

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

DATE & TIME: July 13, 2022 – 5:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID: 823 3009 8396
PRESIDING OFFICER: Peter Criswell, Chairman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Amber Feaster
PRESENT: Legislators Thomas Corcoran, Jr (arrived at 5:27 PM), Aaron J. Levine, and Megan Sperry (arrived at 5:12 PM); and Legislative Chair Tracey A. Bartels
ABSENT: Legislator Craig V. Lopez
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Manna Jo Greene, Eric Stewart, and Laura Petite; Deputy County Executive Chris Kelly; ARP Administration Nathan Litwin, Ashlee Long, and Molly Scott; Director of Planning Dennis Doyle; Director of Economic Development Tim Weidemann; Deputy Comptroller DeMarco; James Murphy; Susan Gillespie; Joseph Gentile

- **Chairman Criswell called the meeting to order at 5:05 PM**

Motion No. 1: To discuss Resolution No. 289 -- Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program –Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 635 - ARPA Parks Program – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Finance

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 635 in the amount of \$5,000,000.00 to create the ARPA Parks Program to partner with municipalities to match up to 50% of the total cost of each park project, with a maximum match of \$500,000.00 per project.

Motion Made By: Legislator Levine
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels
Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, and Levine; and Legislative Chair Bartels
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 3
No. of Votes Against: 0
Discussion: See attached transcript.
Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 2: To discuss Resolution No. 340 – Funding Capital Project No. 600 - ARPA Food Security And Access - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution funds Capital Project No. 600 – ARPA Food Security and Access in the amount of \$350,000 for the purpose of convening an Emergency Food Working Group to complete a Food System Resilience Report with Cornell Cooperative Extension of Ulster County as the partner to convene this effort by engaging the Emergency Food Network, local agricultural producers, suppliers and others in the planning and coordination process.

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Sperry

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Levine, and Sperry; and Legislative Chair Bartels
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 4
No. of Votes Against: 0

Discussion: See attached transcript.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 3: To discuss Resolution No. 341 – Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program -Establishing Capital Project No. 642 - ARPA Homeowner Energy Improvements And Job Training Project - Amending 2022 Capital Fund Budget - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 341 – ARPA Homeowner Energy Improvements And Job Training Project in the amount of \$500,000 to provide assistance to income eligible homeowners while also offering job training activities to improve the energy efficiency of homes, following the same conditions and rules that is part of its CDBG Program.

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

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, and Levine; and Legislative Chair Bartels
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 3
No. of Votes Against: 0

Discussion: See attached transcript.

Motion No. 4: To amend Resolution No. 341 – Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program -Establishing Capital Project No. 642 - ARPA Homeowner Energy Improvements And Job Training Project - Amending 2022 Capital Fund Budget - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 341 – ARPA Homeowner Energy Improvements And Job Training Project in the amount of ~~\$500,000~~ **90,000** to provide assistance to income eligible homeowners while also offering job training activities to improve the energy efficiency of homes, following the same conditions and rules that is part of its CDBG Program.

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

Voting In Favor: Legislators Criswell, Levine, and Sperry; and Legislative Chair Bartels
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 4
No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 5: To approve Resolution No. 341 – Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program -Establishing Capital Project No. 642 - ARPA Homeowner Energy Improvements And Job Training Project - Amending 2022 Capital Fund Budget - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience, **as Amended**

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 341 – ARPA Homeowner Energy Improvements And Job Training Project in the amount of ~~\$500,000~~ **90,000** to provide assistance to income eligible homeowners while also offering job training activities to improve the energy efficiency of homes, following the same conditions and rules that is part of its CDBG Program.

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

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

Disposition: Approved

Old Business: **Main Streets Program** – Presentation by Director of Economic Development Weidemann. See attached transcript.

See attached transcript.

New Business: None

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

Adjournment

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

Time: 7:18 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster
Minutes Approved: August 31, 2022

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

DATE & TIME: July 13, 2022 – 5:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID: 823 3009 8396
PRESIDING OFFICER: Peter Criswell, Chairman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Amber Feaster
PRESENT: Legislators Thomas Corcoran, Jr (arrived at 5:27 PM), Aaron J. Levine, and Megan Sperry (arrived at 5:12 PM); and Legislative Chair Tracey A. Bartels
ABSENT: Legislator Craig V. Lopez
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Manna Jo Greene, Eric Stewart, and Laura Petit; Deputy County Executive Chris Kelly; ARP Administration Nathan Litwin, Ashlee Long, and Molly Scott; Director of Planning Dennis Doyle; Director of Economic Development Tim Weidemann; Deputy Comptroller DeMarco; James Murphy; Susan Gillespie; Joseph Gentile

- **Chairman Criswell called the meeting to order at 5:05 PM**
-

Chairman Criswell: Order and we'll, well we're going to start recording. I'll call the meeting to order and then we'll sort of take it slowly for Legislator Sperry to join us and we'll see when Legislator Corcoran gets on the, on the line as well. So, it is 5:05 PM, July 13. I'm going to call the meeting to order. This is the American Rescue Plan Act Special Committee. And if you could call the roll, please.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Criswell.

Chairman Criswell: Here.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Corcoran. Levine.

Legislator Levine: Here.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Lopez. Sperry. Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Here.

Chairman Criswell: All right. Well, not all counted and present for but you know, we're gonna move on. So, thank you for being here. What I'd like to do is talk about, I think what we'll do is

since there's so, so few people on the line, and people are coming in, I was gonna switch things around and talk a little bit about the financial impacts of the proposals. But I think I'd like to wait just a little bit until we have other Legislators joined. So, I'm going to take the Resolutions in order that's on the agenda. If I could get a motion for discussion for Resolution 289.

Legislator Levine: I'll make that motion.

Chairman Criswell: And a second, please.

Legislative Chair Bartels: I'll second it.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: All right, the three of us. Great. Alright. So um, this Resolution was amended in this committee on June 29th, reducing the \$200,000 maximum to \$100,000 maximum per project. There was no action taken on this in Public Works on Monday and we have not actually had an opportunity to score it either. And as I went back and tried to remember what some of the issues were, the two things came to mind for me, and please others chime in if you remember things, but to me, the two big issues were this, we're trying to understand whether this in-kind match was even a possible thing or how that would work. Because it seemed like that was a sticky subject. The other one was the actual language about the percentages was extremely confusing. So, I'd ask that that language be redone, so that it was just in more plain English. And then we also, I don't feel like we ever resolved the conversation about the in-kind possibility. But I think that we should take that up for discussion right now and really kind of hammer that out and see if that's actually something that seems like it's really feasible or not. Does that seem like a reasonable way to proceed with this Resolution? Okay, great. Let's tackle them one by one. So, let's talk about the in-kind. For the moment. The issues that I heard, one was looking at how was in-kind going to be monetarily assessed? My understanding that there's some sort of sheet out there that the County uses to look at in-kind services? And I guess I want to know, is that a realistic way to evaluate the in-kind services? Is it something that's equitable across all, all services and across the county itself? So, we'd love to hear your thoughts on that. Committee members as well as, as anybody else who wants to chime in on that. Yes, Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. So, um, well, I think that we could well, one, I think if we did in-kind we'd have to come up, like we do for grant, we'd have to come up with, you know, some set number that we were attributing to, to work that was performed, and it would have to be uniform across all the different municipalities. That said, I'm just saying, speaking for me, I'm not very comfortable with the in-kind contribution. You know, this is ARPA funds, the municipalities are getting ARPA funds. We're sharing other ARPA funds with the municipalities and, and I really, I feel like we should be modeling this, if it's going to move forward, in terms of like, I'll speak later to like the broader picture of my, you know, my viewpoint on having us actually look at all the remains during projects, both the ones before us this month, but also the ones that haven't come before us yet, but were prioritized by this committee and the Legislature at large. But if we're, you know, if we are going to move forward with this, I would feel more

comfortable with, with following the model of the Water / Sewer proposal that was brought forward by I believe, Legislators Petit, who's here, and, and Maloney. You know, the idea of, first of all two things, the idea of the county being a minority stake, not a 50/50 split. So, we're spurring a deeper investment from the municipalities. And to that the new realities, would need to actually pony up the money the same way that we are, so that we're getting real, so that we're getting that much more real investment versus conceivably with an in-kind investment we could be fully say funding equipment, and town workers are, you know, putting that equipment in. And I just think, I just, I just think that it's, it's, if we're going to do this, I'd want to see it, I'd want to see it in essentially on the model of Water / Sewer. You know, which I don't recall, if that was 30, or 30, Nate, you would probably recall, that was a 30, or 33%, something like that? 30%?

Director of Recovery & Resilience Litwin: 33%.

Legislative Chair Bartels: 33%. So that would be like, that'd be my cutoff. Like, for me, it would be 33% in cash, no in-kind. And I, and I'm still like, then I would have to evaluate it against everything else. But at the moment in a 50/50 with 50% of the, 50 being in-kind and 50 cash, like all of that. Now, all that said, one other thing, and I don't mean to jump ahead on this one project. But I know it was brought up at the last meeting. And I think it would be valuable to have the conversation with the Supervisors as well. They meet on our, unfortunately, it's on our session day, which does make it hard for many Legislators and now it's in, you know, in person, but the conversation that I think's important to have with them is, you know, how much of an appetite is there to invest, you know, X amount of dollars in recreation in your town? And is it more reasonable if, you know, the, if then, is if, if you, if there is the interest would it be for the next budget cycle? Which is something I think that we would need to know too. And I'm inclined to guess that probably municipalities run on very tight margins, there's much less padding than in in, in budget, like the county budget. So, I'm inclined to guess that probably would hold it. But probably, their investment would come for the next budget cycle, and they need to plan, they need to plan for the next budget cycle. So those are the questions we need to talk to them about to gauge interest, you know, in, in dedicating 2 million. And I also would say, if there isn't the interest, this isn't something that I would feel very comfortable with funding for just a couple of towns. You know, my overall feeling is, as a county representative, I feel most strongly about funding county parks. And, you know, Dennis, Planner Doyle, at the last meeting reminded us, reminded me, I've been here, you know, tied for the longest of any Legislator, and he reminded me that, you know, we don't have a Director of Parks like, these are things that I think the county could stand from investing in. And that's a conversation I think we need to have in relation to this. You know, I feel bad that it's, that it, it, I don't want it to feel personal about this project. But it has spurred the conversation about investment in our own Parks and Rec infrastructure. And that's where I'm coming from which I also really do want to have the conversation with this, you know, the now sponsors but certainly with Legislator Stewart, who was the original sponsor.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. I want to acknowledge that Legislator Sperry has joined us if we could add her into the roll, Clerk Feaster. And Legislator Sperry, just so you know, what we're talking about right now is, we're talking about Resolution 289, which was the ARPA Parks Program. Specifically, what we're talking about, the two issues that came up with is an in-kind contribution from the municipality feasible or not feasible. And the second issue was the confusion in the language, the percentage language. And so right now we're actually talking

about the in-kind contribution and whether that's a feasible possibility. Legislator Petit, can I put you on the spot for a moment? Can I ask why it, what happened in Public Works and what the conversation was?

Legislator Petit: We asked, was that directed to me, Chair?

Chairman Criswell: Yes, please.

Legislator Petit: Sorry. I was actually, had Eric Stewart on the line. The, the, well, some of the asks, or it, of course, the sponsor was not there so they were through Chris Hewitt, even though he had been agreeable to change, making some of the modifications that were presented on the, the updated Resolution. One of the County Deputies also mentioned that it should go before the town supervisors to see if there was an interest, you know, in funding of this type. And the next supervisors meeting, I believe, is next Monday. So,

Chairman Criswell: What, was there any conversation about the in-kind portion?

Legislator Petit: Not, not from our end. No.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. I was just curious about that. Can I ask folks on the executive team to chime in about the in-kind portion? And assessing that? And what's the feasibility of actually having some sort of equitable assessment across the county and across industries for in-kind contribution? Nate, is that something that you could speak to?

Director of Resilience Litwin: You asking for, like other grants and whether or not there...

Chairman Criswell: Yeah. How, I mean, is there any precedent for this? How would you assess it? Have we done this before that you know of, where we're taking an in-kind contribution instead of a cash contribution as a match for...?

Director of Resilience Litwin: Not in my experience, but I'm just gonna, I, I've only been here six months. So that's not to say that it hasn't happened. I just haven't seen it.

Chairman Criswell: And is it something that you see being problematic or easy breezy? Or what's your thoughts on it?

Director of Resilience Litwin: Okay, so as far as in-kind goes, I mean, I used to work for nonprofits and kind of have the understanding from that perspective. I get where the Legislator and the Chair, or the Chair's, is concerned. And I think other Legislators have come in on this. It's not as stringent a requirement as a cash match. I see that point. Typically, that's, I mean, again, I kind of come from the nonprofit perspective where, where of course the cash contribution is a bigger challenge. I expect that's likely the case for municipalities as well, who are smaller than the county. So, the danger of in-kind is, is that, you know, it's I think there's the details of how much it's charged for workers and all those things. And I think that was previously discussed. So at least detailing that in some format, I think is important. And I think there's healthy discussion about risks associated with that.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you. Deputy Executive Kelly, we are discussing Resolution 289. Specifically, we're talking about the in-kind contribution issue that we touched on briefly, but I don't feel like we ever really resolved. Is this something that can actually stay in this Resolution? Or does it need to go? So, you've spoken to it a little bit last meeting. Do you have any further thoughts on this?

Deputy Executive Kelly: No. I, you know, I experienced, where work I did at the Bridge Authority where it was used as an in-kind match, I believe, for US state or federal grants on a CFA or one of those to do signage on Washington Street where the entrance to the Walkway Over The Hudson is in Poughkeepsie. So, they use the Bridge Authorities labor as an in-kind match for their grant. So, I am familiar with it. And there are standard rates as Director Doyle stated, which we could apply to things like this. So, it's not that it's uncommon. It, at least in my experience, but I would certainly look to cap it. It can't be, if this project was to go forward, I would look to make sure that it's strict, you know, that it's, that you can account for it. We had to, you know, to, Bridge Authority, we had to set the labor rate. How much time we have to, we had to submit a bill that included the truck hours, the gas, like it is, it has to be detailed in a sense that can verify the monetary value of the labor being used. You're diverting them from other work. So, that's just from a technical aspect. How...

Chairman Criswell: Who would it be doing that calculation? Would that be the municipality who's on the match?

Deputy Executive Kelly: No.

Chairman Criswell: Or would that be the County?

Deputy Executive Kelly: It has to be part of the process. It has to be baked into so it's consistent across all projects. So, just set the template. This is what we charge for the different parts of labor, or if each project was slightly different, we could make the assessment through that lens. I mean, I would imagine, I guess, I only know of one, one or two of the projects. So, I don't know what the other 10 or 15 other projects would be. Are we doing gardens, physical structures, or whatever else? I mean, when you're talking about electrical work versus other projects, it, it's, it's just different.

Chairman Criswell: But it brings in a lot of labor. I mean, we could be talking about architects, we could be talking about, you know, so many different things, so.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Engineer work.

Chairman Criswell: Absolutely. So, I guess that's, my concern is, are we getting huge, huge document that's listing every single, you know, labor that we could think of, and what that monetary equivalent would be to it. So.

Deputy Executive Kelly: You could. I mean, or, you know, if they're using an architect and an engineer on a project, or they have a town engineer that's already under contract, they already

have a rate that they could submit their work at. We just have to, if this was the route that people chose to go, we have to set a standard that is equitable across a broad array of the projects. And I imagine if it's a Parks program, I'd imagine if they're looking to improve or expand parks or physical structures, that a lot of this is going to be physical design and engineering. I would think. So yeah. On that part, that's kind of where the technical aspect where I'm at.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Legislator Petit, I saw your hand.

Legislator Petit: I'm sorry, I think Deputy Kelly really kind of outlined everything that I was going to, I mean, I've been involved with grant writing and administering them as well and they have a standard. I think Greenway is \$25 an hour. Of course, you have to be specialized in that field, you can't, you know, pick litter for a living and then do carpentry. And he's also correct, if it is engineering costs, those would be part of the invoice that would be submitted as part of the, you know, grant service. So, or the, the 50% matching. So no, he covered it very well. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Stewart, I saw your hand.

Legislator Stewart: Hi. I wasn't actually planning on being here initially, because it was my understanding, you know, the, this language was going to hold things up. But I did want to want to join in and just kind of get feedback from people. So, it's my understanding, based on the little bit that I've heard that putting in the language for the in-kind services is not that great of a problem to deal with. Is that what I'm hearing from Deputy Executive Kelly?

Chairman Criswell: I think we're debating it right now. So, we're just getting a lot of information about it. The two points that we're debating as the in-kind and also the percentages language.

Legislator Stewart: The percentage.

Chairman Criswell: Unclear in the resolution itself. So those are the two things. One of the things that I keep hearing over and over again, is, is there even an appetite from the town supervisors to have this project? So, in my mind, maybe the smartest thing to do is actually to take, take this to the town supervisors with both possibilities of cash and in-kind and see what they say about it. You know, maybe get their perspective on it, because we don't know, we don't know if there's, first of all, if there's any appetite at all, for, for, from any of them. Some of them might say absolutely, you know, not into it, or others might say, Yeah, we could do it with in-kind. Or they could say, we'll use some of, or could they use their ARPA funds to actually support this? You know, so I think there's a lot of questions that we have. Chairwoman Bartels, I saw your hand.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you, I just, I just want to reiterate a couple of things, because Legislator Stewart's here. Just so that I can so that I can tell him where I'm at.

Legislator Stewart: And my apologies for being tardy. Like I had spoken with several people earlier and, like I said, I wasn't initially planning on being here. And so, my apologies for showing up late. And so, thank you for...

Legislative Chair Bartels: No worries.

Legislator Stewart: Thank you for...

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, what I, what I had said is that, first like, I mean, in the big picture, and you're going to hear it again through the course this meeting, like I, I've been advocating, you know, it happens that these three, three projects before us have potentially some level of changes that need to be made, or are considering being made. So that may be what holds them. But in general, I'm advocating that we, that we look at the bigger picture of where we're at and, and, and the context of these projects within that as well. For this per-, specifically, I said that I would, you know, I personally do not feel comfortable with the in-kind match. And one of the examples that came up just now was invoicing for a, you know, for an engineer, like, I'm not sure that that's in-kind, like, that's a cash, if a town is paying, if the, if the project budget involves 50,000 to an engineer, and the town has to pay 50,000 to an engineer, that doesn't strike me as in-kind services. I think of, and someone tell me if I'm wrong, I think of in-kind services as like your salaried Highway Department workers putting their hours toward doing this. And you say, like Deputy Executive Kelly said, Well, you know, that he, they clocked his hours toward a project is in-kind services, because he was doing work on a project. If a town's paying for outside services as a part of the budget of a hole, that's a cash match. I'm good with that. Like I, and I really would like to see in models closer to the Water and Sewer, you know, which are also very important town projects that we undertook that were at a 33%. Like, I don't think the county should be at a 50% match. I think the county should be at most at that 33% match. And 66 is the town, give 66. And it's, it's a real investment in their own town. What, what I know, in advocating for that, I know that it's not likely that most of the town, most of the towns, I'm guessing, when you speak to the supervisors would need to think about this for their next budget cycle. Most of the towns run very tight budgets, they don't have enough buffer to work within. Oh, yeah, we're just gonna throw 100,000 at something at the last minute. And if we move forward with this project, it could be with, you know, with that in mind, knowing that it might take, I mean, it certainly, Nate's here, it might take a certain amount of time for us to implement, you know, I mean, it's, it takes us anyway, like we, you know, the ARPA team has got a lot of things on their plate anyway. So, but, but I would feel, I would feel much more comfortable with that. And then I would want to know, where the supervisors are with possibly making that real investment from their budgets. And I know, I was talking to somebody else about this today. You know, I feel strongly about that in my town. Like, I think that my town should invest more in recreation and its parks. You know, my town sometimes does call for volunteers to mow the town park, like, I think that's crazy. Like, I realize I'm being recorded, but I feel like we should make an investment in our own infrastructure, we make an investment so, if, if we, I like the idea of the county incentivizing something bigger, like spurring the towns to do something within their own town. And so that's what I could, that's, that's like, where I would feel more comfortable. And then I would have to place it against all the other projects for what's left. But that, that's what I said earlier, and I'm sorry, for the people who had to hear it twice. But I think it's important that Legislator Stewart's here at since it's what he brought forward. And the other

thing you missed is that the supervisors meeting now is an in person meeting at the diner, like early in the morning, I don't know, like 7:30 or eight o'clock, and it's on Tuesday. It's on our session days, which is always a hard day. But I can talk to you offline. And I did mention it Supervisor Quigley, who's the, you know, the Chair that this, you know, that this was in the pipeline, and that, that someone would be reaching out to him, expecting it was you, is when you were away, to talk to him, to talk to him about it, which then meant to talk to more of his members. It's a very robust group, like they do, they get together, and they talk things out.

Legislator Stewart: So, you would recommend that I show up at that meeting and give the proposal?

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, between now and then, you and I could, I can get you in touch with him and potentially that, you know, potentially that meeting.

Legislator Stewart: Yeah.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Which is next Tuesday.

Legislator Stewart: Well, I'm certainly happy to do that. I guess that my frustration comes from that, you know, I thought that I had already altered this Resolution very dramatically from what I initially put forth in front of the ARP Committee, which was the request for a million dollars for a single project, which then trans-, which then became 500. Excuse me, which then became, I'm sorry, my phone is blowing up. Excuse me.

Chairman Criswell: It was 2 million. 2 million dropped to 1 million.

Legislator Stewart: Right and then, and then 2 million drops to, 2 million for 10 projects across the county and then we dropped it to it \$200,000 per project and then we change that to 20 projects at \$100,000 and was always wit, you know the, with the goal in mind of making it as accessible to as many different municipalities across the county as possible. I got rid of language in the bill that referred to trails and made it specifically to parks. So, you know, I just feel like I've really made a lot of changes, and I was very surprised that it was shot down in Public Works. And, you know, I took, I took in consideration a bunch of, you know, suggestions, and it just feels like, the more changes I make to it, the further behind I get. Perhaps that's just my frustration speaking. Certainly, I would certainly be happy to go before the mayor, before, before the town supervisors and discuss it with them.

Chairman Criswell: Can I get a little clarity. So, you're saying that it was, it did not pass Public Works. But what I'm seeing in writing is that there just was no action taken. Is that correct, Legislator Petite? Okay, so, so that's different. It didn't, it didn't not pass it. There was just no action taken. So that's better for this, for you. So.

Legislator Stewart: And my apologies for that too, because, like I say, I just got in late last night, and I actually had not had a chance to speak with Legislator Petite until I texted her like, two minutes before I appeared on this program on this, on this Zoom meeting,

Chairman Criswell: I think, I think what I'd like to suggest is, I still see a lot of outstanding questions here. And I think if you Legislator Stewart can figure out a plan to actually speak to at least a good sampling of town supervisors to lay this out as a possibility. And I think we still are debating the in-kind service or not. But, and Chairwoman Bartels, you tell me what you think about this. But I think if we could float it in front of some town supervisors, I do, I do agree with you. I think that the number percentages have to be tweaked. Because, again, we didn't have clarity on that today. And it, was anybody able to work on some of that language. We'd said we were going to try and clarify the language a little bit, because it was really a bit confusing. Remember, we talked about that last time?

Legislator Stewart: This was the language in your meeting two weeks ago?

Chairman Criswell: Correct.

Legislator Stewart: Yes. And of course, yeah, it was the day that I left town.

Chairman Criswell: So, we talked specifically about clarifying the, the percentages and what would be the responsibility of the county, what would be the responsibility of the towns? So, who was going to take lead on tweaking that language?

Legislator Stewart: I don't have an answer for you right now. I guess what I need to do is I need to speak with Vicky and try to, and also speak with Legislator Petite, and try to perhaps come up with some better language. I was also wondering, maybe just get rid of the in-kind altogether, if that would make it easier.

Chairman Criswell: So, I'm going to make a suggestion. If you could also connect with Deputy Executive Kelly to talk about this, the actual percentages and how to clarify that in the Resolution. I think having a further conversation about is in-kind a feasible or not feasible way to actually get some, some sort of a match, and then create a plan to actually connect with town supervisors to just float the idea. A sense of, Yeah, it seems really popular. Wow. It's going to be an uphill battle. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Well, I would just also say we're, to remind everyone that the, the Water and Sewer project, if, if it, if not for the in-kind, if it's, if it's just a match, the Water and Sewer project has language that's pretty straightforward. Because, you know, that's, you know, that's at the 33%. And it's already, you know, it's there. And, again, I like that percentage, but you could change the number, you know, the numbers just changing the number. Sorry for the noise. But the language is already there. I think what, I think what was confusing was the, the in-kind and the cash and the percentages of the percentage. It's because we were talking about percentages of the percentage that were coming from the municipality, and that's when it started to get wonky a bit. But if there was the willingness to simplify, then that we definitely have a model.

Chairman Criswell: So, I'm going to ask Clerk Feaster, Legislator Stewart, and Deputy Executive Kelly to try and tackle that language, if you can, to try and simplify it. Definitely look at the Water and Sewer as a model. I think that's a good idea. I also want to note that Legislator

Corcoran has joined us. Thank you for joining us Legislator Corcoran, I know you're coming back from a meeting. Thanks for being here. All right. So, is there more discussion about this resolution or do we feel like we've got a plan? So, what I'm getting, recommend for tonight, no action again, because we're not clear on a lot of core details that we need to know. So, I'd say, let's do a little bit more work on it. We'll see it at our next ARPA meeting. At that point, then we can talk about sending it to scoring, and where it's going to move forward. Is there any other action that needs to be taken on this tonight that anyone can see? Alright, seeing that I'm gonna move us on then.

Legislator Stewart: Well, thank you all so much. And once again, my apologies for just kind of popping in at the last minute.

Chairman Criswell: You're on Italian time. We forgive you.

Legislator Stewart: There you go. All righty. Thank you all.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Thank you. All right. So, we are going to move on to Resolution 340, which is the ARPA Food Security and Access project. If I could get a motion for discussion. Legislator Bartels. And a second, please.

Legislator Sperry: Second.

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Sperry. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Any opposed? All right, thank you. So, this was postponed in Health and Human Services and Housing on July 6, and then no action was taken in Public Works on Monday. Correct, Legislator Petite? Okay. There was scoring that was done by four of this committee's members. Goals and Mission, it hit a 67. Equity Distribution, 186. Community Impact, to hit a 68, and Financial Management hit a 38. So, a total score of 70. Some of the concerns that were brought up previously were that this was a single time grant program, and it won't strengthen the vital public services long-term. It was difficult to tell the outreach, bulk of the spending two-thirds on development of a one-time report, only one-third of the spending is for programmatic response. And then a question about, Are there alternative responses available, feasible, or being considered? So, I'd love to hear your thoughts on this. Yes, Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: So, I just want to say, I mean, you know, there was a very robust conversation in the Health Committee, as they're, you know, following on the conversation that was raised here. I, I plan, I've been playing a little phone tag, and I had a personal issue come up so I was not able to connect with Amanda LaValle who, but I commit to making that connection, because it's really important that I, that I speak with Amanda, but my understanding, and I guess, Deputy Executive Kelly could speak to it, is that there is a willingness on the Executive's side to make adjustments to this to address our concerns, which I'm really grateful for, because I think, I appreciate that the Executive side heard us pretty loud and clear, and unanimously that, you

know, we really want to invest the money in actual programmatic outreach. And I'm, and I'm not sure, you know, I'm not sure how that's going to shake out if that's going to be the grant program or, or some other, some other mechanism. But I would like to talk to Amanda about, and I do want to just say that I appreciate the willingness to look at it, because I know that this, there's a, there's a strong commitment to addressing food insecurity. And so yeah, so that's, that's where we're at.

Chairman Criswell: Yeah, Deputy Executive Kelly.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah. So, I, in speaking with Dennis and Amanda, looking forward to the meeting, and I think there's some, some newer ideas that Amanda has been looking into so let's do that meeting and see, make the best product here. So, fully committed to that.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. Other thoughts on this? Hearing none, I'm gonna Yes. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels 34:02

I just want to say, not to, not to be all of a sudden all Pollyanna, but just to put it out here because I just want everyone, I just sort of want to center this, because I feel like I continue to be, at least this month, like a voice and I hear it in the frustration, is no longer with us with, Legislator Stewart, you know, a voice of constraint or question. But I just want to say that, you know, there's, I need to recognize the value of having put these proposals in in the first place. Like we don't have the conversation without the proposal before us. So, that is no small thing that we now have something to talk about, even to say that we don't think it's perfect or we want to make changes, or we don't like this aspect, but that's you know, I believe wholeheartedly in that, that that's, that's how, that's how we make progress. So, I just want to say that is the, as the backdrop to my, my naysaying. Sorry.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for that. No, I think we all decided that food security was a major issue that we wanted to move forward. So, I agree with you. It's brought it to the table. And we should get it, especially using the ARPA funds, we decided that the ARPA funds should be spent as wisely as possible and should support as many people across the county as possible. And so, let's get it to that place. I think that's correct. All right. Anybody else want to chime in on Resolution 340? All right. I'm gonna move us along this. Yes. Yes.

Director of Planning Doyle: Yeah. Just wanted to say that, you know, to echo Chris Kelly's remarks, Deputy, Deputy County Executive Chris Keller's remarks. We're, we've internalized some of this discussion at a county level, at the department level. And we think we have a model that will work a little bit differently than the model that was proposed. And it's one of the, it's a model that we're familiar with. We have a Continuum of Care program that we, that we currently operate, to decide who gets money relative for, for housing. And we have an administrative contract for that, so that they, they, they essentially wander through those, those activities so that the, the nonprofits can participate in HUD funding for, and we, for, for continuing for homeless shelters and we, we generate about \$1.2 million a year. And so, the thought here is actually to bring those people to something like the community service models that have been used for mental health, is to bring those individuals in relative to participation and to bring out programs

that are directly related to what the, what the providers are telling us, as needed. And we want to have that discussion around the results of the legislative report, in terms of the recommendations that are in the Legislative report, and then moving forward, it becomes a small contract that essentially allows the, allows the providers to meet and begin to think about what their priorities are on an annual basis. So that's, that's where, that's where we're working with, what we're kind of working toward, which would leave a lot of money back on the table for direct implementation for, for a number of years.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you so much for that. I appreciate that. Any last thoughts on that Resolution? All right, I'm gonna move us on to Resolution 341, which is the ARPA Homeowner Energy Improvement and Job Training Project. Do I have a motion for discussion? Chairwoman Bartels and a second, please. Legislator Levine. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Opposed. Okay, great. And I see we have, Dr. Doyle is to talk about this and also, Susan Gillespie. Hi, Susan, how are you?

Susan Gillespie: Nice to see you.

Chairman Criswell: So, my understanding for this Resolution is that it passed the Economic Development on July 5, six to one. It passed Energy Environment and Sustainability on July 7, as amended, four to zero. Passed Public Works on Monday, four to zero. It was postponed one week in Ways and Means. And 341 was amended, it was amended to correct the organization's name. This was also scored. Goals and Mission, it got a 69%. Equity Distribution of 76%. Community Impact at 69%. Financial Management, 48%. For a total score of 69%. A few of the concerns that were vocalized, I see you Chairwoman Bartels. Get right to you. Relatively few households impacted. Job Training is a small component of the whole and an expensive way to ensure training. And we'd like to see this compared against all proposals left before the Legislature. So, those are some of the concerns. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: So, obviously, as you noted, it's, you know, it's moved through three committees. I think you said three successfully. And, you know, again, you know, I, I'm, you know, one of the people, if not the only, who's, who's raised some concerns. I spoke with Miss Gillespie today, and I'm, I'm really grateful for the conversation. And I look forward to this conversation here. You know, one of, one of, one of my big concerns about the project is, it's a, it's a pretty substantial amount of money to spend to impact a very few homes. You know, we talked, Planner Doyle talked about the, the relatively high administrative cost, you know, 20% is slightly higher than normal. And I'm actually, you know, I'm actually going to going to advocate for something potentially really different. I'm going to, first of all, ask that this committee, you know, just put it out on the table. You know, hold, basically hold this for a month while we work through it. But what I want to say is, you know, the jobs training, I think is, is critically, critically important. It's something that we ranked very high in, in ARPA, and it's the thing that I was most ready to get behind in this project. And in talking to, to miss Gillespie today, and she'll be able to speak about it more, the two cohorts that have worked through this program already. She told me today, two thirds of the two groups of eight, and correct me if I'm wrong Miss. Gillespie, two

thirds, two groups of eight, are already hired, working in the field. That is amazing. That's great. That's, that's life altering. That's the, that's the thing that I'm so excited about. So, when I look at \$500,000, essentially, what, when we call this a jobs training program, what we're doing is we're fully funding a small number of retrofits, so that the jobs training program, which, which exists can have work, which arguably, there might be work elsewhere. And yes, those homes are going to be retrofitted to whatever extent we could afford, as Legislator Greene talked about, you know, 20 to 30,000, homes is not going to necessarily do a full deep retrofit at even yesterday's prices. But what I would like us to consider and talk about is potentially rather than investing such a proportion, such a high proportion in a small number of homes is, let's talk about potentially investing much more money in the jobs portion. I can get totally behind a much deeper investment in the jobs training program. We know that, we know that the organization we heard about, the one, the one job, the organizational job that's helping, that is needed to help the ramp up. Absolutely. Let's find that job. And then let's do more in the jobs training side. Our money, this amount of this investment could go much further if we rethink this, and that's an, I have to say thank you for the conversation today, Miss Gillespie, because it really crystallized for me, you know, what I could wholeheartedly get behind because I gotta tell you, I've been struggling, it's been very hard for me to not feel 100% behind a green initiative. Like I have a pretty long record in this Legislature. And this one's been tough for me. But in, in this conversation today, I realized, you know, there's like, there's a real, here, here, that we can invest in a real solid thing that I actually think is going to have much, much more impact than the way this project is currently proposed. So, I think we need to get anything, I think we need to get some of the key stakeholders to the table. You know, a couple of them are here with us today. But I think we can do it fairly fast. I absolutely want to fund that position. But I think we should, I think we should be investing in the jobs portion of this much more heartedly.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you so much. I'd love to hear from others on this. So, Susan, did you want to say a little bit about this?

Susan Gillespie: Sure, I can say a little bit more. You know, the two-thirds jobs was, was, was, you know, after a relatively brief period. I don't know that they're still in the field. I do think we have a successful model that deserves to be and will be expanded. What I, what I want to see out of this is a real coming together around the different roles of you know, a nonprofit like Communities for Local Power, and the County and the Legislature and making the best use of the funding from different sources. You know, we are funded right now by NoVo for this program. We did we expand to expand it next year. We will have two sessions rather than one and this year's is already quite a bit bigger than last year's. So, we do have some funding concerns. But my main interest in this project from the beginning in the conversation with Dennis and other people in Planning was how to use this opportunity to bring together the different forces and actors in the area of, of green jobs. Because, you know, the contractors, we started out working with local contractors and that's been our great strength. That was the smart thing that we did was start not with, you know, the educational institutions which are coming along and providing education. We're doing it, OSHA, 10 this year and building performance. But the important thing was to start with, the jobs are right with the actual contractors, and that's been a wonderful process. But so, Dennis can speak to his, by his project, and working with RUPCO rep was not an organization that has been involved in, in our project, so far. They do a wonderful job. And I think getting them to the table for something that's cooperative like this,

and county based, is an important thing. And I also, as I said to you, Tracey, that the example of actually not just correcting, you know, the really terrible code violations that exist in some of these, you know, low-income housing rentals. And, and perhaps even in, you know, owner, owner occupied buildings, that's a, it's a real public health issue and an important thing that hasn't gotten enough attention at any level. So, I'm not, I don't, I'd rather not see them as, as in opposition. I'd rather look at what, what, what the best uses of the funds to bring, to bring all of these different forces together. That would be my, my perspective. And I'm confident, and I'm really, Tracey, do look forward to the conversation with you about the jobs program and how we can bring it to a higher level. And, you know, and like I said before, you know, having the support and ideas of the Legislature as well as the administration will be terrific in that respect.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much, Dr. Doyle. Do you want to chime in on anything?

Director of Planning Doyle: Sure, thank you very much for the opportunity. It's, Susan and it's good to see you in person, but to a certain extent, or at least on camera. And we've talked through this program, on a, on many different levels. And I would say, to echo the Chairman's, the Chairman's conversation, I would say that one of the things that we're lacking as a county is, is access into the Citizens of Local Power internship program. So if we're, if, if the Legislature decides to move forward, I would urge them in any way, shape, or form to make sure that that that, that, what does get moved forward is the is the position within the Citizens for Local Power. There's an enormous opportunity within that, within that position, and within, within that increase of administrative capability to essentially allow us to have additional discussions with respect to what Community, what Community rent rehabilitation or housing rehabilitation looks like. And there are other sources for housing rehabilitation funds are not as deep as what we're talking about now. But there are other sources that are out there. And putting all of the, putting all the players together, a very competent agency with respect to housing rehabilitation, with a competent agency with respect to a job training program. And they deal with different constituencies right now in, especially in terms of contractors, putting all of that together and moving it forward, I think, benefits us greatly in the future. And so, if there's a decision to be made here, that's, that's. that, that is timely, it's a decision relative to the position that Susan Susan, Susan is talking about in funding for that position. And if there's a hold on funding relative to the housing rehabilitation portion of it, what I would say is, housing real estate rehabilitation is not cheap. So, if you put \$500,000 up, and you, you start doing the math, that's what you get, you, I mean, there's a lot of money that is required to do housing rehabilitation. I would also say that housing rehabilitation work, deep energy retrofits tied to low- and moderate-income individuals, low- and moderate-income individuals spend an enormous amount of, a disproportionate amount of their funding for energy and moving this and helping that makes it, helps them essentially stay in their house and manage, and manage their bills. We're not, we're not new to this work. We did many years ago. We did a housing rehabilitation program that installed 21 solar facilities on existing low- and moderate- income homeowners that are still operating today. But we want to make sure that we have the ability to essentially create the job training program along with the housing rehabilitation work and, and if the Legislature is, is concerned about the amount of money on housing rehabilitation side, it shouldn't be concerned about the amount of money on, on the job training.

Chairman Criswell: So, I have a question about urgency that you brought up Director Doyle. So, what is the urgency to move this along? Is there some time to have further conversations about how do we beef up the jobs training portion of this proposal?

Director of Planning Doyle: Well, my, my sense is, is that there's an existing position within, and Susan can speak to this, within, within Citizen for the Local Power that, that they're looking for, for money to essentially support that position. So that's the urgency in my mind with respect to that. And for me, that, that allows them to plan ahead for next year. It allows us, it allows us to do some additional work relative to trying to figure out how the energy retrofits are going to work, with how the contractors are going to work, and it gives them an opportunity, gives them, it's basically capacity building within the organization. For me, that's the urgency. And with respect to the housing rehab work, we'll be doing housing rehab with an \$800,000 grant. And are we going to be through that grant by next, by, by say the next time that the committee meets? The answer would be no. And so, there's not an urgency on, on the side of the housing rehab portion.

Chairman Criswell: So can I ask Susan, in terms of budget, is this, are we talking 2023? Where are we at? Like, where's your sort of dropped dead you have to know whether this will be funded or not?

Susan Gillespie: July would be great.

Chairman Criswell: By July 30th?

Susan Gillespie: Yeah. Yeah. We, we have a position. A person who's very competent in the position of coordinator, but she's funded short-term and the idea here was that we would make this into a staff position with benefits and so forth. In addition to what we have now, to keep her on, and to give her, among other things, responsibilities for driving the conversation with the county, and the other actors here forward so that we can, you know, have someone specifically dedicated to that, who will work with all of you and everybody else. It's a complicated thing, as you all know. And, you know, among other things, we can investigate additional funding sources that are going to be out there, right? I mean, you know, including new federal sources. I think, everyone's talking about workforce development, I think we know, we have a little bit of a handle on how to do it locally. And we'd love to see it built out so that it really, you know, reaches all of the, we should be doing it in the schools, you know, starting at a very young age, and figure out how to do that well, to make these green careers really something that people see as a, as a mission, as a good way to spend your life. And, you know, we've had, we've had decades of basically downgrading of the trades. That has to change. There's the attitudinal changes that we have to work on. And publicizing the, the impact that this has had on people who have had the training, some of whom have already founded their own businesses, and are doing very well. That's a nice thing about this area. It's an area where the local contractors, it's relatively easy to, to be on your own. Right? And to, to help shape the future of your community in a really positive way that has immediate beneficial impacts for the people you live there with. So, you know, we think of it as a really wonderful way to help the community as a whole move toward a green economy. So, yes.

Director of Planning Doyle: Other thing I would say to you is that there are other methods of financing that a pilot program that comes together and does housing rehabilitation in combination with workforce development, offers, other opportunities are out there. And Susan's aware of this, and the Legislature should be as well, the City of Ithaca has essentially developed a private sector model, that that basically brings private sector financing in and combines it with a low, small amount of basically, you know, government money in order to make in order to make improvements, but the bulk of the money is provided by the private sector. And it's a loan program, effectively it's a loan program, and they anticipate on doing, you know, 50 to 100, to up to 1,000 houses using, using this, this amount of money, the biggest difficulty that they have, and continue to have to attract the tribe to the private sector investment is what's a typical cost. So, one of the things that you end up doing, when you start this work, you begin to start to develop a typical cost model that you can then move out to the private sector and some of the funding entities that are out there at the private level to fund it. We can also approach local banks and other things that are out there. So there, there's opportunities here that we're not, we're not talking about that is, that is beyond just the \$500,000, or the three or \$400,000 in housing rehab. It's an opportunity to essentially to prove a model and to take that model into the private sector.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. The one concern I have is, it's a bell I've rung over and over again about ARPA funding, is this is a onetime opportunity for us to have this money. So, we try and steer clear of funding programs that will then become something that becomes a burden to the county that we have to fund over and over again. So, I'd want to address that in this conversation and figure out, you know, if we funded this for one year, then what happens in year two, year three, year four, you know, because that's an important conversation.

Susan Gillespie: Sorry, I was muted. The county also gave us a similar amount of money last year. I can't remember what pot it came out of. But we're not talking about a huge amount of money actually.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, sounds great. It's just, that's definitely one thing that we look at, what the ARPA funding.

Susan Gillespie: Understood. Understood.

Chairman Criswell: Let's see. Alright, so another concern is so, so, Susan, just let us know that the money you know, should be in place by July 30th. If we put this on hold, this is not going to go to our July session for a vote. So, committee members, I want to know what your feeling is about voting on this this evening. And moving this forward or putting this on hold so we can flesh it out a little bit more. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Legislator Greene did have her hand up, I don't know if she wants to talk about that aspect or Legislator Greene is it okay with you if I answer that question? I don't know if she can, can anybody...

Legislator Greene: Yes, but I would like to speak to the project.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Okay. So, um, I mean, one thing we could consider, if we want to get into, you know, a deeper discussion about how to spend the bulk of the money is to amend the resolution to fund the position, either for a year or two years, it's \$30,000 a year, you said? So, we could put in a one year or a multi-year funding of it, it wouldn't, it wouldn't read as a multi-year funding. It would read as a, you know, a 30, 60, and \$90,000 commitment to CLR. But it would contractually read that it was for that position over the course, would be an investment in the position over the course of the years. And we could do that, we could do that today, you know, and move that person and then come back to discuss the rest. So, I mean, I think that we could, I think we could do both if we wanted to.

Chairman Criswell: So, we would amend it here. If we approve that amendment, and it goes, it doesn't have to go back to the other committees, or would it just go to the floor as an amended resolution?

Legislative Chair Bartels: It would go to the floor as an amended resolution.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, great. Other thoughts?

Legislator Greene: I would like to speak.

Chairman Criswell: Absolutely. All you, Legislator Greene.

Legislator Greene: First of all, there is already funding built into this for actually doing the retrofits. The position is very much needed and urgently needed. But in terms of putting off the actual retrofits and just funding administration for the job training, and everyone knows how supportive I am of the job training, because there are going to be hundreds of, 1,000s of buildings that need to be retrofitted, the urgencies, the climate. And I also want to say that I am a homeowner, I guess it would be considered moderate income. I have three incomes. I'm working full time. I have a stipend from the Legislature and Social Security. I could not have afforded to do a deep energy retrofit. One, my house, although I had applied for a low interest loan from NYSERDA when I was given the opportunity to have a deep energy retrofit done, but I think about all of the people who are ready and willing and need that help. So, and the fact is that there are funds in the overall project for that work. And it just makes sense to me to have the entrance and the contractors working directly on buildings that are selected through a fair process and, and part of the whole pilot and why that's so valuable. Is that the climate leadership and Community Protection Act is going through the final stage of being defined and if we are a very successful pilot, we will be first in line for the funding that will be coming through to do energy retrofits. And they also have a, an emphasis on what they, what they call disadvantaged communities, which this project addresses. So, we would be very ready to apply for and be awarded funding to keep that going. So, I would strongly encourage keeping the project in-tact, not amending it, and getting it done, both for the urgency of climate and for the readiness, for that's what a pilot is. Not a payment in lieu of taxes. A real pilot is for the purpose of setting ourselves up to be a leader moving forward and to be ready to apply for the funding that will be coming from the federal government and the state. And that's pretty clear, if any, for anyone who's been following the, the Climate Act Process. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much. What I'd like to do is actually individually poll committee members to find out if you'd like to take this to a vote, or if you'd like to put it on hold. So sorry to put you on the spot, but I'm going to do it. So, Legislator Sperry. Sorry.

Legislator Sperry: Why me first?

Chairman Criswell: Because.

Legislator Sperry: I mean, I'm torn. I feel like there's an urgency and I do want to help with funding this position. And I agree with Chair Bartels, so I could be moved to vote today to fund that position as a resolution.

Chairman Criswell: Which Senator Corcoran

Legislator Corcoran: I'm in favor of moving it to a vote.

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Levine.

Legislator Levine: I agree with a lot of the points that Leg, Chair Bartels me and then we're reiterated by Legislator Sperry, I think we, if it's, if it's absolutely necessary to get this position funded for July, I think that, you know, we should potentially entertain a motion to amend this to fund the position. And then, you know, we can have a further discussion on the bulk of it, you know, at our next meeting, so I would agree with Legislator Sperry and, and Chair Bartels.

Chairman Criswell: Chair Bartels, I'm gonna give you the opportunity to just reiterate your stance.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thanks. I'm not going to reiterate it just because I know everybody's heard it. But, but I am going to say that if this is what we do today, I just want to be clear that I'm not advocating that we stop the discussion on the other portion. Like I want to bring all the stakeholders as, as Susan mentioned, as, as, as Dennis talked about, bringing stakeholders to the table and have a conversation about how we best focus our investment. And if and if at the end of the day, it is an invest, it is an investment in this pilot, the way that it's drafted, then so be it. I'm just, at this moment, I'm not convinced that that's the best way to spend the balance of these funds. Like I think we may be able to come up with something that, that we're actually all happier with, in the same way that we're looking to refine the other projects before us. So again, I just, I'm saying I want to be clear that this is not an attempt to quash this and stop the discussion. It's an, it's a, it's an attempt to have a deeper discussion about it. And one that I hope results in something that actually is even more impactful.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Okay, hearing the majority of the committee members, I'd ask if there's an amendment to this resolution. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: May, so I think, I don't know. Again, we're talking about a \$30,000. I don't know what the committee's pleasure is, in terms of funding right now for one year or whether we do, whether we utilize this to make a multiyear investment.

Chairman Criswell: All chime in. Personally, I just think why fund for one year? That just doesn't make sense to me, personally. I think if you're going to fund a position, fund the position so that the person who's administering it knows because there's a sunset, at some point, they'll have to find additional funds from somewhere else. A year is not enough to do that. So, Susan, did you want to chime in on that?

Susan Gillespie: Just, just to say that it's 30,000 this year because we have partial funding. Right? We can probably do that again. I'm not, you know, so I think you should decide what you think is appropriate in terms of the support. Just, just, just factually.

Chair Criswell: Thank you. Yes, Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Can I ask a question to Susan?

Chairman Criswell: Sure.

Legislative Chair Bartels: So, if we were to do multiyear funding? Are you comfortable with the partial funding for next year as, if we were to do two years at 30,000, do you have the funding commitment where, for two years? Like would that be would that cover two years? It's 60,000 for two years.

Susan Gillespie: We will be looking for funding for next year. I'm reasonably confident that we will find it and would be thrilled to have the ongoing support of the county, even if it's partial.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah. And also, if I may, I mean, I think, I think to your point Chair Criswell, the, the idea of making a multi-year commitment is also potentially something that the organization can go out and searching for other funding and say, Look, we are partners with the county, we have a commitment from the county over the course of years. So, it's a question that I guess how many years we want to, we want to talk about.

Chairman Criswell: Does three years makes sense? Does that seem extravagant other committee members? I'll pick on you directly.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Get ready, Megan Sperry.

Chairman Criswell: Aaron, do you have an opinion?

Legislator Levine: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I, I would agree with you. On the idea of, you know, in terms of more than a year, I think is the, for the for the stability of it. I think, I think we should have the discussion about two versus three. I think that that's kind of the question right now, you know, what the, what the view of the majority of the committee is, but I don't, I don't necessarily have a strong preference one way or the other. I don't know if Ms. Gillespie does. Be interested to hear her opinion.

Chairman Criswell: I'm gonna guess.

Susan Gillespie: You know, I think, I think, you know, I guess my question is, what it was, like, what the constraints are on the ARPA money? Can it be spread over three years? If it can, then three years is great.

Legislator Levine: I mean, to my knowledge, it shouldn't be a problem of doing that. Right? We have we have the flexibility.

Chairman Criswell: Yeah, we're fine with that. Actually, I think that timeframe is fine for us. Megan, do you have any thoughts on two or three years?

Legislator Sperry: I mean, I feel like there's more stability for the position if we fund it for three. And if we can do that, I think that that's where we should go. But I want to hear from Deputy Executive Kelly, who had their hand up.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, I was actually punting to Nate, but I saw a thumbs up on the window, I just want to make sure that we cover contract, whatever it is, just to make sure we stay within the timeframe. So, I think we're good.

Director of Resilience Litwin: Yeah, and I always like to repeat, the overall picture of our funds is that it must be obligated by the end of 2021. Probably a broken record so, forgive me. By the end of 2024 and expended by the end of 2026. And we have new guests here tonight. So, I think this is helpful. There are closeout procedures. So, I'm going to add something new, that our closeout procedures, I think some of you are familiar with them. So, if we don't reach those timeframes, there is a danger that the federal government could take the money back so it's just good to know the parameters.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you very much. So, it seems like the will the committee is leaning towards three years Legislator Bartels?

Legislative Chair Bartels: Well, I was, I was gonna make a motion but we didn't hear from Legislator Corcoran so I realized might have been premature.

Chairman Criswell: Sorry, Legislator Corcoran. You're on mute.

Legislator Corcoran: Thank you. I gotcha. Thanks for including me on this trip back from Ulster County Jail. But yeah, I'd be in favor the three years. I think multi-years is essential with this. So yes, I'm in favor of three years. I'd be okay with that amendment.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you, sir. Yes, you want to create...

Legislative Chair Bartels: So, then I would make a motion to amend the resolution to fund Communities for Local Powers. Is that what it's now called? Communities for Local Power at \$90,000, \$30,000 a year in, in a 30,000 per year investment in the position as defined in the, in the resolution, which will include that definition, correct Amber?

Chairman Criswell: Do we have to specify fiscal years or anything? We can just say three years is fine.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Okay. Yeah. All right.

Chairman Criswell: All in favor.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: All opposed?

Legislative Chair Bartels: I'm not opposed. But may I ask, may I say something?

Chairman Criswell: Yeah.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Just because.

Chairman Criswell: So, do we, do, so the amendment passes? Correct. There was all in favor. None opposed. Okay, great. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: And I just wanted to say because I don't, I don't know if it was brought up. I mean, I feel like someone said it. But I know that it came up in both my conversations with Planner Doyle and Miss Gillespie today that, you know, when we talk about getting people to the table over the course of this next month, you know, I think it's going to be critical to get our county OET to the table as well. And I know they're in this conversation. But, you know, I'm really looking forward to the conversations with a sense of optimism, as you know, the, the partnership that, and again, I've heard that word. Miss Gillespie used it today and Planner Doyle used it, the idea of a partnership like where the county can be a partner with such a great organization, in making an impact long term as it relates to jobs. And as it relates to green energy and these retrofits. Again, I think, you know, it may be a month from now, we're back with the balance of this, and it looks the same, but it but it may not. So, I'm grateful to the committee for its willingness to have the conversation. And I say with earnestness that I'm looking forward to the conversation. That this is the beginning of, of this great relationship.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Yes, Susan.

Susan Gillespie: I just to say that we are very much in conversation and cooperation with OET. In fact, I was at a meeting today with them, in which we began to broach the same issues. And you know, it really, it was a wonderful start made with Tomasine about bringing everybody together and then we had a change in personnel. But the emphasis is still there. And the desire is still there I think to bring everybody together to make it work, you know, in the very best way for the, the county.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Now, let me ask a question about Resolution 341. So that was the only amendment we made? Are we moving ahead to vote on Resolution 341, as amended? Legislator Levine?

Legislator Levine: Yeah. I just had a quick technical question. Mr. Chair, I don't know if what Chair Bartels' amendment needed a second? I wasn't sure. But if it did, I'd be happy to second.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. I thought it was seconded. It wasn't. Thank you, Legislator Levine. Yes, Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: So, to be clear, you know, what I meant with the amendment, and I don't know, was that the rest of the resolution, the rest of the funding and the resolution would be struck. And for at this time, we would be funding just the 9, 90,000 for the, for this three-year commitment. Yes, Communities for, for Local Power. So, I just want to make sure and that we'll be back to discuss the rest.

Chairman Criswell: I was clear on that. I just want to make sure the resolution language is clear on that. And that as it moves forward to session next Tuesday that everyone's clear that, that was, that's, that that is what that amendment just did. So, Clerk Feaster, do you think that that's clear Resolution language? That everyone will get that we're only funding the 90,000? Everything else is put on hold until, so, would we re-amend this resolution? Or would this have to become a new resolution? Because we're going to pass this resolution as amended. It will then go into history as being a passed resolution. We would have to create a new resolution for this second portion. Correct? Okay, I just want to make sure I've got the train going in the right direction here. So, all right, so we feel comfortable with that language. And so, what I'd like to do now is call a vote for resolution 341, as amended. All in favor of that.

Group: Aye.

Legislator Levine: Mr. Chairman, it seems like besides the train moving in the right direction, it might sound like the ice cream truck is also moving in the right direction.

Chairman Criswell: I have the ice cream truck outside. I hear it every day.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Legislator Greene, I think wants to speak, Chair Criswell.

Chairman Criswell: Can we can we finish our vote or, we're halfway in the middle of the vote.

Legislative Chair Bartels: I don't know if it was on the vote. I don't know if she wanted to speak on the vote.

Chairman Criswell: Okay, so, so we haven't finished our vote, we have to pick it up Legislator Greene, please.

Legislator Greene: I just want to be sure that you know, that, that the hammer and shovel and you know, the nuts and bolts, which is the money to actually do the retrofits doesn't get lost. And it seems to me if I understand the budget correctly, that that portion that the budget is for the whole project, but the, there is funding for that portion. Having a position and doing workforce development and training is all well and good. But I wonder if Director Doyle could just clarify,

you know, the Mortar and Pistol or whatever, bricks and mortar, right? Is what I'm trying to say, in this case, you know, the insulation, the windows, the,

Chairman Criswell: Director Doyle is no longer on the call.

Legislator Greene: I wouldn't be sure that doesn't get lost. Because a position without actual projects, I don't know. It's better than no position. But if you know, and it's my understanding, perhaps somebody else on the call understands the budget well enough to confirm that there is money available. And by focusing on the position, I don't want the funding for the bricks and mortar to get lost.

Chairman Criswell: Noted. And the ice cream shop is right outside my door now. So, we were halfway through the vote. We had yeas, and I want to call for yes, that was Yeah. And any call, call for any noes. All right, so the resolution passes. Great. And we will let our colleagues know.

Legislator Greene: Is there....

Chairman Criswell: As amended.

Legislator Greene: If I may.

Chairman Criswell: Yes, Legislator Greene.

Legislator Greene: Is there clarity about what will happen? What the procedure for the rest of the resolution? Which is what I consider the bricks and mortar.

Chairman Criswell: Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Well, I think, you know, what I would propose is that we get the key stakeholders to the table to have a discussion about it. Again, you know, the question I think that's going to be before us is how to best invest in green energy retrofits. Whether or not it's to actually fund the retrofits or to bolster a job training program, or both. I think what the urgency of this, this position, and CLP's need to, to get that commitment right now is what moved us to move that portion. Otherwise, I think we would have had the conversation as a whole. But, you know, I think that there's still a conversation to be had about funding the brick-and-mortar aspects of it. And that's, that'll happen. Getting everyone to the table, ideally, very, in a, in a quick order. Like before, you know, next month, it may be at this committee. Chair Criswell, we'll talk about that. And it may be in a working group.

Legislator Greene: I would like to request that I be a sponsor of resolution, and I'm considered to be invited to the table you speak of.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Absolutely, without a doubt.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you very much. Now you're gonna hear the trains in my background, so it's a potpourri of sounds coming from my house today.

Alright, so I want to move on. Thank you for that. I want to take this out of order just a little bit, because I see director Weidemann here, and I want to give you the opportunity. We're going to have a robust conversation about ARPA funding requests, but I know that you wanted to do a quick presentation of the Main Streets Program. So, I'd like to actually do, swapped out a little bit, give you that opportunity to have that quick presentation. We'll do some Q&A. And then we'll get into further discussion about what we spent so far in ARPA money, what the projected projects are out there, what the dollar amounts that are attached to that, and where that would leave us in terms of fund balance at this point. So, Director Weidemann, you're good to go?

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: I believe I am. Thank you, Chair Criswell. Amber, can I get permission to share my screen? Hmm, perfect. Okay, I'm doing this on my phone. So, if I get it wrong, you'll bear with me, I hope.

So, hopefully, you, somebody can give me a thumbs up that you've got my screen? Good. Alright, so I was before you about a month ago to share a first version of this presentation. It's really, mostly the same with a little extra detail. It followed up on a couple of questions that we received during the last presentation. But I didn't receive a whole bunch of feedback, so I'm hoping that's a sign that it's headed in the right direction. Would look forward to feedback today. And then if this makes it to a point at which the committee decides to score, it, obviously would look forward to discussion about the scoring results.

The idea here is to provide a program using ARPA funding to support our anchor institutions and our commercial cores throughout Ulster County. And I'll walk you through kind of, the, the details that we've assembled so far in the program, drawing from past work that the Planning Department did on, on Main Streets, developing a Main Streets toolbox in the past, and then also modeling closely after the New York Main Streets program, which is a statewide program. It's actually open for applications right now, but it is highly competitive. But we have not seen a successful application recently in Ulster County.

Chairman Criswell: Tim, can I stop you for just one minute? Does anybody else see me in the middle of that presentation? Thank you.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Let's see if I can get that to go away.

Chairman Criswell: I appreciate that. Thank you.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: You're welcome. Okay, so first thing: highlights the program, the idea is to invest in commercial cores, either as areas or in the anchor institutions that anchor those commercial cores to increase economic vitality and boost the community's quality of life, especially focusing on economically disadvantaged areas, census tracts, Empire zones, former and prayer zones, opportunity zones, other designated disadvantaged and underserved areas. We're looking at two categories that could be applied for. One is the commercial core itself. This would fund projects like a, an area wide facade improvement program, or a downtown or business district marketing program, that kind of thing. Or anchor institution investments which focus on one anchor building or organization in the core

to strengthen that, that element of the core. The maximum award as we've designed, it would be \$250,000, with a required match of 20%, so total project cost of the maximum grant could be 250,000 and require a minimum of 50,000 in match. Geographic diversity and county wide impact would be included as a factor in the evaluation. I'll get to that in a minute. And this request would be for approximately \$2 million. Of our performance, which would make at least eight awards, we would expect that some requests would either come in below the 250,000 maximum award amount or that upon review by the evaluation committee, there may be decisions to make more than eight awards with smaller maximum awards for each grant. And as I mentioned, there's, there's, you know, kind of a history of this work. It really focuses on trying to build our, you know, our community centers or Hamlet's or villages or downtown areas and business districts and commercial corridors.

Now, this just kind of goes into the difference between a commercial core an anchor institution, drawn heavily from the distinctions that are made. Similarly in the New York Main Streets program focusing on individual organizations and businesses, or facilities versus the district as a whole. I won't read all this in great detail, but I think you get the idea. And then outlining the objectives of the program which will become important. I'll circle back at the end to the proposed evaluation criteria, and these are factors that would be considered in evaluating applications. So, the first, we want to support physical improvements to these anchor institutions within commercial cores. That would mean interior renovations, alterations, additions, and building systems upgrades and improvements. Want to focus on building performance and efficiency in that, so look for improvements that would improve building performance and efficiency. Also, exterior building improvements such as facade work or landscaping, outdoor spaces, like outdoor dining, or hospitality, or event space, renewable energy installations on site, as well as limited new construction when it's an infill construction in the commercial core, and only when it meets certain environmental standards that would be equivalent to LEED certification or PHIUS certification or Energy Star certification. The second objective would be to strengthen overall placemaking efforts. That term, hopefully folks have heard that before, within these compact commercial cores. That would be through validating things like the project's ability to improve walkability and bikeability in these commercial cores, beautifying public spaces in the core through landscaping, or public art, providing visitor amenities. Examples include commercial services that are lacking in the area, or things more tangible and concrete, like an open Wi Fi network for visitors or visitor information and signage, as well. Strengthening placemaking would look at preserving and enhancing the long-term success of multiple businesses within a core. And that's where we would get to things like a district wide facade improvement program or local area marketing programs. Third objective is to prepare communities and organizations to compete successfully for state and federal Community and Economic Development funding. You know, this would look at trying to identify projects that could be either seeded with these awards and then shepherded through the New York Main Streets program, in addition to this award for that, could set the stage for successful Downtown Revitalization Initiative or a new programming that's coming this year. Forward New York, that's focused on rural areas in smaller communities, or restoring New York or brownfield opportunity area programs. There's a number of programs at the state and federal level that we've had some limited success in our communities applying for, but I think this program could set the stage for further success in those program areas.

Implementation of this program, we would look to leverage the kind of program infrastructure that we've been developing through the ARPA funding. So, the Nonprofit Recovery and Resiliency, to the CARES, to the Water / Sewer infrastructure programs. Borrowing application forms or methods for data collection, evaluation, and reporting, etc.

The proposal here would sub-award this program to use EDA for implementation. Obviously subject to contract approval by the Legislature as a separate step. That'd be a contract for services. And as with the CARES program, as we, you know, went back and forth with the Legislature on that, I think we came in at less than or equal to right around 5% admin overhead and, and claw back provisions in the contract. So that if for some reason, not all the funding is awarded, and spent, that whatever is left would come back to the county. And we'd have a joint Legislative and Executive evaluation committee that would score the applications, and that scoring would be based on a rubric that would be designed in consultation with Legislature. I've drafted it here, but ultimately, I think this is where we would look to you all for some feedback and thoughts on what are the right criteria to evaluate projects then we can enhance, refine that scoring rubric. So, here's, here's the stab at the scoring rubric. The first thing is really threshold questions. We need to check whether or not applications meet eligibility requirements. As stated above, they've got to be in a compact commercial core, they've got to be eligible as organizations to receive the funding. This is where we would also look to guidance from the Feds in terms of ARPA expenditures. And then, in addition to that, we would look at three categories: program effectiveness, equity distribution, and community impact. This is modelled largely on the ARPA committee's scoring rubric itself, recognizing that you guys put a lot of thought into what are the things that you want to look at as you evaluate projects for use of ARPA funds. And so, we would look in turn at the applications to see if they further those same goals. And so, you'll see that most of those are similar. The one that I'll just point out, is that second bullet under Program Effectiveness, refers back to the three objectives of this program and so that's where it folds those in, in addition to the other general criteria for our projects. Our proposed timeline, you know, this is really, roughly kind of depends on when we would start this based on the Legislature's authorization to move forward. But we would finalize contracts between the city and the county, we would appoint the evaluation committee, and announce and promote the request for applications in the first month or two and be able to start scoring applications after month three. So, in months four through six, we'd work through that and begin making awards, and begin monitoring and reporting on the program implementation that would continue through month 12 when we would then support the awardees with their planning approvals and project implementation, and also start working on opportunities to connect them to other funding sources.

That's it. I'll stop sharing my screen. But these are our next steps, finalizing the design, putting forward, if we are asked to and if it meets with the committee's support funding allocation and contract approval resolutions, and then working to draft the contract.

Chairman Criswell: Great, thank you for that speedy presentation. I appreciate that. Yeah, I just want to say I really appreciate this presentation. I think that this hits a lot of notes, I think for the ARPA funding. I think it has countywide impact. I think it will have long lasting impact. I really appreciate you're aligning the program goals and the project goals with the ARPA goals. I think that's really important and actually does helps us do our work so we don't have to try and make

those leaps and assumptions. You're going to help make them for us. And I think that's helpful. So those are just some initial thoughts that I had. I'd love to hear from other members of the committee, what your thoughts are on this potential project. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: So, thank you, Tim, for the presentation. I think it was really thought out and you responded to a lot of the comments before. You know, I think it's a, it's a, I agree with Chair Criswell, that it, it does, it hits a lot of notes and could have an impact in, in a lot of communities. Similar, similar, but different from the parks project. Right? I mean, it's, it's like the economic centers of communities versus the recreation centers. And I like that we're having all these conversations. You know, it's a, it's a sort of, I think, a kind of a natural. I hate to do this to you, Tim, but it's kind of a natural segue to where we're at with the funding right now. Because, and, again, I don't mean to be the, the naysayer, but like, this is the point where, you know, we heard about the farms project last, last week, which, while the details weren't fully there, you know, I think there's a lot of support for helping farmers. We know our small businesses and our main streets. You know, we're, we're seeing such a rebound and COVID brought so many people up from, that weren't here originally. Real estate's gone bonkers. Like there's a, there's a real investment happening. And it's, it seems a ripe time to, to invest in Main Street businesses, which haven't fully rebounded. Businesses have, were really hurt by COVID. And all of these things are valuable, and they're just, there isn't going to be enough money. So, that's why I think that again, and I'm here, this is my segue to you Chair Criswell, that's why I think it's like this is the time where we really have to look at everything, all these valuable projects and say, Okay, we have X amount to work with, and maybe more. We know that the county has other money. There are certain projects we can't fund with any money other than ARPA. And I don't mean because of our budget restrictions, but because the county's restrictions. We can't give grants, you know, we can't pay for other people's property unless we take easements. There's like all kinds of rules and regulations that we operate under in the normal county government world that ARPA has lessened those restrictions. So, I think that it's a moment in time where we do need to, you know, assess, you know, everything that's out there, and figure out how, how we're going to, how we're going to finish this off and figure it out thoughtfully, which I know that this committee can do because this committee has taken a lot of time evaluating and re-evaluating and re-evaluating, looking, looking at things over and over from multiple angles. So, if there's any committee, I mean, I have the confidence in this committee to do it. But that's, that's where I think we're at but it was, it's a great, it's a great presentation. And it really does, I think, bring home this moment in time about investing in Main Street.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Other Legislators? Legislator Sperry. Does the boss want to talk, actually?

Legislator Sperry: Yeah, the Little General wants to say something. Um, I agree with Chair Bartels. I do feel like this is a wonderful program and a great proposal. It's just, it's a lot of money to be investing with only having about \$8 million left in our bank account for ARPA, right? Am I correct since it's \$2 million?

Chairman Criswell: 8.7 right now, and potential for other funds to sort of shake loose a little bit, depending on what Deputy Executive Kelly does when he starts to shake the piggy bank a little bit.

Legislator Sperry: Um, so, you know, I think it's true, we need to be very strategic in how we're funding all of these amazing projects that we want to do. Right? So, I don't know, Tim, if there's a deadline right now? Like, or is like, can we just, can we pause? Can we have a moment to like, figure out what we're doing with ARPA funds and kind of strategize?

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Yeah, I mean, of course. From, from my perspective, this is one. I know, I put a lot of pressure on when we were talking about the small business assistance. But I would step back and say, with this one, I understand that, you know, the situation is different now. There are a lot of competing priorities and lots of good ideas. You know, I, I would be happy to continue to kind of explain why I think that this targets a sector and a segment of our community that has been hit disproportionately hard and really could use this help and how it you know, it represents a wise investment in our future, because these main street commercial areas and corridors are really where it's going to be at in the coming decade. And so, I think, you know, I'm a fan of it, obviously. But I get that there's a lot of deliberation to do. So, I'm happy to answer your questions, come back at any point to discuss it further. Whatever works for you all.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. I remember when this committee started, one of the key things I kept saying was, when somebody 30 years down the road is talking about how we spent our money, would they look at the project and say that was money well spent. And I really believe that this type of spending would be something that someone will look at and say, Wow, they really spent that money wisely and really invested. So, I'm a fan of this. I think what I'd like to ask us to do with this is, we haven't officially scored this yet. So, I think what I'd like to do is just send it around to the committee to score it. It's not even in resolution form yet, but let's score it as a concept so that we actually have that in our back pockets. And we can then refer that, refer to it when we need it and I think this is a good segue. Legislator Levine, please.

Legislator Levine: Thanks, Mr. Chair, I would just, if possible, to Mr. Wiedemann, if he could just make sure that the committee is able to obtain that PowerPoint presentation that he just gave us, so that we can delve in more into that with more detail as, excuse me, as we score it. Thank you.

Chairman Criswell: We'll make sure of that happens.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Absolutely.

Chairman Criswell: Clerk Feaster.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: It was emailed out this afternoon.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Thank you, Amber.

Legislator Levine: Thank you very much.

Chairman Criswell: Great. So, what I'd like to do, just in the, in with our time getting short here, it's 20'till, so I'd like to move us along unless anybody has any other direct pointed questions for, for Tim right now. I'd like to bring us on to the bigger conversation of what we spent, what's laying out in proposal form right now. And where we want to head as a committee with our thinking about the next \$8.7 million that were charged. So, everybody okay with that? Great.

Alright, so today, we sent you out supporting materials, which shows the current allocations for the money that we've spent so far. So, it shows everything from the 34.491 million, all the way down to the 8.7 million, and in addition, then, the next page of that document is a breakdown of every project that I know to date that we've been talking about. If there's anything in here that I missed, please let me know. But I think that I captured everything that we talked about. The next thing that again, Amber is the master of these spreadsheets and turning them into beautiful pie charts. So, thank you, thank you so much for your skill set in that. I could never do this. But what, what she did then was put a comparison of the approved allocations to date. And then if we funded everything that we've been talking about, basically how that would take us up to the 34.5 million. Some of those projected numbers were a little bit of an assumption. But most of them were actually either in presentations or taken from, directly from resolutions themselves. So, what I'd like to suggest we do is actually go through each of the resolutions just so we can talk through what we're talking about and what's, what's out there and then have a robust conversation about you know, are we taking a pause? If so, how are we going to regroup to think about what the next steps are. So, I'm just going to start to list off the programs. And then some of them we've talked about already, so I don't think we need to talk extensively about them. But just so we all know where we're at.

So, the Parks program we talked about today, that's a \$2 million resolution. And that goes into a priority topic of Trails and Outdoor Space. The Food Securities contractual program with Cornell Extension, Cornell Extension \$350,000. Again, this was presented to us and already scored, and goes into the Food Security bucket. If at any point anybody wants to comment on any of these just shout out and I'll stop. But I'm just gonna read these off. So, the Green Home Retrofit we just talked about right now. The Community Kitchens, that's an estimated, estimated \$500,000 ask. That's in the Food Securities. The boosts for Main Streets. We just heard Tim talk about. The Meat Processing Facility. So, this is still a concept only and I believe Legislators Sperry and Litts are still working to develop this concept. And we put it in at a million dollars. That, that was not, yeah, okay. So, I got, just got a thumbs up for that. Support for the Farmers. Again, Legislator, Chairwoman Bartels just talked about this. This is in the works right now with Legislator Nolan working to develop this in partnership with Ulster County Soil and Water Conservation District. We put that in at a million dollars, but as Legislator Bartels said, that could go anywhere where from a million to 7 million. We haven't really fully vetted that project. We put it in at a million because in Legislator Nolan's presentation, they'd put it in between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000. So, that's where we put that. Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, and I would. So, I would urge that just, even as we're thinking about it, we think about it on the higher end of that 2 million, just because of the, the need that's

out there. I mean, who knows what it will shake out to be, but I, you know, I would urge that we look at it at 2 million to start the conversation. And then the other thing, just, I think, I think you said community kitchens, I think we went through that, right?

Chairman Criswell: Right. Yeah.

Legislative Chair Bartels: So, I just wanted to, I'm not, not trying to get into the nitty gritty. But, you know, I've noticed in my con-, conversations about community kitchens, that, and I feel like it's a misunderstanding out there in general, like, yes, it is about Food Security, but that's only one aspect. I think it's also Economic Development. And, and so I would just want to make sure that, you know, small business, its small business assistance, its, you know, I just wanted to make sure that we don't pigeonhole that idea. And I also just want to flag it for the committee that it's going to. It's going to require a certain, a more, amount of education, because I think that there's a certain idea that food kitchens are the same as soup kitchens. I mean, community kitchens are the same as soup kitchens, which they're, they're not. They I mean, they could act as a soup kitchen, but that they, they have many, many roles to play.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you for flagging that because that also brings up a, I'll get you to one, in one second Legislator Sperry. Clerk Feaster and I went through a couple of the allocations, and we realize that they actually do sit in a couple of categories. So, for one of them specifically, for the Meat Processing, we put that in both Food Security and Workforce Development. And we, we basically gave it a 50-50 split. We can talk about how we actually allocate things when, when, and if it comes down to a time but, but we realized that several of these actually are sitting in a couple of different buckets, and we want to allocate them correctly, so that there's so that when we look at our overall percentage of spending, it's got a correct balance to it. Is that what you wanted to say, Legislator Sperry? Okay, please go ahead.

Legislator Sperry: Yes, well, kind of. I just also wanted to say that they could both fall under the category of Workforce Development, because we could be training folks at community kitchens and we could also be training folks to be working in a meat processing facility or within that realm. So, I, you know, that's something that we definitely as a whole group want to support is workforce development, and no matter what industry or category it's in. So, I just want to make sure that people understand that that's also an added value.

Chairman Criswell: I appreciate you bringing that up, because it really is something that we looked at a couple months ago at this point. But remember, we actually looked at what percentages we wanted to be spending on what and we came up with Food Security being a majority, Workforce Development being a majority. So, we want to make sure that we're, you know, again, looking at sort of broad categories and what of the current projects or if there's no project in an area, a topic area that we see it feel is really a priority that we need to start thinking about, Okay, do we need to develop some new projects in those arenas? So, thank you for bringing that up.

The UCAT that bus fare, so right now we put a million in, no, no, no, I'm sorry, we put 150,000 into that. And this was the idea that we've been talking about with trying to eliminate UCAT fares for a certain amount of time. That idea is still cooking around. Legislator Erner's working

on that. And then there is the Workforce Development specific to the film industry. And that's something that Legislator Sperry and I have been talking about. We put a million into that Workforce Development project. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: You know, one thing I just wanted to bring up like, and maybe it's something that's, because it's like a now, maybe a now or never moment, or at least a now or soon to be never moment is, you know, we had on the priorities list, and I can't find that, I was just looking at my computer to see if I could find the priorities list that we had created some time ago. But

Chairman Criswell: I think we've had like three incarnations at this point.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, yeah, I have a memory, I recall, and,

Chairman Criswell: If you need it, I can send it to you.

Legislative Chair Bartels: And that would be great. But one of the things that we haven't talked about again, and maybe off the table, but in Workforce Development, and Legislator Sperry just sparked it for me, was the idea of a, like a nursing, a nursing partnership with the College. And I do think that before we would do, before we're finally done with ARPA that we should have a conversation with SUNY Ulster, not just about nursing, but to Legislator Sperry's point about how we're all behind Workforce Development, and that is to say, is there a program that we can partner with them, that would bolster their enrollment and their, their ability to reach particularly Ulster County residents. But that also, we could, what, what I liked about the nursing proposal was the idea that it was almost going to be like a, you know, a contractual agreement. We had talked about working for the county for a couple of years and yes, it came out that that might not be necessary, we might not need public health, health nurses in the county. I don't know what the final answer was on that. But, but even an agreement to work within the Hudson Valley region for a period of time, if you were fully funded in a scholarship program, in whatever field, it is that we're talking about. And I just think it's important. I mean, I'll, I would love to be a part of the conversation or, or with whatever Legislators from this committee want to want to be on it. But to reach out to the college to see if there is any kind of symbiosis or partnership that we could have there that maybe we're not even thinking of.

Chairman Criswell: That's great. Thank you so much for bringing that up. I knew that there were a couple things that we had been sort of floating that that didn't make it onto this list. So, if anybody else has any memories of any other Workforce Development programs that we talked about, or just other programs in general, please, if you don't think of it today, but think of it later, just let me know and I'll add it to this continued list. All right. And then the last one that I have on this list is further funding for municipalities, which included things like generators, traffic assistance, other infrastructure, and that was to the tune of 300, \$234,000. That's an estimated, and that that was also in concept only. So, is there any, is there anything else that anybody's remembering that we talked about that we wanted to put money towards or any specific projects? Yes, Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: I mean, one thing that we had talked about was, like, purchasing CSAs from farmers in a way to support farmers, but also to get, you know, get fresh food to low income or folks that are, you know, that have SNAP benefits. So, I'm not really sure I mean, I know like at this point in the season, it's really difficult to, you know, buy a CSA, because you want to do that in the beginning of the year. But obviously, we would be thinking forwardly to like maybe next season or figuring out a way. So, I'm not really sure if that's something that we want to kind of umbrella under Food Security, or if that's something that we want to write as a separate resolution. But I think that it's, it is symbiotic and that way that we're supporting our constituents in our community, or in, our residents and we're also supporting agriculture and farming.

Chairman Criswell: Great. Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, I um, you know, I think it's, it's great. It's great. Like the symbiosis is great just because it does hit on multiple things, and I think it is something that we would be looking to engage the farmers on for the next season. So that is, that is at, I want to just say that I support that as well. And I did find that.

Chairman Criswell: I wonder if, I'm sorry.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Um, so I did find a list. And I just wanted to say that there are a couple that, you know, I just, just, just throw back out there, a couple that we haven't,

Chairman Criswell: Let me just say one thing, Chairwoman about the last comment that you made. Maybe the CSA idea is something we could fold into the larger Farmer program as well. So.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Absolutely.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. I'm sorry, please go ahead.

Legislative Chair Bartels: The, you know, we haven't talked about this at all. But there was, there was a, in the top 20, there was a proposal for legal counsel counseling for residents facing evictions. I don't know, it never, nobody ever brought it to the committee, but that one had been ranked within the top 20. And it's one I haven't heard anything about pretty much since.

Deputy Executive Kelly: On that one, like, just, I think a contract is fine. I wouldn't be, I'd heard something mentioned about staffing it or doing something within the Public Defender's realm, and their criminal attorneys. And I do worry somewhat about us advocating on one side of a contractual agreement just for one or the other party, because I also have dealt recently with, with people trying to get, to evict people that are dangerous, drug dealers, all of those types of things. And if we're just engaging on the one side of a two-sided agreement,

Legislative Chair Bartels: No, Chris, I'm sorry, I didn't finish the thought. It was, it was to find, it was to contract with Legal Services.

Deputy Executive Kelly: I know, but we would just be supporting,

Legislative Chair Bartels: The one side of, the tenant.

Deputy Executive Kelly: And I, I just have a concern about equity in those arrangements, not to say that they're certainly facing a lot of burdens here. But it's just something to be aware of, from a policy perspective that, you know, there are problems on both sides too.

Chairman Criswell: And the other concept that we continually talked about was seed funding. So, using this money to, you know, again, it's like, we're not going to have this money again so we just can't fund things that then become a burden to the county. So, what can we fund that then can either become self-sustaining, or, you know, move on its own? Legislator Petit.

Legislator Petit: Thank you. Um, we've been talking about bus shelters. Generally, bus shelters are under the purview of municipalities. But it as we expand our public transportation, and we become greener, and try to encourage people to use it, we should make it a little more user friendly. And then the bus shelters would also have signage put in there, which would mean additional marketing budget line for UCAT. This has come up several times on our meetings.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Thank you for that. Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: I know that at one point, we had talked about housing for farmers, and I'm sure we could umbrella that under the support for farmers category, but I think that that's definitely a high need in this county.

Chairman Criswell: That's great. I think the other thing I want to do, I'm really feeling compelled to get more voices of the Legislature in on this conversation. So, I've sent out messaging to the full Legislature saying, We've got this money, how do you want to spend it and gotten a few responses here and there. You know, some, you know, some people send five different proposals, and they really are, are on it, and others, you hear nothing from. So, I'd love to figure out a way, how we can once again message the full Legislature and say, we've now got 8.7 million left. These are, you know, here's a, here's how we've spent it so far. Like I actually think I want to send out the, the document that I sent to you all today, once again to the full Legislature saying, Here's how the money's been allocated. We've got 8.7 left, what do we want to do with it? So that we can once again, sort of get, get input, you know, from all of our colleagues across the aisle as well as in our democratic caucus. So, thoughts on that?
Chairwoman Bartels and Legislator Sperry.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. Yeah, I think that I think that's a great idea, sending it out to all the Legislators and also sending a request. And if, you know, and, and I don't know, I don't know if the ARP committee at some point in the next couple of months wants to even consider making a presentation to the full Legislature because that's something we could do, potentially on a session day. I know session days can be long, but this is important stuff. Yeah, I want to, I'm going to now, I'm going to pause because I have more thoughts, but on this subject, I want to hear from Legislator Sperry.

Chairman Criswell: Okay. Legislator Sperry.

Legislator Sperry: Thank you. I was just thinking, Chair Criswell, when you were saying that we should present them with the information that you shared this evening, I was thinking that perhaps it would be a good opportunity next week when we're together at the College for session is to do a handout and of that pie chart and the information, and then give another sheet of the categories that we've all been talking about and ask everybody to rate them while we're in session, and lock the doors and nobody can leave until they rate the categories. You're welcome.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. No, I like that. I like that. Chairwoman Bartels, what do you think?

Legislative Chair Bartels: Um, yeah, no, I think that's great. And, and just, if it's, if it's okay, I just have another thought, you know, you talked about earlier. And I know, it's, it's my vernacular that I've been raising this idea of a pause. And I think it might be the wrong, I think I'm, I think I was probably using the wrong word, the wrong language? Because I don't, I don't think what I'm advocating is that this committee pause its work. And like, take two months off and see you in two months, and we'll just reassess. I think it's just a shift to evaluating in more depth where we are. And what I'd like to ask is that, ideally, in the next month, that we hear from the ARP team, you know, a detailed read on where we're at and what we've committed to, you know? I know that there's some, you know, that were in various stages, for example, in the Sewer and Water applications are in, you know, are second responses out? You know, we know, we're here in the, in the Not For Profits evaluating? I don't, I don't know, because we haven't heard it. We're evaluating this, we got this many responses, this is where we're at. And we'll go right down the line and say, you know, let's have a dialogue about that, so that we're, so that one, this committee and the Legislature, the whole, knows where we're at. I mean, I, I've said in private conversations, you know, it's very possible we're talking about the things that haven't come before us yet or haven't been approved by us yet. It's very possible that something that's been approved by us, even something potentially that I voted against, is proving to be so valuable that we think we want to spend more money on that aspect. Right? So, but we don't, we won't know that until we have that checkbox. So again, I don't mean it as like a break in work. I mean, it as just a, a shift for the moment to, to get to get our, our full bearings. That's all.

Chairman Criswell: Yeah. I appreciate that, because what I see us as committee continually doing is refining and refining and refining. And I think this is just one more step in that refining journey, where we're trying to figure out what the priorities are, what we're spending on. And I really like what you're talking about. So, I'm going to look at Nate, and I'm going to look at Amber and say, is there some way we could kind of put something together? That is, is an overview of, you know, I mean, basically, we have it already, all the projects that we've funded, is there, can we get a little bit of a synopsis of where each of those funded projects are at? That type of thing? And then then that would give us more information? And, you know, how, how's it being received? You know, what's the success? Have we seen any success? Is it too early? You know, I think those are all really good questions. And I'm sure once you start doing that, you'll come up with your own questions or the information that you want to share about, about the process. So, I think that's a great idea. Chairwoman Bartels, I think that's really good. The other thing I was thinking about was, you know, I sent out a questionnaire to this committee, I don't know, three months ago, maybe something like that, which was asking us to, again, sort of refine our thinking about what our, how we were going to spend this final allotment of money. So, let

me go back and look at that questionnaire. That could actually be something, Legislator Sperry, that three simple questions, you know, that, that's the thing that everybody, you know, from, from the entire, from both caucuses fill out when we're at session. Ambers, that's something that you can help me find? That that questionnaire that we sent out to the committee. That'd be great. I think that that would be the way to go with that. So good. I think this is a really good and necessary conversation right now. I want to ask, is there anybody from the Executive team who wants to chime in on this? And are you feeling, are you feeling the love with this? Are you with us?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, we're good. I think, you know, I think there's some interesting concepts floating around and I'm, I'm kind of still stuck on making sure that we are, whether it's ARPA or otherwise, we're in the housing game for the long-term. I can tell you that I, you know, Economic Development, Employment and Training is all part of my portfolio, so is Tourism. And the biggest hurdle to us right now for developing a workforce and getting larger employment sectors here is housing. You can't build an economy without adequate housing stock at all levels. So, there's the workforce, there's the affordable there's, there's the all-levels approach here. So, I had a meeting today with a group that is looking to bring hundreds of employees on, and this is not I-Park, this is others. And where are they going to pull 400 people from, you know, if there's not adequate housing? So, I feel like, and I've had this discussion with others that maybe there is a competitive program that we can set up for more housing, to open it up to the rest of the county, for applications, something along the lines of what we've done in other arenas with non for profit, small business, those areas. I don't know, it just feels like that's still one of our biggest hurdles to climb. I have a meeting with Homes and Community Renewal, one of their key people on Friday, just to get a sense of what makes a competitive applications, whether it's LIHTC, the Low Income Housing Tax Credit stuff, or other programs that really make these projects move from a developer standpoint, I just really think that we have to think beyond like, oh, ARP is done, but we still need 10,000 more units in order to house people adequately and safely. And, you know, it's, it seems still like the right thing to do to continue to invest in. So as long as that's part of the conversation, we're certainly good.

Chairman Criswell: That's great. And also, Tim, you know, I want to just nod to the 2040 plan. And, you know, that's our long-term vision for the county. So, are there things that we could be investing in, that are supporting the 2040 vision from your perspective? That would be great to hear.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Yeah, well, I mean, I'll just say that many of the things that you're already evaluating tie nicely back to the 2040 strategy. So, I think, you know, food and agriculture, clearly. I know there's talk about film and television workforce development. But I would stress what Deputy Executive Kelly just said, that housing, which was also mentioned, as an important kind of input to our Economic Development works, is essential. It's, it's hard to stress, how essential and we all know, we all know it. And we also know that it takes years to build the pipeline of those kinds of projects. And I think, I expect that Chairwoman Bartels will be sending an email to invite you, we're gonna have a workforce conversation with a bunch of folks and I think it'll focus a lot around the housing challenges. And, you know, I look forward to continue to engage the Legislature on that, I think it's, it's the,

the issue of the of the decade, and we would be remiss if we didn't do our best to try to address it with these, these funds, which, you know, I think are appropriate to use for that kind of work.

Chairman Criswell: That's great. Well, I guess I would just ask you to look at the 2040 goals again, and see if there's something that, you know, all of a sudden pops up as a, oh, this could be a potential, you know, ARPA, ARPA funded something that that helps us move, move along.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: Sure. Happy to. Thank you. Sure.

Chairman Criswell: And the other thing I want to make sure is, you know, I'll just say it gently, but I just want to make sure that there's also no surprises like, oh, we had this in our back pocket for eight months, and now we're gonna present it to you. So, please don't do that. That would not be fun. So, just want to make sure we're all on the same page about, you know, what we're talking, about potential funding, so. Chairwoman Bartels?

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. Um, yeah, I mean, two things. One, I forgot. You know, one of the other projects that we didn't, we haven't discussed or funded, is, I think it was once called Community, Smart Communities? Community Smart? What it was, it was through, SMART Communities. It was basically a proposal through Planning to assist towns with zoning. And what I liked about the proposal when I heard about it in detail, was that, you know, it was really going to strengthen the relationship between the County in terms of Planning and the communities, and communities are, I mean, varying degrees, but are facing some pretty incredible development pressure, not related to affordable housing or related to, you know, I mean, I'm speaking about my community, related to some pretty massive subdivisions, right? That, that don't even include affordable housing. So, how do we have those conversations with Communities because the Deputy Kelly's point, like, I just don't like a competitive grant for you know, affordable housing. We just don't, we don't have the money. You know what I mean? Like, we like to be to be a real player. In that we're such a peanuts part. So, I think we have to think about another way to, another way to get engaged with communities on the ground of zoning. And that, I know is something that Planner Doyle brought up, and its sort of fallen behind and it was, as I recall, a pretty minimal expense, because it had to do with an additional planner, more than anything else. And, and programming, it wasn't so much about funding anything. It was about creating, you know, creating more dialogue. So, there's that.

But the other thing I just wanted to bring back up, like, I totally agree on the housing issue. And I know, I know, I'm preaching to the choir here, but I feel like it needs to be said again, about ag because I'm just really concerned, like, we all know that, how housing is priority number one that, you know, in every sector, you know, we're lacking, and particularly in affordable and workforce housing, and how do you build the other sectors without having a place for people to live? But AG is facing a very different kind of pressure, and it is our very identity, right? It's like, Tim can talk about the impact of ag on our local economic development. It's long been agriculture and tourism, and sometimes it's agritourism, you know? So, agriculture is such a huge part of Ulster County's identity. And new farmers can't get property to farm on. Existing farmers are facing crazy offers on their properties for development against crazy long work hours for their, for their work. So, I mean, it's just like we, if we don't, if we don't get the agriculture community to the table and talk to them, and that's why I'm so responsive to what Legislator

Nolan brought up last time, and talk to them about what we they need and what we can help. And this is beyond, this is beyond ARPA, this is us as the Legislature. I just worry that we're going to miss the moment. And then we're going to all, I live in Gardner, which is defined by agriculture, and I'm going to wonder where all the apple orchards went. And I'm going to talk to my grandkids about how that used to be a bunch of apple trees, and now the 700 homes you see there. And it's, it, there's a way where we can make ourselves a part of this conversation and can invest and can assist and can just allow people to be heard. I think that that made, that that, I do think we have to think about it across all sectors, but even in this final money, which is why I'm saying we need to, like, I'm, I'm willing to think about that number being much higher. So, I'm just making a passionate pitch.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Legislator Sperry, do, something you want to say?

Legislator Sperry: Well, also, piggybacking on that, not to mention the fact that you know, there is the, like the West Coast is either on fire or flooding. And you know, the Hudson Valley is most likely going to be the breadbasket, you know, within the next few years. So, we don't want to be reactionary, we want to be proactive, right? So that we can set our residents up for success and being able to grow for us and grow for the rest of, you know, as many people as we can. So, you know, there's a lot of farmers, young farmers coming to this area to learn the trade that are sleeping in tents on, you know, their foreign property. I don't really know what the answer is. But, you know, even if we were to start building new housing, I mean, for it to come online, it's like three years out at least. Right? Between materials and supply chain and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. So, you know, we have to really approach this with a multi-pronged approach and figuring out like, how we can do this on a lot of different levels, as it intersects with different categories of, you know, industry and need. But I agree, it's, it's like terror level red right now. So.

Chairman Criswell: Absolutely, absolutely. I'm aware of the time. It's 7:15. So, I want to respect people's time. This has been a terrific conversation. And I think that we're going to walk away from this with some really good actions, especially, I love the idea of pulling the entire Legislature on site. That's a great idea. So, thank you for that Legislator Sperry. Any other final wrap up thoughts as we kind of move on to the next? Clerk Feaster, do we have to do any other business? We didn't have any other business? Okay, just double checking. Make sure we're good there. So, if I don't see any other hands, I want to just say thank you because I think this was really a good robust conversation and we're going to come up with a different word other than pause. We're going to call it something else. We'll figure out what that is. Tracey, you and I will figure out a good word for that.

Legislator Sperry: I think she means that the ARPA committee is going on sabbatical. And we've earmarked the money for us to all go to like a beach or an island somewhere.

Chairman Criswell: And I love that you're joking because we're being recorded right now.

Legislator Sperry: Ha. Ha. J.K. Taxpayers.

Chairman Criswell: Legislator Corcoran, did you have something you wanted to say? Okay, I saw you. You jumped on. Yes, Chairwoman Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, I just, I want to echo your thanks, as well. And just tell, tell you, all the members of the committee, and also those who participate regularly from the Executive team, the Comptroller's office, just said, I, I appreciate you all as well too. Like this committee makes me emotional, because, you know, I think we're doing really great work and everybody's commitment is so fierce, and we can have real respectful conversations and disagreements and come out the other side. So, thank you.

Chairman Criswell: And nobody leaves bloody which is the whole goal. So, that's a good thing. So, all right. Well, thank you everybody. Have a great night tonight. Clerk Feaster and I will come up with some notes from this meeting and we'll share them as appropriate. And again, if you have any other thoughts that percolate between now and our next meeting, just send them to myself and Clerk Feaster and we'll get them back to you. So, thank you for your thoughtfulness. And we will see you later.

Legislator Levine: Mr. Chair, we need a motion.

Chairman Criswell: Could I have a motion to adjourn this meeting?

Legislative Chair Bartels: So moved.

Chairman Criswell: And a second. Thank you, Legislator Corcoran. And all in favor.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Criswell: Thank you. Have a great night. Take care.

Time: 7:18 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster
Minutes Approved: August 31, 2022