to, there is a criteria. Not, it's not just, hey it's water infrastructure, and they're going to, you know, cut your check. You're going to have to prove to the, the Executive, it's not going to be many hurdles. But that this is not a project that's already started. This is about making something happen, that wasn't going to happen and helping these towns do something, you know, meet them halfway or almost halfway to ensure something gets done that wouldn't normally get done. And I think everybody I've talked to, every, 100% on both sides, from, from the Executive to the to our own Legislature really thinks that this creating this pool, and then having a criteria and a set way to do this with all the municipalities having a fair time amount of time and shot to come and get their project and is the way to properly do this, that have all these Legislators running with these projects to the to the ARPA funds.

Legislator Stewart: And I agree that first come, first serve is not necessarily the most desirable way to, you know, spend funds, so.

Chairman Criswell: The, the other way that this supports the criteria that we've come up with for spending these ARPA funds is creating a pool, or bucket, or whatever you want to call it, spreads it out over the whole county as several Legislators have said, Legislators have said now.

Legislator Stewart: Right.

Chairman Criswell: Whereas coming up to us with individual projects, you know, it's a, it's a smaller region that we're serving. So, I think that, you know, we're, we're, if we do this project, it will serve what we're actually saying we want to do. So.

Legislator Stewart: Great, well thank you both for that explanation. I appreciate it.

Chairman Criswell: You're welcome. Chair Bartels, I saw your hand up.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. Yeah, just, just two things. One to Legislator, Legislator Stewart is asking a question about two resolutions. I think this one is only relevant to the water sewer resolution that you have and not the, not the other resolution that's in. That's the first thing. And then the second. My second comment is, you know, I would hope in in creating the Scoring Matrix, or whatever you're, you're calling it. To, this is to the, to the ARPA team. And, and the, you know, the standing members of the ARPA committee to whatever extent you're collaborating on this, with the team, you know. I would like to see there be some, some level of priority given to projects that could conceivably, could have a greater county benefit. Because and it may not be an exclusive and exclusionary requirement. I'm not saying that you don't make the requirement if you don't have a greater county benefit. But it may come down to the fact where we're looking at, we're at X amount of dollars, and we're looking competitively at two different projects, or 10 different projects. And, you know, and in that case, I would want to, I

would want the projects that had a greater county benefit to be ranked great, more high, more highly, and that, and I see that as being even things like economic development to the individual community as being, having an extended benefit to the county versus necessarily, for example, a water sewer connection that's just servicing market rate housing. So, so that's, that's the one thing and then the other thing just for everyone's information, there are quite a few communities that are ready have requests in in various states of detail. I would say, based on what I've seen, Saugerties' request is the most detailed thus far, but there are more than, than the number of communities that Legislator Maloney detailed. So, this may get very competitive, you know, fairly, fairly quickly. But I do think that it's really important work. And I think to the extent that our participation can spur this, that's, you know, that's what the, the money, it's one of the things that's very explicitly stated in, you know, in the ARPA guidelines. So that's all thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that Chair. And just so you know, Deputy Executive Kelly and I have not had a conversation yet about how the ARPA committee will be a part of or won't be a part of the scoring have individual projects that go under this umbrella. But I hope we can have that conversation because I do think it would be an appropriate use of the rubric that we already have and how we can adjust that for individual projects like this. Do you agree with that, sir?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Sure. Can I make other points too?

Chairman Criswell: Absolutely.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Okay, so that was one of the first points is either finding a way that we did on the small business or non-for-profit side, where we had the collaborative approach where we'll actually go through the rubric with Executive and Legislative participation. It seemed to be a model that makes people comfortable. So, I would be happy to put some of our DPW and maybe Planning on that, and I'll float that as an idea. The other part is, Dennis, I'm gonna put you on the spot real quick. You don't have to go on camera. Last year, the, there he is, the Legislature asked Dennis to survey the municipalities about potential for water and sewer projects. I can't find the spreadsheet. And I keep telling Tracey, I'm gonna send it. Dennis, if you could resurface that or maybe one of the Clerks would also have it, because we did give it to the Legislature that was set up for us and I'd circulate that widely, just so everybody has the same points of information. It's got its various stages of like, I think the, Chairwoman Bartels pointed out where some projects are certainly going to be much further along than others. One thing that Nate and Dennis and trying to design, a, you know, a call for projects here is doing a pre-application. So, what we would do is have a crate-, have the criteria for the project to be even accepted to be scored. It would be an initial screening, where we would be able to vet. And, an, it'd just be more efficient to say, is this project, have a capital stack that includes matching funds from the town right? Like that's, that's an easy, yes or no, if it doesn't, and you're unable to secure that, we shouldn't even bother scoring it, right? The other thing would be timeliness of completion. These funds have a limit on them. We need to make sure that the municipality in charge of the project is going to be ready to go, has design engineering, whatever it is, that their timeline is realistic. So, we don't kind of tie up funds that otherwise could go to some other projects. So, aside from that, I think Joe, Legislator Maloney hit on a lot of the good points there. I think that we're going to be able to jump into a diverse array of municipalities here and help them with their projects.

And I do want to say that I agree with Chairwoman Bartels is, we should be thinking about where these additional connections are, these water and sewer projects incentivize other projects or other priorities of the ARPA funds, but also for the Legislative body or the Executive. I think on both sides of the aisle here there's a lot of agreement on what we should be doing in the County and I think you've seen that through the use of ARPA funds for affordable housing or other efforts. I think that we should keep that in mind, definitely as we go through that. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much. I'd like to bring up the amendment now. So, can we have a motion to accept the resolution as amended? Is that where we need to go with this?

Legislator Levine: I'll make that motion to put it up as amended.

Chairman Criswell: And a second on that.

Legislator Corcoran: Second.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: So, the amendment is adopted as, or the, the, the amending of the resolution is adopted. I'd like to call for a vote unless there's any further discussion on this. Yes, Legislator Levine.

Legislator Levine: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, just a very quick comment. I just wanted to basically reiterate and agree with the comments of Chair Bartels in regards to, I think it's important that you know, we try to look at look at these proposed projects, and try to find the highest priority for projects that have, you know, countywide benefits and the most, you know, the most bang for the buck, if you will. So, I would very much agree with that. But the, the other the only other thing I would add to that would be, I think it's, probably also important to, we should pretrial, we should probably try to look at trying to figure out a way to figure out the priorities of the project from looking at it from the infrastructure, logistical infrastructure needs like highest priority projects that, you know, we're dealing with, a water system that is, that is severely compromised and needs immediate repair, I think should probably go higher on the list and something that, you know, it's kind of more upgrading and that's already working somewhat well. So, I think we shouldn't be looking at immediate need, would probably, you probably would, I would think want to go high on the list, higher on the list than a project that is of less immediate, logistical needs. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. You know, one thing I failed to do was, Chairwoman Bartels, I see your hand but I'm gonna ask Amber to read the scoring because we, all the Legislators were able to score this.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: For Goals and Mission, this project scored an 8.8 out of 12, which is 73%. Under Equity Distribution, this project scored a 25.6 out of 36, which is 71%. Under

Community Impact, this project scored a 29.8 out of 37, which is an 81%. For Financial Management, this project scored an 8.4 out of 15, which is 56%, for an overall total of 72.6 out of 100 or 73%.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, thank you very much. Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. I just was gonna, I just wanted to confirm that the committee feels comfortable with a \$5 million commitment.

Legislator Corcoran: Yes.

Chairman Criswell: Yes.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: All right. I'm going to call the vote on this. All in favor of approving resolution 96, as amended. Say aye.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Opposed. And I'm an aye as well so, the resolution passes. Congratulations. Thank you, Legislator Maloney. I think it's gonna be a really great project for our county. I think it's gonna serve a lot of people. So, thank you for bringing that up front. All right. Next is resolution 160. Can I have a motion for discussion?

Legislator Corcoran: Motion.

Chairman Criswell: Second.

Legislator Lopez: Second.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Opposed. Okay. Legislate-, Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: You're welcome.

Legislative Chair Bartels: So, I've been to this committee before and I've, over the course of the last term was at the Economic Development Committee with the land bank proposal. And I just want to give you a little bit of background on this. And, and also to let you know that in this month's packet, there will also be the first phase of the requirements for our application for land bank. And I'll go into that a little bit further in a moment. So, New York State's Land Bank

program was established with Article 16 of New York State's Not For Profit Corporation law and pursuant to that, communities were authorized to create land banks upon the condition of approval by the New York State Urban Development Corporation. They, there's a limit on the number of land banks that are permitted to be allowed in the state. Initially, I believe it was set at 11 and that's been expanded and there is still, they are still accepting applications. For a period of time in this discussion, we were under the erroneous impression that we were prohibited from applying because the, within the county in, in the City of Kingston, there's a local land bank. But upon further investigation, it was found that we actually do have the capacity to plot, apply. And it's, it's our intention to apply and the first steps to, toward an application are actually formulating the board, which is not before the ARPA committee because it's not an ARPA function. But I'm bringing it up to say that in this month, there will be an, there will be a resolution creating the board and naming the board despite the fact that this seems like a very backward approach. It's required by the enabling legislation that the board being, be named and created in advance of the application. So, we're actually putting people, and that's been some of the challenge, actually, frankly, asking people to serve on a board that we don't yet have the authority to, to have. But, but we have some, some excellent, excellent candidates, and you'll, you'll see that in the Economic Development Committee next week. And, and we're beginning the application process, which includes the initial articles of incorporation, et cetera, et cetera. Among the things that are, that are considered in the application process, are the commitment and I'm gonna, I'm gonna read the exact language for you. But the, essentially the commitment from the county in terms of financial resources and, and its stated here in the actual land bank guidelines here. It says "the nature and extent of proposed financial resources to be made available to the land bank, by, by the FGU and participating municipalities in accordance with section 16-10 of the act". So, the request here before you today is to make to make a commitment to the land bank, with the understanding that, first and most obvious, if we do not succeed in getting approval to create our own land bank, we will not expend the money from it. That's, that's the first thing I just want to be clear about.

I'm requesting that we commit to a million dollars. And that, I see that, I see that commitment, as it's a, it's an, it's an upfront commitment, but I see it as a, as a long-term operational commitment to, to the land bank, should we get the approval, not something that's going to be through in one year. That's going to help the land bank get started operationally in terms of staffing, etc, and initial land purchases. Now, you know, in my research, one of the, one of our neighbors, and I will provide in the backup before you do your scoring guidelines from the state that I'm referencing, and reports from Albany County, who I think really, for me has served as a model in my research in terms of their success. You know, they all many county's land banks has a relatively short history. Again, we're, you know, the act only happened in 2011. And in a short amount of time. I just want to pull up some information for you. In a short amount of time, they have done some pretty amazing things and, and I just like to take a moment to talk to you about that. Their land bank was established in 2014. That was the year that they, they did, took the steps that we're talking about and, and they got their approval in 2015. They acquired their first property, funded their first demolition, closed their first building sale, and closed their first land sale. In that, so again, remembering that's 2014 incorporating. 2015 first steps. By 2019, they had funded 75 demolitions, acquired 1,000 properties, closed on 450 sales, and instituted a myriad of amazing programming. The idea of land banks was originally created as a direct response to blight. We're now facing a different problem in Ulster County and we can utilize the land bank to

do a whole heck of a lot of things, including prioritizing county, our, our county, using it to effectuate our county priorities as it relates to affordable and workforce housing, as it relates to open space, as it relates to agriculture, etcetera. It's a, we've heard it said, it's a tool in the toolbox. I'm, I'm approaching this with an exceeding amount of optimism that, that we have a real strong chance of succeeding if we put forward a strong and solid application. And this, this I see as, as a part of that application.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much. I had one question about the, sort of ongoing question about can Kingston and Ulster County have a land bank at the same time, and I'm just curious what your research has been on that to date?

Legislative Chair Bartels: So, so technically, the short answer is yes. We can. The, the, some, let me call it cynical, conventional wisdom maybe that was, it, the fact that Kingston has a land bank within the borders of Ulster County might make our application more difficult. And, and that may or may not be true. What I, we did have a meeting with the Kingston Land Bank and we, we discussed the possibility. I think the ideal purpose, you know, the ideal for an application would be to have one county-wide land bank, for example, in Dutchess County, it's the, I may get the name wrong, but it's the Dutchess, City of Poughkeepsie Land Bank. And I'm going to be just totally upfront that it's my hope, longer term, that that's where we end up. It's also my intention to go back to the City of Kingston Land Bank with a very specific ask of a model like, such as the Dutchess, City of, City of Poughkeepsie Land Bank. But we have to be clear that what we'd be asking City of Kingston Land Bank to do is to totally reorganize under this joint venture. And so, you know, I'm more than ready to, if they say, yes, we're ready to do that, that's wonderful. Then we'll bring that application forward. If they say no, their no will be a part of the application because in my conversation, you know, again, we're facing a certain urgency of timing that we've all, we've all talked about it and discussed as it relates to all the other things I just mentioned: housing, open space, agriculture, all these things, which can by some measure be addressed with, with a land bank. And I would take that information as a part of the application to say that we've directly asked for collaboration and at this time, City of Kingston Land Bank, and I'm not putting the words in their mouth, but if the answer is no, we will bring that no as part of the application.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Any Legislators on the committee have questions? Legislator Levine.

Legislator Levine: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a very quick question. I'm not sure if Chair Bartels or yourself has this information just readily available right now. But just my only question was in regards to my, my recollection is that this, this was high up on the Legislative Priorities List and I just wanted to know if anybody had that, what the number was?

Chairman Criswell: It was number one.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Number one.

Legislator Levine: That's, that's why I had a feeling it was up there.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for bringing that up. Any other Legislators on the committee? Any other Legislators on the call have a question or comment? Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: A couple quick things. I doubt Kingston is going to be real cooperative, just my guess from my experiences with these kinds of things. No village ever wants to consolidate with the town, probably the same kinds of reasons. It probably should happen that way. Kingston should dissolve into the county if we're going to do it and perhaps, you know, Phil, and the other Kingston Legislators, if you agree to start, maybe starting those conversations, but I don't think it's just, they're just going to willingly do it. It just doesn't happen that way. Unfortunately, I suggest maybe a time clock written into this resolution that if we're not, if we don't have it, by this time, the money kicks back, because the last thing we want to do is cost ourselves the ability to spend this money by waiting too long or having to rush to a project at the end if it doesn't come to fruition and then I'll have to look at it. I haven't looked at the specific language, but if we ended up doing it differently, does it have to, I'd hate for our Legislation not to be able to be used if we set this land bank up differently, or something down the line. So have open language to have it set up and maybe it would help, a two or three minute, I didn't know a lot about land banks until I started talking to you, Tracey, a couple of months ago. I still have some concerns, but I'm definitely not a no. Maybe going through a logistical hypothetical from start to finish on just one property and how it would work would help. You know if you could do that in two or three minutes. You know, mention the money, the property where it is, you know, all hypotheticals, but how it would work from beginning to end.

Chairman Criswell: Chair Bartels, if you would like to respond to that.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, you're asking for right now at this moment of presentation? So...

Legislator Maloney: I didn't look at it as a presentation but a generic hypothetical. I mean, I have this property, it's on, its, you know...

Legislative Chair Bartels: Right. So. So, um, you know, the only, the only government entities that are, that are allowed to even apply to become, to, to create a land bank are foreclosing government units. That's what they're called and that's the FGU that I'm referring to. So, so, the way, the way it works is, I mean, the, the first, the first possibility is rather than take properties that have that are have gone through foreclosure and now are going to the highest bidder at auction, we could, those properties could go to the land bank in consideration of the taxes that have not been paid, or in lieu, in lieu of the taxes we could just transfer directly and the land bank then through, whether through partnership with other organizations, which there are many models of that where land banks across the state work with, not for profits, work with work with different organizations to, to rehabilitate properties. So, the model could be that the property, the land bank takes ownership of the property and resells the property to be rehabilitated by the owner. But does that in a way that ensures, if for example, that property is to be deeded, as affordable, they make those requirements as a part of the transfer of sale, or they could, the rehabilitation could be done first, again, with the same end idea. And properties can also be arrived at not through the, not through the government entity. I mean, the, the only requirement that I that I know is that, or that I, that I'm aware of in terms of a limitation is that a land bank

cannot own property outside of the jurisdiction in which it's created. So, our land bank couldn't own property in Orange County. But within the confines of our jurisdiction, they could, that the properties that they received, they could as I started to say in using the Albany County model, there's a myriad of end uses and it's about making those priorities. Albany, Albany County also has a series within their land bank of programs, I mean, they have a program that they call Spend A Little, Get A Lot. So, in this program, for example, they have properties that have been sitting under their purview for more than a year. I think it's for more than a year. If it's, if it's been in their inventory for more than a year, they have, they make these properties eligible for this program and they require that the eligible buyers have to live within a certain radius of the property and that then, and then they are within a certain percentage, I believe it's less than or equal to 50% of AMI. And they make those properties available to those peoples for very, very little money in order to get them back on the books. Now the idea really is because again, this was created with the initial intention of, of dealing with blight, the ideal is to get properties back on to the tax rolls and functional but the benefit that I see in terms of the land bank is that we can do that, that happens with the county auction, we just don't get to make, we don't get any say in terms of the use. We don't get to provide for a greater county benefit through that auction. It just goes to the highest bidder.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Other questions? Legislator Erner.

Legislator Erner: Thank you, Chair Criswell. I have a question. I'm cautiously optimistic about this idea. I have a lot more to learn about land banks but I've heard enough and know enough about the Kingston land bank and some problems that have been universally acknowledged about it to feel comfortable with the idea of maybe, maybe we could learn from those, those problems and those mistakes and see about this, this merger idea. So, I'm happy to, to do some approaching of folks about that from my part. Thank you

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: All right. Hearing for no further questions, I'm going to recommend that we take no action on this but we get back to Chairwoman Bartels if we have any further questions and we will score this by Sunday night to present the scoring sheet to the other committees.

Legislative Chair Bartels: And may I just say that tomorrow, through Amber, I will, I'll send some backup, some further backup information so that everyone can look at it and if you have questions, please don't hesitate to call me. No question is too small.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: All right, moving along. Can I have a motion to discuss resolution 161?

Legislator Corcoran: motion

Chairman Criswell: A second.

Legislator Levine: Second.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. All in favor.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Opposed. All right. Legislator Stewart.

Legislator Stewart: Hi. Thank you and thanks to the committee for taking this for your review. My resolution regards extending an existing water line that currently runs from High Falls to SUNY Ulster. And that water line was installed, I guess, four years ago and at the time, that water, the count, the college, excuse me, was having a hard time with their water supply and also, they were using, they were relying on wells, and a lot of the homes surrounding the college were having water shortages and their wells were running dry. And it was a real problem with the college. In fact, they had to close the college for a couple of days until they got the situation somewhat under control, and the town of Marbletown, and obviously the Legislature felt it was important to keep the college up and running and so they, they took this water line to SUNY Ulster from the High Falls Water District. At the time that was approved, the wording in there was wording, there's language in the bill that would allow that pipeline to be extended. And what we're hoping to do is to extend that waterline, take it down Leggett Road to 209 Main Street in Stone Ridge. And the reasons for this, well, there's a lot of reasons for this basically. First of all, that, that strip of land along 209, everyone, there is no municipal water other than the High Falls Water District and all the houses on 209 rely on private wells. A lot of those wells were still having problems with wells going dry during periods of drought. But perhaps even more problematic is there's a very strong sulfur smell that is very commonplace all through Stone Ridge. Many people are spending tons of money to install all sorts of filters, filtration systems. And also, water quality is an issue. Like I say the, and the more, the more development that takes place, the greater stress that is put on these private wells. And the one of the main problems that you know, the town of Marbletown is very anxious to create affordable housing and one of the biggest problems in building high density, affordable housing, whether it be for seniors or for workforce housing, is the issue with wells and so we think that by extending the waterline to 209, we could kind of kill several birds with one stone, so to speak. So, it would allow for greater development in the future, it would allow for the development of public housing, it would solve the issues of water quality and water shortages. And this is something that you're working with the design and planning firm of Brinnier and Larios. And this is something we've been kind of kicking around for a year or two. The town board sent out a questionnaire to folks who live in that area, and a copy of that questionnaire is included in the background documentation. And the response from the public was overwhelmingly positive. Also included in the background information was a, a map of the proposed phase one and I need to point out that this request for \$1.5 million is only for phase one of this project and those funds would, would be met by the Town of Marbletown. So. So they would be, you know, so they have a lot of skin in the game to, like, it's, like this would be just phase one of this operation. And, you know, eventually they

think that to run the entire project from start to finish would probably be well, we have all sorts of estimates, but any, probably around \$7 million, is what we're looking at somewhere in that price range. So, this would be, you know, a good start in, in bringing water to all the folks along 209 and Main Street in Stone Ridge. And like, say one of the major reasons that we're doing this is also the desire to build higher density, affordable housing.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much. Members of the committee have questions or comments. Any Legislators not on the committee? Questions or comments? Legislator Greene.

Legislator Greene: Yes, I just want to say that the project is actually in my district. Legislator Stewart and I have and have different sections of Marbletown, and I want to very much support his proposal.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you.

Legislator Greene: And I have also canvassed the neighbors who are my constituents, and you know, there's been a certain amount of controversy. There was a proposed Fire Training Center in that area, which people did not feel was appropriate. But the improvement for water availability that this project represents is not only acceptable, but welcome.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. And I apologize, I didn't mention that you were a sponsor of this legislation, as well as Legislator Petit so I apologize for that. But there are three, three sponsors for this. So, thank you.

Legislator Greene: It's fine.

Chairman Criswell: All right.

Legislator Stewart: Thank you all.

Chairman Criswell: You're welcome. Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: I know that you had mentioned that they, the, you know, part of the reason why they're eager to expand the water is because of the possibility of wanting to develop affordable housing. So, can you just give us a little bit more information of where that's at? Has it actually been, is it in the planning process? Is there specific locations that are being cited? You know, how far down the road would that be after the water gets expanded? And what type of housing?

Legislator Stewart: Thank you for the question. The Town of Marbletown has been looking at several different locations. Right now it is very much kind of in this planning stage. As Legislator Greene mentioned, at one point we were looking, we were hoping to put senior housing on Cottage Hill Road on a 50-acre parcel that's owned by the county. That is not going to happen. But that would have certainly been, you know, a good location were it not for certain characteristics of that particular parcel. The town is also looking to purchase, perhaps, a 90 acre parcel that is currently for sale on 209 across the street from the shopping center, where the

grocery store is. In addition to that the town also owns a parcel in the center of town that is currently the Highway Department garage, it was formerly the town hall, and that is another location that..., The town plans to build a new garage and that is another location that the Town's looking at to possibly build affordable housing. In that particular case, it would be more like a couple of townhouse type units. We've been told by a engineering firm that we could perhaps put as many as eight units there. The, the other parcel that I mentioned a few minutes ago across the street from the Emanuel's Shopping Center is a 90-acre parcel. Like I said the town is considering purchasing so the, the, the exact two locations, I mean, so we have several locations in mind, but they're not shovel ready projects unfortunately, by any stretch of the imagination. It's still very much in the planning phase. However, the issues concerning water quality, and issues of wells going dry during periods of drought is something that is definitely an issue now. And we feel that this would benefit both residences and businesses along Main Street. So, it's an issue of economic development as well.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that. I'm going to recommend that we take no action on this, but please score this by Sunday night so that we can get this to committees and then we will look at it again when we meet on the 13th. Do I have a motion to discuss resolution 162?

Legislator Corcoran: Motion.

Chairman Criswell: Second, please.

Legislator Lopez: Second.

Chairman Criswell: And all in favor.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. All right. Legislator Stewart, back to you again.

Legislator Stewart: Back again.

Chairman Criswell: And this was sponsored by Legislator Stewart and Petit. And just so you know, this was also 19 on the Legislature's ARPA priorities list.

Legislator Stewart: This particular resolution. Thank you, Legislator Criswell to begin. This particular resolution deals with Grady Park. Grady Park is a narrow strip of land in the center of High Falls right in the middle of the historic district. It's about 1.5 acres and it's the strip of land between Route 213 and Old Route 213. It is, if you're familiar with High Falls, that is the site where they have the D&H Canal Society's flea market on the weekends during the summer. It is also, it's currently, it's basically a vacant lot at this point. And within that vacant lot, there are the ruins of several locks from the D&H canal. The town has done some initial work, just cleaning up the space. For a long time it was basically a vacant lot that was overgrown with weeds and dead trees. The town has done some cleanup work there and some minor improvements such as putting up a guardrail. That was the public safety issue. There's a very steep slope on some of this land. In 19, excuse me in 2018, the town signed a 99-year lease for this piece of land that

was owned by the D&H Canal Society and that agreement stated that the town would create a park and then take over the maintenance of that park. The D&H Canal Society is currently going through a multimillion-dollar renovation program where they're taking the 18th century stone structure that was formerly the Canal House Restaurant and they're turning that into a visitor center. And I believe that is going to be opening in June of this year. And there, this is going to be their Visitor Center and it's also going to be a great draw for tourism in the area and so this is designed to go hand in hand in the efforts of, in their efforts of, of creating their new visitor center. The plans for the park would include an, and there's maps and everything that I included in the in the background documentation. To develop the park the town hired Greenman-Pedersen, which is a planning and engineering firm based in Albany, and they created some really spectacular plans for the park that would include an ADA compliant walkway that would go through the length of the park. That would include viewing platforms where you could look across 213 and see the falls. If, they would restore the ruins, that would restore and stabilize the ruins of the locks that are in this particular park. There would be all sorts of educational signage that would explain in detail, you know the history of the canal and its impact on not only the community of High Falls in the Town of Marbletown but also for the entire county. In addition to that, it's not just the park, it's also included, it's also great improvements to the municipal parking area, building additional green space, adding parking spaces, creating crosswalks across 213. So, it's kind of a multifaceted approach there. In addition, there is a, there's an existing creek walk that runs along the banks of the Rondout Creek. And there's been improvements made to that and now we are linking. And now that particular pathway has been designated as a connector to the O&W Rail Trail. And for the last several years, there's been all sorts of improvements along 213. The recent improvements to the Kathy Cairo Davis Bridge, and sidewalks have been added. So, it is now a connector to the O&W Rail Trail and we envision this park eventually as serving sort of as the nexus of our trail network. So not only would it take the O&W into High Falls and link Stone Ridge and High Falls, but it also would connect to the D&H Canal Society's Five Locks Walk, which is an existing pathway that they have, an existing trail that they have. And it would also, it's designed to work with, you know, long term with projects that are in the works. Currently, the D&H Canal Society is also looking at building a loop that would run down Berme Road in High Falls. And eventually, what we would hope to do is to have this be a key link to joining the O&W Rail Trail with the, with the Wallkill Rail Trail, hopefully going through, and the idea would be to go through lands that are owned by Iron Mountain. So, I mean, that's all, you know, that's all things that we hope to do. But currently, like I say, it does serve as a great connector to the O&W with plans for expansion. So, the park serves like a multitude of different functions. It serves as a meeting place, as a green space. It serves educational functions. It serves as describing the history of the canal and also the environment. It also serves historic preservation purposes. And it's a project that I've been working on personally for about five years. We, when I say we, the Town of Marbletown and its major stakeholders in the in this park, including the D&H Canal Society and the High Falls Conservancy, we've worked very closely with the entire community and have had questionnaires and all sorts of public forums and meetings and we have also received letters of support from the County Executive, from the D&H Canal Society, of course, also from the Rondout Valley Business Association, from the Ulster County Develop, Economic, Board of Economic Development. And so, like I said, we think we have a great deal of support for this project and I, I hope you will consider granting us the funds and again, the \$1 million that we're requesting for this would be matched by the Town of Marbletown.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much. Questions from the committee. Questions from many other Legislators on the line? Great. Well, thank you very much for that presentation. I'm going to recommend that we take no action on this, but we will score this by Sunday, send it out to other committees, and then we'll take it back up again at our meeting on the 13th. Thank you.

Legislator Stewart: Wonderful, thank you so much for that.

Chairman Criswell: Appreciate the presentation. Thank you for that thorough presentation. Appreciate that. Okay, I'm going to ask for a motion to block resolutions 163 and 164.

Legislator Corcoran: Motion.

Chairman Criswell: And a second please.

Legislator Sperry: Second.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Any opposed. All right the block pass and now a motion to discuss the blocked resolutions please.

Legislator Corcoran: Motion.

Chairman Criswell: A second. All in favor.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Any opposed. All right now I think I'm going to hand this over to Chris or to Kevin. There he is. Hi, Kevin.

Kevin O'Connor: Hey, guys. I don't know if Chris wants to say anything but I'm going to ask Emily Hamilton. Were you able to share screen?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, I'll defer to you guys. That's fine.

Kevin O'Connor: Can we share screen?

Deputy Executive Kelly: I believe so. Amber.

Kevin O'Connor: We have provided a PowerPoint that we wanted to go through. Emily, are you able to go through that or would you prefer that I do it?

Emily Hamilton: No, I can get through it. I just have to keep telling my son to be quiet.

Kevin O'Connor: Thank you very much.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Common problem.

Emily Hamilton: It says host disabled participant screen sharing

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Okay, try that now.

Emily Hamilton: Okay. Okay. Hello, everyone. My name is Emily Hamilton. I'm a Senior Project Manager at RUPCO and I'm here to talk to you about Silver Gardens. Silver Gardens is a proposed project that we just submitted a application to New York State Homes and Community Renewal today for funding. So, this is located in Highland right off of 9W off of a street called Argent Drive and across a pond from a affordable housing development owned by the Gerentine's called Holden View.

So just to give you some background on, on RUPCO and, and Gerentine's projects before I go into more detail about Silver Gardens. So, to remind you of our mission. RUPCO's mission is to create homes, support people, and improve communities and our vision is for strong, vibrant, and inclusive communities with a home and opportunity for everyone. And I'm not sure if everyone on, in the meeting, is aware of all the work, that development work that RUPCO has done in Ulster County and in Orange County. But here's a bit of an overview. There's the Lace Mill here in Kingston, 55 units with a preference for artists. There's Energy Square that was completed during the beginning of the pandemic, in 2020. It was 57 apartments, most of them are one bedroom, and it is our first net zero projects and one of the first in upstate New York. Landmark Place. 35 of the apartments in the former Almshouse have been completed and are completely occupied. 28 of those apartments are for those who are formerly homeless, various backgrounds. And we will complete the other building, the new building in, by the summer and those will be an additional 32 and 34 units, excuse me, and the, in the Almshouse and 32 units in the new building. All 35 and older. Sam.

So. Newburgh phase two. We've done two phases in Newburgh. Both with, the Newburgh Land Bank. And our first phase was 15 buildings, 45 apartments. Our second phase is going to be a total of 61 apartments, or 24, and 24 buildings. Actually the residential units will be in 22 buildings and two buildings will be community space. One of those buildings is the church that you see here, featured here in this presentation. The former First United Methodist Church. In that church, there will be a Youth Build Program and other job training programs, and a daycare center.

So, the Gerentine's own four different projects that RUPCO manages. I don't know if, if Richard you want to talk a little bit about your projects.

Richard Gerentine: Go on, Emily.

Emily Hamilton: Okay. So, Jenny's Garden, one and two, Milton Harvest, and Golden View. So, Golden View was completed in 2008. And as I said before that will be located across

appliance next for any reach, across appliance from Silver Gardens will be located across the pond from Golden View. Silver Gardens will be 57, if funded, will be 57 one-bedroom apartments and a three-story wood framed building with an elevator, a total of 52,600 square feet in the Hamlet of Highlands. It will be for those 55 and older. There'll be access to transportation. RUPCO also provide a van with a driver funded through an Empire State Supportive Housing Initiative grants through the state. So yeah, has access to transportation, shopping, and recreation because there's Hannaford right there right next door. So, the green building design features, which is what this funding will support, most notably the geothermal system which is not only for heating and cooling, but it will also be to heat the hot water. So, this project is aimed to achieve an upper tier level of performance, 30% more efficient, more energy efficient than code LEED certification and a indoor air plus certification. And it is a joint venture between RUPCO and the Gerentines. So, the need for, for housing as we all know is, it's off the charts. So, evictions are currently on the rise with an average of 14 per week. We got that number from an outreach worker at, at RUPCO that goes to the hotels that house people who are, who are homeless. The motels in, in Ulster County. So, senior, frail, and homeless population are definitely in need of, of housing.

So, this map shows the location of Silver Gardens, and it will be high quality new construction set in a naturalistic setting and will have convenient access to major amenities and attracts-, that will attract seniors. This project has already been awarded, or has a conditional award based on capital financing for 29 units of supportive housing. So, housing for those who are currently homeless and specifically for the frail elderly. There'll be two units with HIV/AIDS, 19 for frail elderly, and eight for chronic, chronically homeless. So, services provided will be mental health counseling, case management to access public benefits, homecare services, and life skills training. So, there'll be 57 total apartments. 57 one-bedroom units at 682 square feet, and handicap accessibility for the 29 special needs units. And that's another closer map of the location of Silver Gardens. Site plan.

So, there's been concerns expressed about the developer fee for this project. Normally, the agency, New York State Homes and Community Renewal, allows for a 15% developer fee. We have decided on a 10% developer fee which is 1.638 million. And the lands sale from Girondini to RUPCO, a 590,000 has been supported by an appraisal. The rents. In all affordable housing tenants should pay no more than 30% of their income in rents. And this just, gives an example of what, what that means. And here's a breakdown of the rents for Silver Gardens. 10 units for seniors with an income of income of 50% AMI. 18 units for seniors with an income of 60% AMI, which is \$939. And the remaining 29 units, with monthly rents of \$823 will be subsidized by the Empire State Supportive Housing Initiative.

So, the idea is to start construction in the winter of 2022 and complete construction in the summer of 2024 with total occupancy on the fall of 2024. So, as I mentioned previously, we submitted an application today. It's actually due tomorrow, but we submitted it today for a 9% Welcome Housing Tax Credit or, or as we say in the tax credit industry LIHTC. So, the agency does consider Silver Gardens a very competitive project because of it receiving an ESSHI award, a Supportive Housing Operating Subsidy award. And this just tells you about how, how competitive it is to get affordable housing funding.

This is a, what we call the capital stack, all the layers of financing that are going into this project. Welcome housing tax credits will be allocated by New York State Homes and Community Renewal. And New York State Shop or Supportive Housing Opportunity program is a New York State Homes and Community Renewal source of funding. Federal Housing Trust Fund comes from the federal government but is administered by the states. And we, the stack includes the, the ARPA funds of \$600,000 for the geothermal system. And then funding from NYSERDA. And a deferred developer fee which the developer will get over time from the rents from the development. So why do we need this money. A \$600,000 ARPA funding commitment demonstrates local and county support for Silver Gardens. During the last round of funding, Westchester County used local funding to help support two projects there and those two projects were awarded funding. So, in the last rounds, I don't remember the exact number off top my head but over 10 projects applied, and only three were awarded for the Mid-Hudson region. And two of those projects that were awarded were in Westchester County and had receive local funding, had been awarded local funding. So, Silver Gardens supports ARPA's mission and goals for households impacted by the pandemic, permanent supportive housing, and social services and case management, remedies systemic public health, public health challenges. And all of these populations that I mentioned before represents underserved and vulnerable populations. The funds will continue, excuse me, contribute toward the building of a geothermal heating and cooling system. And it's not only for the heating and cooling, it's also for the heating of hot water. And that's it. Thank you.

Legislator Corcoran: Is Peter still here, or is he gone?

Emily Hamilton: He said he was gonna leave, right?

Legislator Corcoran: Yeah. I wanted to make sure he was, didn't want to step on his toes. Okay, so well, thank you, Emily. I appreciate it. It was a very well presented. I guess I'll go to members of the committee. Any questions, comments? Nope. Outside the committee, Chairwoman Bartels. Thanks.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Um, so yeah, thank you for the presentation. I mean, one thing that I'm interested, and I feel like it's going to, hopefully, it's something we can figure out between now and the next time that the committee meets. And, and I've spoken about this before, anticipate that it's something we're going to discuss in one of the coming resolutions, particularly the, the demolition of the jail on Golden Hill in anticipation of the affordable housing project there. My understanding is that what's been proposed in that project is that the value of the demolition that we're proposing to undertake as the county through ARPA funds, we will, in some way, shape or form put into a contractual arrangement either as either as a recapture fee waiver, either as a recapture, or...

Emily Hamilton: I'm not done yet. Can you wait, honey? In about 10 minutes.

Legislative Chair Bartels: ...either as a recapture or a, or an equity stake in the project, should there be a sale. Again, guaranteeing, in an effort to guarantee that the county's investment is protected should the project, and again right now I'm talking about the, the one that we have not yet discussed yet, the one on Golden Hill, but I think we should consider something very similar

here, that the county's investment is protected as a long-term investment in what we intend to invest in which, on Golden Hills, affordable housing. In this case, what we're talking about as affordable senior housing, and I understand the importance after talking both to Mr. O'Connor RUPCO and, and to our former colleague, Mr. Gerentine, as the developer, that, you know, the county's investment in this is less to fill a budget gap than to demonstrate the county's partnership in the project, which, which is, which is meaningful, is very similar to what we're, on some levels, what we're talking about with our maximizing local investment, but also how that translates to these awards. And it's something that I think as a county, we need to talk about in the bigger picture. Again, not specific to this one project, but how are we going to strategize in investing in these kinds of projects moving forward, this is a, right now we're talking about to two projects for consideration that, but for the ARPA projects, prior to this, we wouldn't have been able to even consider this kind of this type of investment. It would have to be strategized in a very different way. And I think we, I do think we need to be forward looking. But again, so I raised this not to, not to, just to raise the specter of how do we, how do we ensure that? Whether it's a recapture clause, and or an equity stake on sale.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you. Mr. Kelly.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you Chair. To Chairwoman Bartels' point, the language that I've heard thrown around, and I don't mean that loosely, just the three terms are a seller's note, equity stake, or recapture rider, where if the mean, if the project sells and the use changes, that's where we would look to get the money back. I would say I don't, I don't know if Dennis Doyle could speak to this or either Nate, I know you've had some experience in this realm as well. But if the, the intended use stays the same, then we wouldn't look to recapture. If the sale, if a sale took place in 20 years, and it stays with the same intended use, obviously, I think our investment would be sound. The other thing I just want to touch on with this project is a lot of the feedback, that I think we get on a lot of the different projects we do not just in affordable, just in general, is that we're not geographically diverse. And this project brings us into more of the southern and central end of the county, where we're trying to, it's, you know, affordable housing and senior housing. It's not just a Kingston, Town of Ulster in this area, local issue, it is county wide. So, I do like that. This is providing some of the geographic diversity. Thank you.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you. Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: Thanks. So. So, something I've, that, that you always have to be concerned with when you're giving out tax dollars, especially when you look at the IDA or things like that, as always, is that this will not happen without our tax dollars. And I know, reading articles, and it was presented to the Town of Lloyd Planning Board several months ago that this project would have geothermal components. And now, I mean, are we, is this not going to happen if we don't give this \$600,000? I mean, ultimately, people in the private sector are going to make a great deal of money off of this apartment complex. I get that it's needed. But where do we draw the line as a government and say, we can't just keep giving out money every time somebody asks, because it's something sounds good. Where several months ago, it was presented to the Town of Lloyd Planning Board that this would have this, was this. So, is that going to have it without our help? Do we need to give this 600,000 from ARPA to ultimately something that is going to make people lots of money in the private sector, when there are many other types of these apartment

complexes that don't get that money? Saying nobody's making any money here. This wouldn't happen. I don't, I saw Chris shaking his head, this wouldn't be happening without the 600,000?

Legislator Corcoran: I'll just skip over. Go to Mr. Kelly. Real quick.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Kevin will probably follow on to my comments. So, what Emily went through was the capital stack. So, a lot of these projects are built on competitive state funding for the purpose of incentivizing housing, that wouldn't make money in a purely private setting. So, when you're talking about the Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, or when they're talking about ESSHI, which provides the, the funding for the services that will be offered in supportive housing, it doesn't, these types of installations don't make money without support from both state and local governments. What Emily was talking about was when, when you go through a capital stack, and when Westchester County puts forward projects for these same funds, what they're doing is saying, because they have local, they have county and municipal support, financial investment in these projects, it makes them that much more competitive, and therefore more likely to happen. So, I don't know if Kevin had anything on that. I know he's got more experience than I, but.

Legislator Corcoran: Yes, Mr. O'Connor.

Kevin O'Connor: So, thank you. And thanks Em for putting, you know, taking us through the presentation. Chairperson Bartels, I would really love to follow up with you, as we move forward about trying to create a local fund that would have some permanence. I think it's quite unfortunate, but here we are the worst housing crisis in my 32-year career. We virtually have no housing resources at all, when the phone rings, and it rings every single day with people looking for housing. But we find ourselves in a very competitive environment. In the state of New York, who was putting out these monies, has a choice and the money is gonna go to Binghamton or Buffalo, or, or perhaps Ulster County. We've been asked this already for well over two years, we have spent a tremendous amount of time, energy, and money at risk. And as we demonstrated and saw this this last round, in Westchester County, who has bonded for both infrastructure and housing dollars, they got two projects funded, it was a little bit of a you know, enough to get them and they're scoring local leverage as a scoring item. And, you know, we put ours in last year and we didn't get funded, and we didn't have any local match. And it's really, it's about adding to the scoring so we can get funded. This project is fully approved, and shovel ready. We've been working at it for well over two years. A lot of people have been paid their fees, architects, engineers, the Federal. The environmental work is ready, it's tremendously needed. And I do hope that we are able to come together and find a way past ARPA funds to be able to support our local projects, because it's going to be important at the state and federal level, to be able to compete with others to, to really to bring home this much needed affordable housing. So, the capital stack starts always with debt, private debt. We're borrowing \$1.2 million. That's what, based on the income and expenses of the tenants 29 of these units, we already have the supportive ESSHI. People can move in with zero income. Homeless seniors with zero income can move into brand new apartments, and then hopefully we can get them entitled, so they can get some support. But their rents will be supported by the ESSHI support. And we have a rich array of services. You know, I've been developing new affordable housing for a long time. Woodstock Commons took me 10 years. We don't have any staff at Woodstock commons for,

you know, we have 20 senior years there. I don't have any support staff at Landmark Place with the site support. We have tremendous staff at Silver Gardens. We're gonna have tremendous staff to be able to provide support. So again, we've taken it through and got it fully entitled. And we think that this is the kind of local support that is needed. And on the issue of recapture, happy to have it recapture this, there's plenty of state money. The state money is, is going to regulate this project for 50 years. And if we don't keep it as affordable housing, millions of dollars that the state is going to provide in the subsidy in front of your money, that we're asking for the county, would also be recaptured. So, we're happy to have it added to the recapture. And this, this is, it's going to be affordable housing if it's funded for the next half century. And if it doesn't, the state will recapture all the money as well.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you. Legislator Erner.

Legislator Erner: Thank you, Chair Corcoran. I just want to recite back essentially what Deputy Executive Kelly had said, which is that this project would not make money if not for XYZ different factors going into it. And I just want us to pause on that idea for a moment and reckon with does the project need to make money? Does the project need to make money? We're talking about housing. We're talking about something that everyone needs, something that should be a right. I'd like to see our county focused on that. And that's not to say that we don't need to do this project. But that is to say, if we are contributing to the making of the money, then we have a responsibility. Because this is public money as Legislator Maloney was saying, to see to it, how we're using that money and making a profit is not necessarily congruent with the best interest of the public. That's all. Thank you.

Legislator Corcoran: All right, thank you. With that being said, Mr. Gerentine. Any other comments?

Richard Gerentine: Yeah, just sitting here tonight listening to you Legislators, and I admire you sending their, putting your time and doing your due diligence and all that's what I hear over and over again, for many people that talking tonight, what the county needs is affordable, affordable housing. I mean, we have a project here that's been through the process already. We did not get funded. We went to the state, we asked how we can make this much stronger. They said if we had local participation some way it would help immensely. We are asking, you have ARPA funds that are set up for purposes such as this. If you know, you really want affordable housing, this is a place that could be something that you can put the \$600,000 in, not only for the affordable housing, but also for the green component of that housing. You know, we could have went with a much more economical heating system, which would be half the price of what we're paying for. But we put a green component in there which, you know, hopefully, it's going to help many areas regarding our carbon emissions and things of that nature. So, I mean, look at the whole picture. I mean, we gave, we gave we gave a lot of concessions. We gave the Town of Lloyd an easement through our property from Grisview to go up through Fannie Reese Park, which is a state park, scenic cuts and the Palisades runs. We did many other things with Scenic Hudson regarding the environmental things that they wanted throughout the project, such as landscaping, such as plantings, such as you know, various other things. There was a lot of work done here throughout the whole project. We're very proud of what we have done. I own four projects in the southern part of Ulster County. I have 309 people on my waiting list. We get calls

every day: can I have an apartment? Unfortunately, you know, we're full. We're full. When people are no longer with us or go to a nursing home, I mean, we have people that are in line waiting for the next department. It ended up a big crisis in Ulster County. And yeah, we get a runoff from some of Orange County sometimes because we are close to Orange County. But if you're serious about doing affordable housing, there is a project here that's up and ready to go. It would be a great venture relationship between Ulster County and RUPCO and myself to make this thing become a reality. Thank you.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you. Let me get to Legislator Petit and other right back to you, Mr. O'Connor.

Kevin O'Connor: Thank you.

Legislator Petit: Thank you, Chairman. I would just like to say I'm very excited about this project. I think last year, I was one of the people that got in touch with Mr. Gerentine because I suddenly had seniors who are now housing insecure. The \$1,000, \$1,200 that they're making on Social Security when they retired 20 years ago, seemed like a lot. And now it's nowhere near what they need to cover the rising cost of housing. We, and we have been, Mr. Gerentine's very correct, saying for well over two years now we need more housing, we need more in our inventory. This is another perfect project. I understand RUPCO's projects, they've always been very green, affordable. They're just, it's nice, safe, secure housing. So, and I think for 600,000, if that's the, the buy in that all the participating vendors in and financial institutions are looking for, you know, for what was it like 200 units? This project, a project like this has my support.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you. Mr. O'Connor.

Kevin O'Connor: Yeah, I think, to respond to Representative Erner. Love to come in sometime and talk a little more about the affordable housing, and the funding that's available, and the programs that are available for affordable housing, so that we all can maybe we have a better understanding. Now we're dealing with financial institutions. So, you know, to have, to be able to borrow 1.2 million, the project has to stay in the black so that the debt can be repaid, otherwise, the bank won't make the loan. The tax credits, you know, all the money is public so, all the federal and the state, all of it is public tax dollars that are coming in terms of award, but then there's a lot of private investments. So, we have a company that's going to invest in the tax credits and purchase them. That's really you know, \$12 million of private equity. And this is the, the, the game, if you will, the funding that's been created. The low-income housing tax credit was created in 1986 under President Reagan, and it is the number one producer of affordable rental housing in the country and involves large financial institutions. It is really the one and only framework we have to get affordable rental housing and I for one will stand up and defend all day the outcome that we receive here. We get 57 apartments, 29 with support, 29 that people can move in without that is tremendous. And it takes a lot of brain damage to get through these projects. It's very competitive. But I'd love to come in and talk about and lay bare for a, Representative Bartels, I've tried to put you in touch with directly with New York State and a representative of Homes and Career Renewal. So, you know, we can be completely transparent. This is the process. It's a, involves a lot of financial partners. And they have you know, both financial requirements and interest. There's tight limits. Cash flow is limited by the state. This

has been looked at, you know, a number of times. So, be happy if you know, to create a workshop or otherwise, however, it might be convenient to try to impart some more information about how the process works and what we're up against in affordable housing today.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you, Mr. O'Connor, we appreciate that, and your willingness to come forward and help us out. So, I think with that said, we are going to take no action on this, will grade it and we will take it up the next meeting in April. All right, so we'll move forward. All right. We're at resolution 165. I'll ask for a motion for discussion.

Legislator Lopez: I'll move it.

Legislator Corcoran: Second.

Legislator Levine: Second.

Legislator Corcoran: Okay, seconded. On this one, we have Amanda to do a PowerPoint presentation, as so we know this was number five on the priority list. And I think currently, we're working on some amendments to the resolution to the County Executive's office during this project. That's correct. Yes, Mr. Kelly saying yes.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yep.

Legislator Corcoran: Okay, so I'll turn it over to Amanda, and I believe she has a PowerPoint presentation on this.

Amanda LeValle: Good evening. Thank everyone for the opportunity to, to share this with you. And let's first make sure that I'm doing that. Are we good? Can folks see that?

Deputy Director Kelly: We got it.

Group: Yep.

Amanda LeValle: All right. So, this project is really, specifically around addressing foreclosure eligible properties, which we spoke about a little bit before, that also have conditions that we call brownfields. Brownfields can be real or perceived environmental hazards. Okay, first, first slide here is a little text heavy and somewhat dense. But we wanted to share with you some more detail about the foreclosure process so that you understand both the, the length that it takes, and also exactly what step the county is intervening in to, you know, to kind of push the pause button in order to do our proposed environmental investigations. So, the big takeaways from this slide are from the left-hand side here, that it takes from unpaid taxes in 2019 would have been eligible to, to be part of, are eligible, actually, because the auction hasn't happened, to be part of the 2022 auction. There is a period of time in which there is a list of the parcels that are delinquent on their taxes. At any point in time, the owner can come in and redeem, pay the tax, back taxes and redeem. At a certain point in time, the, the more formal petition, a notice of foreclosures is filed, and the notices are mailed to the owners. And closer to the actual auction is when the judgment happens, that's when the deed is actually signed over to the county. So that's important to know

that there's, there are the steps in this timeframe, up until that judgment, owners can redeem, redeem up until that judgment, and then afterwards, they may buy their property back up until 5pm the day before the auction. So, as I started to say before each year, there are several dozen properties which are eligible for foreclosure and auction. However, due to these what we might call brownfield conditions, which are real or perceived environmental conditions, they're removed from the proceeding. So again, we're kind of pulling them out before the Judgment when the county takes the deed.

Okay, just I'm gonna escape here and try to... I think I might have to do it this way, but I think you can still see the full screen. Again, so the, the range of properties can go from, we have two EPA Superfund sites that are on the list. So that would be something that has had some recognized environmental conditions: abandoned gas stations, junkyards sites with open or unresolved DEC Spill Records. And in those cases, we need to be careful, there are certain protections, it's called it, in, innocent land-owner protection under the federal Circular Law but that covers certain hazardous substances but doesn't extend to petroleum. So, let's say if you had a site that had both solvents and petroleum, the county could potentially be liable for portions of the cleanup, if they were to be in that chain of title, if they were to take the deed. However, we know, although there's this reservation about taking these sites, that these sites sit in community, they're sources of blight, they can be sources of environmental hazards to the neighbor and to the community. They're really signs of lost opportunity throughout, throughout the communities. And the county continues to pay the property taxes to both the town and the school district.

Couple examples just so folks can get eyes on these. This is Brown, Brown's Junkyard, down in Wallkill. Last, oldest year of back taxes is 2009. So, it's now approaching half a million dollars in back taxes. This is the street view here of the site. And then over here on the side in this area, you can see a maze of roads. And these, every little dot here is a junk car in the background. So, this, this site is, there's a lot going on here. This is another site in Marlboro that has again, back taxes to 2008, has debris and junk all over the site. It's not exactly known what, what could have happened on the site. This is Ellenville, there's a site where, there was a I believe a fire and these, parcel was damaged and your, there's some question as to whether there's some PCB contamination on the site.

Okay, so now to what we can do about it. We have an ability to, to start to look at these properties and return them to the tax roll and to prioritize them as they're impacting communities and look for ones that might present the greatest opportunity. We can use the ARP money to complete some of the environmental due diligence and work to assess and characterize these properties. So, what has been done historically, and this, this happens regularly is these properties are foreclosure eligible, they have many years of back taxes, they are removed from the proceeding, meaning that they are not, there's no judgment, the deed is not taken on those properties. The county is afforded the opportunity through New York State Environmental Conservation Law to take a Temporary Incidence of Ownership for the purposes of entering the parcel and conducting environmental risk restoration investigation upon such a parcel. So, what we're proposing is that we go ahead and take a TIO, it's called the TIO, to go in front of a judge in order to get that that ability, and that would allow us to do testing on the site and enter the property without taking the deed for it. Now this could include a records review with the town and the county or the DEC. Just to be clear, that technically wouldn't require a TIO since you

wouldn't have to be on the site. As would title reviews and liens wouldn't require actual site work. However, if you're doing site inspection along with testing of soil and water and air, you would need that to, to get on site. The two pictures below are a property and Accord that is foreclosed, was foreclosure eligible that the county used to try to, in order to enter the property and do an environmental investigation. And further to the right, is a foreclosure eligible property in in Ellenville that we were able to enter and remove some barrels of materials.

The proposal in front of you with using ARP funding comes in to being able to upscale this effort which we have done twice so far, in order to more adequately address the, the number of properties that are on that foreclosure eligible list and have some kind of environmental concerns on them. And what we're proposing is that first we would do what is the industry standard, which is the record review, and possibly come up with a sampling plan. And then on the second phase, for some set of those, which we do phase one work on, we would, again, enter the site to do more testing. We're also proposing a line in there for legal services and that would have, that would support us, especially if there are any liens on the property, or if we have to negotiate with, perhaps, we're able to bring DEC or oil spill funding to do some kind of remediation. That generally requires outside legal counsel who's really very knowledgeable in environmental issues. After that investigation is complete, if it's documented not to have serious concerns, it can be foreclosed upon. It doesn't have to be option two, that's an important thing to say here, that if there were another purpose that were important to the county, it does not merely have to go out to the highest bidder. If there were a condition that were discovered that were questionable on the site, the intent of this program is not then to do the remediation on that site, but it is to refer it to DEC or the Oil Spill Fund, which is administered by the State Comptroller with Brownfield Cleanup Program, the State Superfund Program in order to progress along those next steps. And we were actually able to do something similar on a property in Kingston. We were able to gather enough information, it was a foreclosure eligible property, but for the City of Kingston, but we were able to present that information to DEC and then that property entered the State Superfund Program, and then DEC takes it from there and does, really ramps up the investigation and they have to come up with a plan for remediating what's going on.

So, there's over \$11 million in back taxes on property suspected of having an environmental hazard. The county has to date us that TIO process on two properties and the ARP funding would allow us to significantly scale up that effort along to better meet that level of need that we're seeing. And ultimately, you're removing the blight in the community, you're, you're finding those potential sources of contamination, and you're opening up those sites for a variety of use. It could be to go through auction, but there are other ways that, if that, that property could be handled if there was a specific value or use that the county could see to it. Brownfield cleanup and redevelopment is also an action in the New York State Smart, Climate Smart Communities Program, it can actually get a community quite a bit of points. But that just speaks to you know, this is a site redevelopment and cleaning up environmental hazards are important things as we think about climate actions.

This is one list of the back tax log for an, kind of the, what I affectionately call the environmental problem child list. But it just gives you a sense that of that distribution of those properties. Those are at least 11 different towns and all across the county, and you know, totaling over, you know,

Amanda LaValle: I would have to check that with finance. However, that was the list that I believe is commonly known for that has been they say severed from the judgment due to environmental concerns.

Legislator Maloney: Could I make a request that we get the complete list of, of properties that can be foreclosed upon that haven't for any reason? I think, I suspect that this is basically the one of the only reasons that you, that we would have not to, but can I get, that I know, we got a list from, I think Chris sent out a list of brownfields. But I don't know if everything was on that. I'd like that list of every property that we could foreclose upon, that we haven't. Also, who, is that just kind of up to Burt, that perception that we talk about? Who's, whose decision is that? Because that's, mentioning Tech City earlier, I think that probably deserves a legitimate investigation. But, but what, who made that decision? And who makes those decisions using this perception?

Amanda LaValle: It is. That's a really good question. Because it you would...

Legislator Maloney: I would think that you would be involved in it being the environment. I mean, you should be.

Amanda LaValle: Yes. I'm, I'm involved with it. However, it's a group of people, again because there's definitely you know, the legal side to it, the finance side to it, the Environmental Science assigned to it. So, it is kind of a balancing act between looking at those issues. And, but these are ones that you know, there's, there is a process. So, each property that is coming into the kind of being foreclosure eligible. Information is received from the town's and that has to do from the assessor, so, they'll look at code, code and inspection issues, so there'll be some kind of digging there. Then there's also perhaps, you know, if there's any flags there, there might be a DPW drive by to inspect it. And then there's also some internal records review of those properties. So, we do the best we can without doing this without actually doing an environmental site assessment. And, and the, just to one point, just to kind of to add on to that, when we worked with an environmental attorney, and outside attorney on one of these projects, and we talked about what we did internally as far as looking at DEC spills and different databases, that, that attorney worked with quite a few other counties and all over the state and he said, no one else does, to the extent that we were doing as far as attempting to vet those properties.

Legislator Maloney: Thank you. One last question. And before I ask it, can we, so can we get, Amber, can we get that list from Chris on the, the, that I just asked for about? Or anything that we have any properties? We have not that are at the 36-month mark, that we haven't foreclosed upon? And can we also request I guess, from Burt, who's decision, the process to using that discretion, that perception, get the process and maybe it's something we should all know and learn. And then perhaps we need to have an actual county policy that we codify in the Legislature to make sure every person that is back on their taxes 36 months is being treated completely equally in the community, because I'd hate to see another Ginsberg type situation. And looking at Tech City, it is possible not to get past 36 months, for us to use, perceive that there is an environmental issue there, not take the property, and the property owner is then just allowed to do whatever they want with the property and not pay taxes until we decide to do so. Is that what ends up happening? They're able to use and possibly even profit off this property

without paying taxes? Does that happen? I mean, it seems that that happens, right? There's, no we don't. My question, I guess is, we don't go, if we hit that 36-month mark, we say hey, look, we could take this property, but we're not going to because we perceive a possible environmental problem. Could, do we ever say but you're not allowed to use it anymore? I don't think we're allowed to do that.

Amanda LaValle: We wouldn't have the deed.

Legislator Maloney: Yeah. Okay. All right. So, if I could get those two things, that'd be awesome. But I agree with everything. I'm very for this for ARPA funds.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you. Quick interjection before I get to Mr. Kelly, if he still has his question. I can tell-, you're good? All right. So, I can just tell you, because obviously one of those properties is in my municipality. And I can tell you, Joe, that, I think, obviously, it starts with code enforcement, which is my position. So that one property, you know, we're sent down there as code enforcement, we do a report back to the county saying, there are 18 on, you know, cars here. They're dilapidated. They're leaking oil. So, we start the process in the field by actually inspecting that property and giving the county the heads up on what's there, what potentially is there, water is there, ponds is there, cars is there, whatever it is, and we fill out a complete checklist, sometimes extensively on many properties in each municipality. And we get the heads up to the county on what's actually happened in our town. So, each code enforcement officer has a responsibility to fill those forms out every year and give the county a heads up on that and then they have the opportunity to come out, view that as often as they want, basically, from street view. But again, they're taking our word, from being again, we know what's going on in our town. We do that every year for every property in our Town.

Legislator Levine: Tom, your mic, I think was starting to cut out.

Legislator Maloney: We got we got most of it right up until the very end, then it cut out a little but we got most of it. Thank you for that. And that makes sense. And I think that should probably be documented in part of some kind of official procedure or policy when, when deciding not to, and then that would, then we'd ensure that everything, everybody's being treated equally. Thank you.

Legislator Corcoran: The County gets that in writing every year from each code enforcement officer in each municipality, whether it's just a house or it's one that is you know, brownstone. Any other questions? With that we'll move on, we will take no action on that. Move it to grading and take it up at the April meeting. And we will move on to 166. Take a motion for discussion on 166.

Legislator Levine: I make the motion.

Legislator Corcoran: Need a second.

Legislator Sperry: Second.

Legislator Corcoran. Okay. All right. So, 166 is establishing and funding Capital Project 632 Crisis Stabilization Center purchase of 368 Broadway. As far as I know, funding was dedicated to this project that amount of \$3 million in October of 2021. And we are working with the County Executive staff to amend the resolution accordingly. Is that right Mr. Kelly?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yes, sir.

Legislator Corcoran: All right.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Nate will go through some of this, he's to the left of me or the right depends on where you're sitting, I guess. So, as you said, Chair, this is to execute on a resolution passed in October of 2021 funding a Crisis Stabilization Center. And I'll let Nate take that.

Nate Litwin: Okay, thank you. So, the, what has come out of that resolution back in October 2021 is the identification of a property: 368 Broadway. I know a number of Legislators have been able to tour it, which I think was, was a great thing. And I'm, I'm taking over a little bit from Marc Rider tonight who wasn't able to be here. But he was able to provide those tours. Well, we have a, 368 Broadway is a four-story building that was built in 1991. It's 30,000 square feet. It has 13 owners. They have all agreed to sell. It is a commercial condominium association, was 17 units, four of those units are, are owned by Kingston Hospital, and two are, have the same owner. And that's how you get the 13 owners. My understanding is at the end of this, we will have an empty building and we have a list of uses stemming first and foremost from that resolution 4-2-4 in October. A use for it would be the Crisis Stabilization Center. 24/7. Anybody can show up, there would be staff on site to stabilize and provide people services, particularly for substance use disorder. Also, Mental Health Departments at Golden Hill will move into this site. Ulster County Department of Mental Health would move into the site. One of the, one of the things that I think is important to note about the site is that there are no approvals needed. It wouldn't be a change of use. It is operating as a number of doctors' offices. So, it would be taking on an existing use. There are potentially two other services, service providers in the community who will also be here. One is Access Supports for Living and these are folks that would come in after our ownership and as part of the, the suite of uses and services that the county would do. So, Access Supports for a Living and some, some, I'm not gonna say this right, Samadhi, which is another substance use disorder provider that operates in the county. The condo association, the condo association would be dissolved. And so there would just be the one owner. There are no known tax concerns. In the letter of interest, there is 90-day due diligence, with environmental and structural inspection allowed for. There was a process on negotiating down to 2.0 million for the purchase. So, the resolution in front of the committee is, is for 2-point, 2 million dollars for the purchase of the building. There would be additional monies just looking down the road for a build out as much as possible. Ulster County wants to do that in house through the Department of Public Works. And I have discussed this and I'm keeping Robert Parete and Brendan Masterson of the, at DPW in the loop on this project. There is an anticipated 1 million in renovation costs. And the timeline for use of the building is as quick as the end of the year. One of the other pieces, there is another segment, so there'll be the purchase, the build out, and of course then the operating. Chris might be able to talk about this a little but more, but I understand there is a RFP that I think might have even been issued. So we are in the process, the county's in the process for looking for the operator for this building. And that

operator once decided would be able to run under monies received from the state and be reimbursed for the costs. So that's how the, the, the operating funds can, can flow to the project.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Nate, if I may.

Nate Litwin: Go ahead.

Deputy Executive Kelly: I'll follow onto that part. So right now, we've issued an RFP for services, there's also a statewide RFP for them to come in on the operating and capital side for these projects. So, they're kind of flowing in the same direction. But those pieces should fall into place within the next few months. In addition, so the other part, I just wanted to follow up. So, in addition to calling for the 3 million in funding, in October of 21, it was actually established as county policy by the Legislature to have a Crisis Stabilization Center so there was a bit more wording to the resolution, rather than just saying, this is something we want, it's actually established policy that we, that this is something we'll be pursuing and there's money foot behind that. So, I think that this prop this property is, I know a few of you guys have walked it, it is in an ideal location where we can co-locate with a lot of the service providers, and part of moving Mental Health into its own department. And then physically co-locating them, with the service providers puts us a bit more back in the field. I'm not saying that we're opening up clients and clinics and stuff like that, but to be with our service providers, and to kind of, I guess, just have more visibility into what's going on out there is going to be helpful as well. Thank you.

Legislator Corcoran: Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. I did take a tour of the building along, along with several Legislators and I hope and I'm sure we'll be able to afford that to any other Legislators that are interested in the, I don't know, the turnaround time, I'm speaking for Deputy Executive Rider who's not here, but I'm sure we'll be able to make it happen. And I just want to say, a couple observations, one, I think it's the ideal, it's an ideal building in an ideal location. I, you know, you just walk through it, and you can, you can very quickly and readily imagine it in the in the goal that we're intending it to, to be in. There's substantial amount of parking, which is important in Kingston, as we all know, dedicated parking to the building. It also, it also has access right onto the street, you know, it has a high, two high visibility locations, which I think is also really important. And just mine, non-technical observations. I mean, much of the building is currently in use, and it's in, it's in pretty, it's in good shape. I mean, they're, they're offices. You will need to make some changes for the programming that's going to happen. But we were walking through, Legislator Walter and Legislator Criswell were with me, and both of, both of them toured the Dutchess County Crisis Stabilization Center and they were speaking in 3D, you know, like this could go here, and this could go here. It had a very immediately accessible sense of its potential. And so, I'm really thrilled that this this is happening. I know we have a little technical cleanup on the resolution in relation to the, to the other capitals that were established, but that's um, that's just technical. Like this, this is, this is gonna, this is a major step in realizing this. And I think that every one of us is going to be very proud looking back on, on the establishment of this project and where we see it through in the end.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you. Thank you for that input. Legislator Erner.

Legislator Erner: Thank you, Chair Corcoran. I had the good fortune, thanks to Deputy Executive Rider and the realtor to tour the space this morning. Had a great time. I'm very excited about what, what can happen there. Just wanted to clarify what I saw there based on Mr. Litwin's presentation, and that Access Supports and Samadhi do appear to be current occupants there. And so, I suspect that we would just have them stay as tenants. And thanks.

Legislator Corcoran: Alright, great. Any other questions or comments? With that said, we'll take no action, then grade, and we'll take it up in April. Next meeting. Okay. Resolution 167. Motion to discuss.

Legislator Lopez: I'll move it.

Legislator Corcoran: Need a second.

Legislator Levine: Second.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you. Resolution 167 Adopt Any Negative Declaration for the Demolition of the Former Ulster County Jail Located on Golden Hill and Establishing and Funding Capital Project Number 630 - Demolition of Jail Golden Hill - Department of Planning, with that I think we're going to shoot it right back to Nate, right?

Nate Litwin: Actually, if Dennis Doyle is available, he might be the best to speak on this.

Legislator Corcoran: Okay, we'll go over to Dennis.

Dennis Doyle: So, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And if I may just take, I'll take a little bit of time to walk you through this. The County Jail a was a former County Jail and there's some apartment buildings around it, has always been looked at by the County as a, as an opportunity to essentially tear that structure down. It's, it's not an, it's not in any shape that you would want to reuse it and then offer it for an economic development site. It was one of the first sites that the County Planning Department, working with the Legislature, essentially moved to, essentially use that area for affordable housing. There is resolutions in front of the Legislature that would surplus that land to a development corporation. And we're working with Penrose to essentially make sure that we can build an affordable housing project up there for 160 units. The discussion with Penrose and the discussion, and, and the discussion with the with the city has been, essentially, it's similar to what we're seeing with respect to Silver Gardens, with one, I think, important difference and that is, is that the funding sources with respect to low and low income housing tax credits, the LITEC that, that Emily mentioned, do not like to do demolition work. They do not want to pay for demolition. And Penrose is struggling through a process now to make sure that they can get their capital stack, they can meet the necessary requirements and get the project funded. They have asked us if we would be willing to essentially move that jail out of their way, as part of as part of a comp, a local contribution. And so, what we've done is, is essentially had that discussion with the city because the city is actually a lead agency under the state Environmental Quality Review Act for the review of the, of the, of the construction of the affordable housing project. They have indicated to us that they would not have an objection to

the county essentially beginning a tear down of the jail. We believe that the site has utility, even if the affordable housing project isn't developed, the site would have utility for other public benefit uses. And so, what we, what we tried to essentially structure is a, a process whereby the county would assume through what they call a segment, a lawful segmentation under the Environmental Quality Review Act, the ability to essentially make its determination that the, that the demolition of the jail would not have a significant impact on the environment. And then the second piece of that is actually to fund the teardown of the project itself because it's currently owned, the County currently owns the land. The, one of the other reasons to think about, that we thought, that it was appropriate for the county to do this, is that we will await the Legislative decision, the city's decision relative to the, relative to the SEQRA process, and that may take some time and have the jail essentially. I think you lost me. If we have, if we have the jail essentially being able to demolish the jail with the timeline for this. So that was the other reason to essentially make sure that we did it at this particular point in time.

Legislator Corcoran: Okay, thank you. Any questions from the committee members? And then we'll move on to any other questions. Legislator Erner.

Legislator Erner: Thank you, Chair and thank you for that explanation, Planner Doyle. I have heard this week from some residents of the area that, this site is located in here in District Six, about concerns around stormwater. I think the, this probably won't be news to anybody who's been following, but they're, they're struggling with who can address this. The county as the owner, the City is the lead agency. And we're talking here about a Negative Environmental Declaration, which perhaps also has to come through a committee I'm on, Environment Committee. But I just would like to know how these residents, who say they're having a lot of problems with the runoff and have for decades actually behind their homes, how we're, how we can, how they, they and we together can address that, especially if we're going to do something like a demolition sometime soon.

Dennis Doyle: So the I'm not aware of any stormwater problems. I know there's some concerns with existing stormwater situations as it relates to the health-related facility up there. But from the County's facility, most of that stormwater goes into a stormwater, there is a stormwater detention pond on site. When we built, when we built the, we built the additional buildings up there, we, we built a stormwater detention pond. The demolition itself will actually remove some of the, the impervious surfaces up there and show it. On the short term, it should help the stormwater, to the stormwater issues associated with the former jail site. And as we move through the process with respect to building a facility up there, whether it be, whether it be an affordable housing facility or something else, they will have to meet new stormwater regulations. And we're, and that discussion would go on with respect to the review of the site plan with respect to that. So short term demolition would be, would be, would be a benefit to a certain extent, because there'll be less impervious surfaces on the site, and a longer term then any new project up there will have to meet new stormwater regulations associated with the associated with a new construction. I would also add, I know that there's been some concern expressed with respect to construction traffic associated with both the product, the building of a new facility as well as the demolition. We would work with it, we would work with a contractor on a construction traffic to make sure we had construction traffic routes set up. And one of the things that we would also make sure of is, and I know that there's been some concern expressed by the

Glen Street resi-, residents, there is no way that we would permit essentially construction traffic to use the Glen Street entrance relative to any demolition.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you, Dennis. Just before I get back to you, Phil, just let everybody know that we did receive additional information from Dennis on this project. And it's on the OneDrive for review. It's a technical drawings, pre demo asbestos inspections, quality control specs, site assessments, and things of that nature. So, all that's available on the OneDrive and that it was provided by Dennis already. So, it's available for everybody take a look at. Just so everybody knew. Mr. Er er, you have another comment or question?

Legislator Erner: Yeah, thanks. Just to follow up. I know there's a, the city's having a public hearing on Monday about this. And if the, the residents there, anybody who had a concern, or had additional questions, because they won't really have questions answered there. From the county's point of view, could I, could I follow up with, with you, Mr. Doyle or with another from the Planning Department for possible meeting with them?

Dennis Doyle: Sure, I mean, my sense would be is, is we're more than willing to sit down and have conversations. We have not heard a great deal of concern relative to the project as it relates to the environment, the environmental concerns beyond traffic. There has been some concern about construction traffic, but the general concern has been the amount of traffic going in and out of the site. So, if I can illuminate some of those issues, that's fine. And if we can illuminate some of the, any of the questions they have relative to the demolition, more than happy to do that.

Legislator Erner: Thank you.

Legislator Corcoran: All right. Thank you. Any more questions or comments on resolution 167? Seeing none, we will take no action, grade it and move it to take it up and next meeting in April. With that any new business? Any old business? With that said, I will take a motion to adjourn.

Legislator Levine: Motion.

Legislator Lopez: Second it.

Legislator Sperry: Second.

Legislator Corcoran: All right. Thank you. All right. Well, thank you, everyone. Well, that was a long one tonight, but I appreciate everybody's efforts and staying with us. We'll see you next couple of weeks. And we'll get everything graded by Sunday and get it back so it's ready for next meeting. So, thank you very much. Have a great night. Thank you.

Time: 7:37 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster
Transcripts Approved: April 27, 2022