

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

**DATE & TIME:** August 31, 2022 – 5:00  
**LOCATION:** Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,  
Meeting ID: 826 5113 2743  
**PRESIDING OFFICER:** Peter Criswell, Chairman  
**LEGISLATIVE STAFF:** Amber Feaster  
**PRESENT:** Legislators Thomas Corcoran, Jr, Aaron J. Levine, and Craig  
V. Lopez  
**ABSENT:** Legislator Megan Sperry  
**QUORUM PRESENT:** Yes  
**OTHER ATTENDEES:** Legislators Manna Jo Greene, and Kathy Nolan; Deputy  
County Executive Marc Rider; Director of Economic  
Development Tim Weidemann; ARP Administration Ashlee  
Long, and Molly Scott; Deputy Director of Planning  
Amanda LaValle; Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco;  
Ulster County Soil & Water Conservation District Jake  
Wedemeyer; Travis Ferry

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

---

**Motion No. 1: To approve the Minutes and Transcripts of the July 13th Regular Meeting, the July 27th Regular Meeting, and the August 10th Regular Meeting**

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Corcoran  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Lopez  
**Discussion:** None  
**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Criswell, Corcoran, Levine, Lopez  
**Voting Against:** None  
**No. of Votes in Favor:** 4  
**No. of Votes Against:** 0

---

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

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution funds the ARPA Food Security and Access project 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 Corcoran

**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Lopez

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

**Voting Against:** None

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 4

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 3: To amend Resolution No. 340 – Funding ARPA Food Security And Access - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience**

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution funds the ARPA Food Security and Access project 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~~ **update the UC Emergency Feeding Plan with UlsterCorps** 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 Corcoran

**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Lopez

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

**Voting Against:** None

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 4

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Disposition:** Approved

**Motion No. 4: To approve Resolution No. 340, as Amended – Funding ARPA Food Security And Access - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience**

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution funds the ARPA Food Security and Access project in the amount of \$350,000 for the purpose of convening an Emergency Food Working Group to update the UC Emergency Feeding Plan with UlsterCorps as the partner to convene this effort by engaging the Emergency Food Network, local agricultural producers, and others in the planning and coordination process.

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Corcoran

**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Criswell

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

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Disposition:** Approved

---

**Motion No. 5: To discuss Resolution No. 400** – Amending The 2022 Budget To Establish And Fund The Ulster County Agricultural Crisis Relief Program - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution establishes and funds the Ulster County Agricultural Crisis Relief Program in the amount of \$2,000,000.00, to be funded by American Rescue Plan Act funding.

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

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

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Disposition:** No Action Taken

---

**Motion No. 6: To discuss Resolution No. 435** – Dedicating Funding To Implement The Boost For Main Streets Program – ARPA - Economic Recovery – Department Of Economic Development

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution approves funding in the amount of \$2,000,000.00 for the Boost For Main Streets Program for capital investments, such as rehabilitation of commercial properties, storefront improvements, and façade improvements for Main Streets within Ulster County.

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

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

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 4  
**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 7: To approve Resolution No. 435** – Dedicating Funding To Implement The Boost For Main Streets Program – ARPA - Economic Recovery – Department Of Economic Development

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution approves funding in the amount of \$2,000,000.00 for the Boost For Main Streets Program for capital investments, such as rehabilitation of commercial properties, storefront improvements, and façade improvements for Main Streets within Ulster County.

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

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

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Disposition:** Approved

---

**Motion No. 8: To discuss Resolution No. 436** – Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$2,000,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Ulster County Economic Development Alliance – Department Of Finance

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with the Ulster County Economic Development Alliance in the amount of \$2,000,000.00 for the purpose of administering the Main Streets Program – ARPA.

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

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

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 9: To approve Resolution No. 436** – Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$2,000,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Ulster County Economic Development Alliance – Department Of Finance

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with the Ulster County Economic Development Alliance in the amount of \$2,000,000.00 for the purpose of administering the Main Streets Program – ARPA.

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Corcoran

**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Lopez

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

**Voting Against:** None

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 4

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Disposition:** Approved

---

**New Business:** ARPA Contingency – See attached transcript.

---

**Old Business:** ARPA Project Tracker – See attached transcript.

ARPA Homeowner Energy Improvements and Job Training Project – See attached transcript.

---

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

### **Adjournment**

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Corcoran

**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Lopez

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 4

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Time:** 6:10 PM

**Respectfully submitted:** Amber Feaster

**Minutes Approved:** October 12, 2022

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

**DATE & TIME:** August 31, 2022 – 5:00  
**LOCATION:** Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,  
Meeting ID: 826 5113 2743  
**PRESIDING OFFICER:** Peter Criswell, Chairman  
**LEGISLATIVE STAFF:** Amber Feaster  
**PRESENT:** Legislators Thomas Corcoran, Jr, Aaron J. Levine, and Craig  
V. Lopez  
**ABSENT:** Legislator Megan Sperry  
**QUORUM PRESENT:** Yes  
**OTHER ATTENDEES:** Legislators Manna Jo Greene, and Kathy Nolan; Deputy  
County Executive Marc Rider; Director of Economic  
Development Tim Weidemann; ARP Administration Ashlee  
Long, and Molly Scott; Deputy Director of Planning  
Amanda LaValle; Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco;  
Ulster County Soil & Water Conservation District Jake  
Wedemeyer; Travis Ferry

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

**Chair Criswell:** It's the August 31, 2022 meeting of the American Rescue Plan Act Special Committee, and I'm going to call the meeting to order. So, could you call role, please Amber?

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Criswell.

**Chair Criswell:** Here

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Corcoran.

**Legislator Corcoran:** Here.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Levine.

**Legislator Levine:** Here.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Lopez.

**Legislator Lopez:** Here.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Sperry is absent. So, four present, one absent.

**Chairman Criswell:** Thank you. Thank you very much. So, I'd like to ask if at all, everybody in the Committee has checked out the minutes? We have minutes for the July 13<sup>th</sup> meeting and the July 27<sup>th</sup> meeting, and the August 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. We're going to be approving all those tonight. So, if I could get a motion to approve.

**Legislator Corcoran:** Motion to approve.

**Legislator Lopez:** Second.

**Chairman Criswell:** And a second, please. Great. All in favor.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairman Criswell:** Any opposed? Great. Alright, let's move on to resolutions. So, can I have a motion for discussion to discuss Resolution 340, which is the ARPA Food Security and Access resolution?

**Legislator Corcoran:** Motion.

**Legislator Lopez:** Second.

**Chairman Criswell:** And the second. Perfect. All in favor.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great, let's discuss. So, let me just give you a little background on where this is at. So, this was postponed in Health. We scored it previously, the committee did. But with these amendments that are coming in, it's going to be a very different project or it's going to have a very different look. So, we heard about it last time, but what I'm going to suggest is that we rescore it with what we hear tonight, because it just is quite different than what it was. We've never rescored any, anything before, but I think that this has enough dramatic changes in it that we should rescore it and look at it, kind of with fresh eyes. Amanda is going to talk us through the proposed amendments. So, I'm going to pull it up and Amanda, is it okay if we just kind of do the, the changes one by one and talk them through?

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** Sure, that's fine. That works.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great. That sounds good. So, if we have 340 in front of us, some of them are pretty straightforward, but some of them I think will need further explanation. So, the first whereas basically just substitutes Cornell Cooperative Extension with UlsterCorps. And can you just remind everyone, Amanda, why that is happening?

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** Absolutely. There was feedback from the committee that, that there, there was a desire to fund more direct to support of, of Emergency Feeding Organizations. And in the original proposal, there had been kind of a split between doing some

kind of high-level food policy planning activities led by Cornell Cooperative Extension, and then also work with food pantries and UlsterCorps. So, with that feedback from the committee, we kind of reoriented this project to really focus on supporting the Emergency Food Service providers and, and the outreach. And so, we, we shifted that kind of organizational support element to UlsterCorps and so that's how come it's shifted from, from CCE to UlsterCorps.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great, thank you and committee members. I'm going to encourage you as we go through these changes, if you have any questions, just shout them out, and we'll get it straightened out. So, the next one is a change that says instead of “complete a Food System Resilience Report”, it is to “update the UC Emergency Feeding Plan”. And so that, tell me if I'm right here, Amanda, but what we were doing is we were, we were poised to actually create a report, a new report. Rather than doing that, we're going back and looking at an existing report, slash plan and we're going to update that. Is that correct?

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** I think that's, that's totally correct. So, there was this initial vision of using Cornell Cooperative Extension to do more higher-level planning and kind of around food systems. And so, we've pivoted to taking a draft report from, I think 2019, that was developed around pre-pandemic, and using all those folks who had worked together on that report, reconvening them, and they would be part of this group that would be organized and supported by UlsterCorps, the Emergency Food Working group. So those are the key players, that'll be in the room, there'll be, we'll be talking to them and we'll use them to update this Emergency Feeding Plan. That plan can then be used to update the County's Comprehensive Emergency Plan, the CEMP. And also, it will have, by doing it that way, we'll have really good connections with the Emergency Management Department, for the county, so that that, that information will be taken into kind of the formal emergency response channels for the county.

**Chairman Criswell:** That's great. Can you just tell us who some of those players were who went in to creating this?

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** Absolutely. So, UlsterCorps, Community Action, Red Cross, the Southern Baptists, who organize a very large mass feeding operation with a trailer, as well as other nonprofits and smaller organizations. So, a lot of the big players in the, in the county and then other smaller ones as well.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great. I'm really happy to hear that UlsterCorps was part of it, because one of the concerns I had was that you're going to be basically giving a plan that other people created to an organization, but hearing that now, they're, they've been a part of it from the beginning, understand that they can hit the ground running with it, so that that alleviates one of my concerns. Thank you. Alright, the next whereas it's changed is just simply UlsterCorps, from, from Cornell Cooperative to UlsterCorps, and we've crossed out suppliers, can you just tell me why we've crossed out suppliers there?

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** Absolutely. Again, because the focus is pivoting from higher-level food systems planning to more focusing on the Emergency Feeding System. The thought was you wouldn't be convening the suppliers as part of that, that Emergency Food working group. You, you could have local agricultural producers and the fact that they are



participating in Farm to Food Pantry, though the effort that UlsterCorps leads. However, you, you likely would not really be engaging suppliers in that forum.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay, great. Thank you. Um, the next whereas has an addition to it, not the next one, but the one following. It's the intent to use \$75,000 and it's through a subrecipient contract with UlsterCorps. So, can you just tell us what this \$75,000 is going to go for? What's the timeframe from usage of that money? Some things like that.

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** Yes, so that \$75,000 is over three years. And that's support to UlsterCorps for convening meetings, regular meetings, probably every other month, at least, possible sub-working group meetings, and also an Annual Food Summit. And so that money would go to for UlsterCorps to be able to provide that level of staffing to the group.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great, so it's really 25, 25 grand a year here, right? So, that seem to me, seems extremely reasonable. So, alright, um, the next one. So, this number changed, correct? This was increased from what it was?

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** So, the total dollar value of the project is the same. \$350,000. But again, responding to the feedback of the committee where the intent is to really provide that support to the organizations who are on the ground providing food and services to people in need. By not also trying to focus on the high level food policy planning, we were able to increase the amount of money that would go towards those food service agencies. So, that's where the \$275,000 comes from. So, that would be money that could be used to those organizations to directly benefit them. However, we do see that there will be a, a process with the, the Emergency Feeding Group to look at a needs assessment and do some prioritization across the county to see what the what the most critical needs are for the entire system and not just for one organization. So then with that information, we'll be able to come up with kind of a scoring rubric for applications, then have the, the individual organizations apply for their projects, or maybe apply together for certain projects, or agree that other projects benefit many of them, and then be able to fund that.

**Chairman Criswell:** That's great. I remember, I think there was a moment we talked about Community Foundations in the Hudson Valley,

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** Yes, yes.

**Chairman Criswell:** ... being the grantor. I guess that's still in the works?

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** Yes, absolutely. They've been very receptive to, to this partnership. You know, they're very committed. They have an existing program called Farm Fresh Food, in which they do something very similar. It's a grants program. They do a call for applications, they score those applications, and then they fund those projects. And they've been very receptive to working with us on something similar here for a small administrative percentage, but very reasonable.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay. And I'm just going to ask the obvious question, this is over a three-year period as well, the granting?

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** Yes. Yes. Yep. But again, you know, the hope is here, that by setting up the structure with these partner organizations, especially with Community Foundations, it gives us the opportunity to do, you know, other, look for other funding and other sources, you know, we'll have the structure there. And then if there's additional grant money that comes along, or if there's a donation from a foundation or something like that, the structure is there. So, that's what I think will really serve us in the long run.

**Chairman Criswell:** That's excellent. Great. And then this last one, this was the one that was a little bit of a mystery for me. I just actually don't know the history of Resolution 118 of April 2010. And why are we talking about the environmental considerations in this? If this doesn't seem?

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** Yes.

**Chairman Criswell:** Just explain it to me because I don't get the connection.

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** It's, you know, pro forma, I guess you could call it that anytime you are funding an action, you should be providing some kind of reference to SEQR, whether or not it applies. And in this case, you know, the state has a type II list, the County adopted our own type II lists back in 2010. And so, we are referencing this action under that existing type II list. But again, it's pro forma as far as SEQR goes.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great. I had a feeling it was that, but I just wanted to hear from you. So, Committee members, anybody have any questions on any of those amendments to this resolution? Okay, seeing no questions, I'm going to ask that we take a vote to approve the amendments as presented.

**Legislator Corcoran:** I'll make a motion.

**Chairman Criswell:** Can we do that right now, Amber? Is that fine? Okay. Do I have a second?

**Legislator Lopez:** I'll second it.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay, great. All in favor of the amendments as proposed.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairman Criswell:** Any opposed? Alright. Seeing none, the amendments pass. And what I'd like to suggest that we do since I think this is pretty far along. So, let me ask the Committee here. Does anybody feel like at this point, we need to rescure this having now heard the presentation that was done last time and the thorough explanation of these amendments? Does everybody feel like they have a clearer understanding of this project? Where it's gonna go? who the players are? Yeah.

**Legislator Corcoran:** Yeah. I was in favor of it.

**Chairman Criswell:** Questions on it? In favor.

**Legislator Corcoran:** I'm good. I thought the amendments were good adjustments to it. It was good to see the money go to where the food needs are and more and not planning. So, yeah.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great. Craig or Aaron, do you have any further questions that would need this to actually go back to the scoring process? Or?

**Legislator Lopez:** I don't think so.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay.

**Legislator Lopez:** I'm satisfied. I'm satisfied with it.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay. Hearing, hearing no further questions, I'm gonna actually then call this one to a vote.

**Legislator Levine:** I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I lost you for a sec there. I don't have any questions.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay, great. So, I'm just gonna call this to vote. So, all in favor of Resolution 340, as amended, say aye.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairman Criswell:** Any opposed? Okay, seeing no opposition that resolution passes. Congratulations, Amanda. I think this is going to be a great project. Good luck with it. I look forward to working with you further on as it moves forward.

**Deputy Director of Planning LaValle:** Thank you. I'm excited about it. And I think it will do a lot of good. So.

**Chairman Criswell:** Excellent. Thank you.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Legislator Levine, would you like to turn your video on for your vote to be recorded?

**Chairman Criswell:** Yes. Aye.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Okay. Perfect. Thank you so much.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great. Thank you. Alright. Um, yeah, again, I feel, feel good that we're spending this money in this way. So, I think that's \$350 well spent. And that's going to have

some really good, long-lasting repercussions for our county. So that's good. Alright. Let's move on to resolution 400. If I could get a motion for discussion for 400.

**Legislator Corcoran:** Motion.

**Chairman Criswell:** Thank you a second, please.

**Legislator Lopez:** Second.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great. All in favor.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairman Criswell:** Alright. So, thank you. Let me give you a little history of this one. So, this one was postponed in Economic Development. We already scored this. And the total score ended up being a 69%, which is a fairly high score for this. The Goals and Mission, it got a 73%. Equity Distribution, it got 71%. Community Impact, 74%. And Financial Management, 46%. So, that was the, question area for this has always been around the management side of it. How's this going to work out? So, I've had discussions now with Legislator Nolan. I've also spoken with Chair Bartels, so I'm going to propose something tonight, which, do we have to? I don't know if we'll have to make an official amendment to the resolution, Amber, with a position discussion. But let me let me talk about what we're, what we're thinking about. So, we had sort of been in a stuck place of is this position going to be a contracted position that would then report to the ARPA team? Or would this be a position that is actually a County position that then goes through a department? And we were trying to figure out what home this would have, which department. And so, we're trying to come to some sort of compromise to kind of move this forward. So, what I thought about today was having this be a one-year contracted position, and then have it be a salaried position with the County. So, during that one year, it could have the opportunity to sort of find its way in a way, you know, find out what's working, figure out what department it really should live in. And so, so the proposal is contracted for one year, and also our budget season is upon us and so, I think to alleviate this happening, sort of get shoved into the budget right now, if we have this as a contracted position, it would be much easier to plan for the following budget to figure out where it's going to be going. So, we talked about living in Economic Development. We talked about living in Environment. And I think what, what we're talking about now is that it sit in Planning for right now with consultation from Economic Development and from Environment. And so that's the general direction of what, what the thinking is right now. But I'd love to get feedback from committee members as well as folks from the Executive team here. What your thoughts are on that proposal? Committee members.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** Legislator Levine has his hand up.

**Chairman Criswell:** Yes. Legislator Levine, please.

**Legislator Levine:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Um, yeah, in regards to the, you know, the question of where we think position would best be, you know, siloed, I would say, well, with our, with our County Legislative Committees, you know, obviously, I know, Economic

Development kind of has ag under its umbrella. I know, obviously, the county departments don't necessarily exactly follow, how we how we discuss things in the Legislative Committees, but it would kind of make sense to me, if Ag is under the Economic Development Committee for the time being, that that it might be most appropriate to, to put it with Economic Development with, you know, with consultation with other departments as well, unless anybody else has any, you know, I'm very interested to hear what other committee members or the Executive's office might, you know, what their ideas are. But that was just my thinking.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great, thank you. Yeah, I'd love to hear from Tim or Marc. Do either of you have opinions. And Craig, I'd also like to hear your thoughts, and Tom.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** I think Craig had his hand up before I do, but I do, we're using the hand-raise, so I don't know if you can see it on the computer.

**Chairman Criswell:** Yes, I can see. Yeah, please. Thank you, Deputy Executive Rider.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** So, my only concern about the new proposal is that I feel like it might be difficult to hire a contract agency for one year, and then bring on somebody on board to be a county employee. That may not be the same person, and we may lose a year of work. I think if we're going to have it live as a county employee eventually, my suggestion would be to have it start as a county employee, and then move forward. But I think I'm open to other ideas. I just like to hear a little bit more on why it's starting as a contract agency. I think it's a great. I think it's a great program that, you know, I hope everybody gets behind. I just would like to hear why we're starting one way and then switching.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay. Legislator Nolan, do you want to speak to that question, or I can speak to that question? Yep, you're on mute right now.

**Legislator Nolan:** Thank you. Yeah. I didn't know if you wanted to get Legislator Lopez's question out, as well.

**Chairman Criswell:** I saw, I saw the thumbs up. I didn't see a hand raised. But legislator Lopez did you want to ask a question?

**Legislator Lopez:** Yeah, yeah, well, Marc made my point. So yeah, that was also something that I was concerned about, you know, contracting for just one year. But otherwise, you know, I don't think it's a bad compromise, except for that. Yeah, that, that caveat that, I don't know if somebody will be willing just for one year.

**Legislator Nolan:** So, it, reasonable points. It is a compromise. And it may not move us as far forward if, as deciding one way or the other. I think there is support for having a position at the county. But I'm a little reluctant to have to wait until we go completely through the budget process. To determine that we're going to do that, and then start looking for somebody. So, I was looking for a way that would move the program forward more quickly. If we move forward, but then lurch backwards, that's, may not be worth it. But I did think that there might be consulting organizations that would come in and help us put the project together help us decide where we

want this person, what that job responsibilities would be. And so, it could potentially give us somebody working on this, other than me, sooner, somebody with skill and experience working on it, and therefore be something to be handed off to the budgeting process and the hiring process where we would know more concretely what we're looking for.

**Chairman Criswell:** Thank you. I think also, some of the points that I heard were, that this could eventually be a position that's a little different from what we're talking about right now and more of sort of an overall ag position. And so, in some ways, I think, having a year of sort of, on the ground, working it through, talking with different organizations, trying to really figure out what's needed. That could actually be, I think have a, a good timeframe to support figuring out what this larger position would be, what would the duties be, where would it live, that type of thing. So that's a possibility. Tim, did you want to chime in on this?

**Director of Economic Development Weidemann:** Yeah, I just wanted to echo what Legislator Nolan was saying. I think, you know, as I understood the resolution as it first came forward, and then, you know, more recently in conversation with Legislator Nolan, I think that concept of a year to have, you know, a contract position to help us design what this becomes in the long term. And, you know, I think in the meantime, we have the capacity in those three departments that have been mentioned in association with this, Planning, Environment, Economic Development, ag really does cross all three of those. And so, I think, I can't speak for the other department heads there, but I know that our department would be happy to support that planning and kind of initial effort under contract position, and then happy to return to this process in next year's budget to figure out what the permanent solution is. That sounds wise to me, because, you know, our agricultural community is important. It's also complicated. And the needs are not fully known, I think at this point, and I think that conversation will be really productive.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great, thank you. Other thoughts? Anybody else on the call? Yeah, Marc.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** I think, you know, Legislator Nolan answered my questions and concerns pretty well. I think it does make sense to have somebody help build out the program. That's not what I was understanding in the kind of original, how it was laid out. I thought we were gonna start it as a contract agency for a year, half the program, then turn into an employee. If that was the case, I think we would lose a year. If we're having somebody build out a program who is an expert, like, I'm assuming it would be RFP, but like a Cornell or somebody else, then I think that does make sense to do the contract agency, and then, you know, turn it over to permanent employees. So, thanks for that explanation.

**Chairman Criswell:** Got it. Um, I think we need to, we haven't seen any resolution amendment language on this. So, I think that's where our next step has to be. Because I do feel like this should be spelled out in the resolution itself. Is that correct, Amber? Would you agree with that, that this new change that we're talking about should be spelled out in this?

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Well, right now, that's up to you guys, or up to Legislator Nolan as the sponsor of the resolution. And the, right now the resolution reads as coming from the Finance department, the ARPA division, so that would absolutely want to be changed to the Department of oversight that you intend for it to be.

**Chairman Criswell:** I feel like this is an important enough change that I would like this actually spelled out in the resolution itself. Legislator Nolan, would you have any opposition to that?

**Legislator Nolan:** Muted again. No, I think that's fine. I was just going to try to pull it up and look and see where that would go. Certainly, the change so that it reflects that the Planning department would be the oversight makes sense and I just would like to be clear about what changes would make it suit. But I'm happy to make those. I think the, we tried to keep the original language fairly broad, because it is a new program, a new position. So, I think there's room in it to cover most of this.

**Chairman Criswell:** It has, it has big budgetary implications. So, I think getting the budgetary implications clear. And that resolution would make sense. And then I agree with you, the broader strokes, I think, will need to be worked out when something gets brought in and sorted out. And I also wanted to remind the committee that, you know, so this was scored, and the scores are actually sent already to the other committees. So, so what we can do, what I'd like to suggest we do tonight then is take action on, give Legislator Nolan a chance to actually revise the resolution, then we'll come back at this at the next meeting. We will approve any amendments to it, and then we'll vote on it. Does that sound reasonable?

**Legislator Nolan:** And I assume this committee would have no objections if I'm able to get those revisions drafted, if we send those to the committees that will be reviewing, who have the opportunity to look at this resolution in the first week of September. So, that would mean they might approve language that you would be seeing at your next committee meeting you haven't seen yet, but that would be based on what we discussed here.

**Chairman Criswell:** So, would they be able to technically, they would not be able to approve those amendments, would they? Or would we, would we have to approve the amendments?

**Legislator Nolan:** I think you all do. All of the committees. So, I just wanted to go ahead and get those ones in the bag if I can, and then come back.

**Chairman Criswell:** We're not offended. Committee members. How do you feel about that? Do you feel right about the language going to other committees before we see it and approve it?

**Legislator Corcoran:** I don't have a problem with that. I mean, if they could take a look at it and again to keep, keep this thing moving forward and not delay it any more. I don't have a problem with them looking at it first. I'm okay with that.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay.

**Legislator Levine:** Mr. Chairman, yeah, I don't have a problem with it if the, if the other, you know, if it has to go through all the other committees, you know, of jurisdiction as well as us, I don't see why, you know, in the interest of time, them taking a first crack at it, and then we have to approve it anyway. I don't think it really matters who takes the first crack, so no objection on my end.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great. Legislator Lopez, any on your end?

**Legislator Lopez:** Yeah, no, that works for me.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay, great. So that's what we'll do. So, no action tonight. We'll work together Legislator Nolan to get those, those amendments sorted. And we'll get them in front of other committees, get them back to our committee, and we'll get this voted on next time. So excellent. Thank you so much. Appreciate that. Thank you. All right. Um, can I have a motion to discuss resolution 435, which is the Booths for Main Streets Program?

**Legislator Corcoran:** Motion.

**Chairman Criswell:** Thank you. And a second, please.

**Legislator Lopez:** Second.

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

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairman Criswell:** Alright. I live near the train station so your gonna hear that, hear the choo choo going by. Let's see. So, this was out. This went out for scoring, not as a resolution itself, but it went for scoring as the concepts with the backup. And it got a total of 66% with Goal and Mission at 67%, Equity Distribution at 69%, Community Impact at 70%, and Financial, Financial Management at 49%. So again, total, grand total there of 66%. And I think it was Legislator Lopez, you, you wanted to see the resolution before you did the scoring. Is that correct? And you, you had the chance to do that?

**Legislator Lopez:** I did.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great. So, you're satisfied there. Alright, so Tim, do you want to add anything to the mix here in terms of the crafting of the resolution? You feel happy with it? Or is there anything that you need from us to further discussion for this?

**Director of Economic Development Weidemann:** No, I don't think so. I wasn't unfortunately able to attend when you did the scoring but did get the scoring sheet from Amber. Thank you, Amber. So, happy to answer any further questions. I feel like the resolution language, both this and the next resolution, which is a contract resolution affecting the contract that would be in place with UCEDA to implement this program. I think it speaks for itself but I'm happy to take feedback and questions.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay, committee members, this is our this is our moment to ask the, ask the hard questions if we have them. Any concerns about the program itself? Or the way that it's going to be managed? Are we satisfied with the, with the potential number of grants that would be available? I don't want to call them grants. Monetary support. What, however you want to



call it. Are we satisfied with that? Are we satisfied with whatever this process is going to be where people are given this fund? Tim, do you want to talk a little bit more to the, we talked a lot in the Economic Devel-, economic support for small businesses about not having first in, first out. Do you want to talk a little bit about that and tell us a little bit more about how you're going to analyze who's going to get those funds?

**Director of Economic Development Weidemann:** Yeah, maybe I'll talk on three things: the application and evaluation process; the geographic dispersion and diversity that I know is an item of concern that came up in the scoring; and then I also just want to talk about the mechanics of how we're thinking of doing this just to give you an insight into kind of the, the actual implementation and delivery of the program. So first, you know, we heard loud and clear when we were having the discussion about CARES II, that the process we used for CARES I, which was really dictated by the CARES funding that the state had and the state's eligibility and program requirements, which was more first in first out award program / crisis situation in the early parts of the pandemic. With CARES II and with this program, we will have an open solicitation for applications and solicit those from any eligible project, which is, it's outlined in the contract and the resolution language, could be individual businesses in these downtown districts. It could be associations of businesses representing a kind of commercial core area, could be even communities themselves that want to do, for instance, commercial facade improvement program, something along those lines. We identified an evaluation rubric that was included in the contract that's attached as backup. That really mirrors the evaluation rubric that you all set forth for the ARPA funds, which, you know, became clear as, you know, we were going through this the best way really to ensure that the program outcomes align with the goals of this body for the use of the ARPA funds. So, we'll be keeping an eye on all those measures that you put in your evaluation matrix for ARPA as we go through the evaluation and selection of ultimate awardees. The process, once we have those applications submitted after the application window closes, we will assemble all, have the complete and compliant applications into packets that then will go to a review committee, much like the Not-For-Profit Program and CARES II that will include members of the, appointed by the Executive and members of the Legislature, to review and score the, the applications. And then we will exhaust the funding moving down the list in ranked order of score until we use up the funding. And so, I think that addresses the concerns of the first in, first out. This will be a competitive process, evaluating each application on its merits, with the input of at least two members of the Legislature on the evaluation committee. So, maybe before I move on, I'll just see if there's any other questions about that point before I move on to the next. Legislator Lopez, did you have a question? I saw you on mute. Just wanted to make sure.

**Legislator Lopez:** No, I'm good.

**Director of Economic Development Weidemann:** Okay. And then the second item I wanted to point out is geographic dispersion of awards. You know, I think we are keenly interested and I can speak, I think, in confidence here. I don't think there's any Kingston represent-, Oh, no, Peter, of course, you. Kingston has gotten its fair share of downtown revitalization awards and support, I would suspect that we will, we will have a healthy conversation with the evaluation committee. But there are many downtown commercial cores, maybe smaller cores and even commercial corridors throughout the county that often get overlooked for this type of support. And so, I think

it's, it's fully our intent to solicit applications from those areas. And I would suspect that in the review process, especially using the same rubric that you all have for your evaluation of projects, which has an element in it to encourage countywide impact, I think we will see those communities outside of Kingston score well in that evaluation process. I see Legislator Greene has her hand up.

**Chairman Criswell:** Legislator Greene.

**Legislator Greene:** Thank you, I just want to mention that, you know, there's a lot of emphasis on what I call priority communities, what the state has identified as Disadvantaged Communities, DACs, and there is now a map of the draft DACs. And whereas the original environmental justice maps for New York State, really only highlighted census blocks in the City of Kingston, and I think there might have been kind of in Plattekill, or that part of the county because of a high migrant farm worker population, there were really only, I think, two areas in the county. And now when you look at the Disadvantaged Communities, they are spread throughout the county. And I was really surprised to see that Main Street Rosendale, which is a relatively poor community, was listed. So, I strongly suggest that we become familiar with, and that wasn't all of Rosendale, it was just a specific census block. It's a very refined tool. And I just want to encourage people to become familiar with it. And in terms of the climate act, 35 to 40% of the benefit, or more, but the target is not less than 35 to 40% of the benefit to go to low and moderate income, well, to go to disadvantaged communities. Thank you for hearing me out.

**Chairman Criswell:** Thank you for that input. That's great. Good to know. Thank you.

**Director of Economic Development Weidemann:** Yeah, I appreciate that too Legislator Greene. I will make myself more familiar with the tool because we've always felt that the, the term Disadvantaged Community means everything and nothing often and so having a resource that actually points to a broader set of areas that, that qualify will be helpful. And it is one of the criteria that we will be scoring on so I think having that tool be the basis for making that scoring decision would be a good, good decision, good process.

**Legislator Greene:** And just to be sure, it's, they're still taking input and so it's called draft, but I think it's, you know, very carefully developed.

**Director of Economic Development Weidemann:** Right.

**Chairman Criswell:** Tim, did you have a third point? Or,

**Director of Economic Development Weidemann:** Yeah, just third point, I just want to, you know, we've learned a lot from the CARES I and as we launch into CARES II we're going to take some of those lessons into that, but they also apply here. One of the big challenges often is that, especially nowadays, it's hard for especially businesses and, you know, these business associations that might apply for this funding, often don't have cash in hand to make these expenditures. And we're very sensitive to the reasons why a reimbursement program makes a lot of sense, we don't want to have awards go out to ultimate recipients, and they get the cash, and then they don't comply with the award. And then we have to chase them down for the money.

But we think there's an opportunity here because these are larger awards up to \$250,000, to manage them almost as a forgivable loan. And so, we're going to work with the ARPA finance team to perfect that, make sure we have a process in place. But it may involve, you know, basically awarding these as loans that are forgivable if the conditions of the award are met and that way the cash can go out in advance. And we've had some initial conversations with UCEDA board and will engage our Revolving Loan Fund Committee because one avenue to do that is through our Revolving Loan Fund. And so, I think there's some creative thinking about how we make this money accessible to the awardees, while still protecting the county and, you know, ultimately, our federal taxpayer dollars to ensure that they're used to the best and highest use.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great, thank you. And thank you for your work on it and for making the adjustments that we asked for. I'm going to call this for a vote. All those in favor?

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairman Criswell:** Any opposed? No. See, seeing none, it passes. Congratulations. I think it's a great program. Again, I think a really, really positive use for, for these funds so looking forward to seeing this pass the full Legislature. Alright, that's it for resolutions so we have a little bit of new business. I see on the agenda is Legislator Walter.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** There's another resolution. Resolution 436 for the contract approval for UCEDA to administer the Main Streets Program.

**Chairman Criswell:** I didn't. I didn't see that on my agenda. Sorry about that. So, I don't think we need to discuss this much. We just discussed the whole thing. So, can I have a motion for discussion for 436?

**Legislator Corcoran:** Motion.

**Legislator Levine:** I'm sorry, I just have a quick one. Actually, I do have a quick question now.

**Chairman Criswell:** Certainly, certainly.

**Legislator Levine:** I just, just for,

**Chairman Criswell:** Well, let's, let's move. Let's move it. Let's, let's move it so we can discuss it. So, I've got a motion and I just need a second on that, please.

**Legislator Lopez:** Second.

**Chairman Criswell:** Perfect on favor.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairman Criswell:** Now it's, now it's to you Legislator Levine.

**Legislator Levine:** Yes, thank, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And that's, that's, just a very quick question for Mr. Weidemann in regards to, you know, his beliefs kind of structuring it almost as a loan that could be forgiven. I mean, would this be something that we might be mirroring like the PPP program on the federal level? Would you kind of envision it as something similar to that, in terms of its forgiveness opportunity?

**Director of Economic Development Weidemann:** Yeah, it would be, as far as I'm concerned, similar in the sense that we would draft up a loan agreement, that would be the impetus for making the initial award. It would indicate that if the conditions of the award are met, that that loan converts to a grant. And so, it basically assures that if they meet the conditions, they do not have to repay that loan, if they do not meet the conditions, then our first course of action would be to have a balloon payment due where they would repay the amount that was lent to them and then we'd have other recourse through collateral and, and ultimately a Loan Loss Reserve if something went horribly awry, which I would imagine is structured pretty similarly to the way much on a much smaller scale, but similar to the way that the PPP program was designed.

**Legislator Levine:** I very much appreciate your explanation. Thank you so much.

**Chairman Criswell:** I'm sorry, I didn't mean to rush this. If there's further discussion on this happy to create some space for that. Anybody have any questions about resolution 436? Any other questions about the structure of how this is going to happen? Okay, hearing none, I will call for a vote now. So, all in favor?

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairman Criswell:** Legislator, yeah, perfect, we need to see you. Thank you. Any opposed? Okay, this passes. Thank you. Thank you. Alright now on to new business. So, I see Legislator Walter's Eviction Services. So, Legislator Walter's not here. Is there going to be somebody who speaks to that or we'll just bring that up next, next meeting? Okay, so we'll bring that up next meeting.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** I do have one thing to add on that, and that's that, um, I believe this week Purchasing put out the RFP for the services, for legal services.

**Chairman Criswell:** Ah, okay.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** Just to get an idea of what the cost would be and if there was interest.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** So, doesn't mean you have to award it. Doesn't mean that there's money already set aside. It just means we'll have an idea on whether even there's an interest.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay, good and good to know that it's in motion. So, I was thinking about something, you know, with erratic costs of construction and, you know, increased costs, I was wondering if we might consider actually putting a little of this ARPA money into a contingency fund for projects that go over? I was thinking something like a million dollars because I don't know if, I don't remember seeing in many of the budgets contingencies for, for cost. So, just a thought, but I'd love to get feedback on whether you think that that would be something and I know that we have a time limit with which we have to spend the money. So, there would have to be a moment where we say, Okay, now we need to change this into, into actual spending. So, just a thought, again, love to hear, hear anybody's opinion on whether something like that might be prudent, or whether we should just spend it down on projects. Yeah. Marc, would love to hear your thoughts on that.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** So, typically, are you saying on any, like put in a contingency in case any of the ARPA projects go over? Because we do on our regular Capitals have contingency on each of those. If you're just talking about the ARP, but yeah, I'm not sure that we've put any contingency, but like, I'll give you an example, Elizabeth Manor, I know is going to cost more than what we set aside through ARPA, but we're just gonna bond that. And so, for some of these projects, it is going to, same with the Crisis Stabilization Center and some of these others that are like construction related, we're just going to go out to bond for those costs.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay. Any other committee members have thoughts on this?

**Legislator Corcoran:** Yeah, I think it's, I think it's a good idea. But I don't know if I'd be in favor of it. I think we take what we've got in front of us, and we dish that money out. And potentially there are going to be somethings that we've dished money out to, that's not going to pan out so there will be some money there. But to set something aside, I think with our time limitations, and the requests coming in, again, I think the idea is good but I don't know if I'd be in favor of that. But that's my opinion.

**Chairman Criswell:** Yep, no, that's great. Legislator Lopez, any thoughts on it?

**Legislator Lopez:** No, I, I kind of agree with, with Tommy and I, it's something that I'd have to think about, you know, but I don't know if I'd be in favor of that either. So.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay. Legislator Levine, do you have any thoughts on it?

**Legislator Levine:** Well, yeah, I think it's a, I think it's a really interesting idea. You know, my thought on it is in regards to, you know, we were kind of thinking along, you know, almost a mirror image of this initially, I thought, in terms of some of these projects that we were approving, and the thought was, if they were coming in under budget of what we, what we, you know, allocated to potentially be able to use the, you know, the funds that came in under budget on potentially other projects. So, that was, that, that would have been something that I would be, you know, very interested in taking a second crack at. Something that we didn't initially fund if, if something came in under budget. Now, you know, looking at it this way, if construction costs caused something to go over budget to what we allocate it's, are we thinking about putting it into resolution form? Because I think that that's a question that we should probably, you know, wait. I

would like to hear what Legislator Sperry has to say about it as well. And we could kind of have a discussion on this at a future meeting if it's put into a resolution form, but I would be happy to have the discussion amongst, amongst the entire Committee.

**Chairman Criswell:** That sounds great. Thank you for those thoughts. And yeah, it was just something that popped in my head that I just wanted to throw out in front of the committee. Molly, I'd love to hear your thoughts on it.

**Molly Scott:** My thoughts?

**Chairman Criswell:** Yes.

**Molly Scott:** Um, I vaguely remember talking to Nate about something like this. And he had, he had expressed like, interest in doing something like that, just because, like Marc said, there are projects that are gonna go over, but you know, we're gonna bond them. But it's like. Yeah, I mean, it's just, it's something that like, I think it could be a good idea to have like stuff set aside for projects. But I can understand also, with the time limit that we have with the funds that can be, you know, a little weird, just because we need to spend it by a certain period of time. But if we set aside funds for projects, and then we just plan to maybe do something in the future with whatever's left over, I think that that could be a good idea.

**Chairman Criswell:** That makes sense. Ashlee, any thoughts on this?

**Ashlee Long:** I don't think there will be any issues spending the funding in the amount of time that we have if the committee were to decide to set aside some funding as a contingency. I think that, in my experience with capital projects, and projects in general, costs don't tend to come in under. They tend to come in over, especially with inflation and prices that we're seeing now. So, I think it would be something to consider, something to give a good thought to, because while Marc is saying bonding as a potential, this money is, you know, there and is a good source and that's something that's sometimes hard to come by.

**Chairman Criswell:** Got it. Any, anybody else on the on the call have any thoughts on this? Yeah, Tom.

**Legislator Corcoran:** Again, I think it's a good idea. But I think maybe the idea is to have contingency projects lined up, ready for the money that might be there, instead of setting money aside and waiting for it. So, if the projects are there, and those are the contingencies, if, so we allocate the money given to us and if the money is there, money left, here it is. Because, because when we vote, and we read, and we reevaluate, and it's based on that number. It's the number that they've come for. So, if it goes over, I get it. So, let's bond it. But bottom line is, you're coming for a number, and we're grading it, we're approving it, we're looking at it, we're tweaking it, we're postponing it, we're doing whatever I have to do for it, that number is there. And I believe that number is solid. Let's have a contingency project sitting there waiting to come when something falls through, or there's a little extra money. And then those are the people that are, you know, they're, they're on the waiting list. And that's when, you know, that's what I think. Contingency project more than contingency money.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay, great. Good, good discussion. And you know, we can also pick it up again, next meeting when we have Legislator Sperry with us, and, and Chair, Chairperson Bartels. And I do want to talk to this idea. We have been talking about this over and over again, about if any money shakes out from projects that don't come to fruition, we will go back and we will relook at our priorities, we will find any projects that have been sort of sitting fallow, see if we can revive them. So, I do think that that will actually happen and that will be our, I mean, I'm getting, getting into a little old business right now. But this, our next phase as a committee is really going to be looking at the tracking of the spending and the progress of all the spending that we've approved. So, that's going to be kind of our next phase. And I know that Amber is now working with the ARPA team, on trying to figure out what the right way is to get us that information that's really digestible, so that we're not in crazy micromanage mode of how much did you spend on that screwdriver, but we're really seeing sort of the larger picture of, you know, how is the project moving forward? Does it seem like it's on track? Does it seem like it's wildly off track, you know, those types of things. So, I think that's going to be our, our next year work. Personally, I think we're still going to be in, spending this money down probably until November, maybe December, depending. I mean, we're getting closer now. But I feel like this is going to be, be 2023 work as, as money starts to get spent and we're starting to see things. So, anybody from the ARPA team have any thoughts on that? When I just said. Seem right? Okay, great. Alright. Old business. So, we have the ARPA Homeowner Energy Improvements and Job Training Project. Manna Jo, do you have an update for us on that?

**Legislator Greene:** Yes, I do. Thank you. Dennis Doyle, the Director for Planning doesn't have a resolution ready yet, but we did, we've been in communication with him, with Susan Gillespie of Communities for Local Power. And Susan, and I had a conversation with Chair Bartels. And, um, if the committee will remember, CLP had requested \$30,000, and actually was approved for three years for \$90,000 to administer, essentially, the workforce development and training component. But I was concerned that the, what I call bricks and mortar, the money to actually do the energy retrofits, what has not yet been approved. So, the thought is, especially given that we have another, I don't know whether it's two weeks or a month, but till you meet, till ARPA meets, again, to use that time to actually convene the Green Careers Pathway, which includes many stakeholders. Basically, it would be CLP and its contractors working with RUPCO on projects that are already slated for repairs, and funding has been set aside. But some additional funding would be included to do the energy retrofit on these low- and moderate-income dwellings. So, I think that what we're going to do, be able to do, is come back with additional components that show not only are we doing the repairs, and the energy retrofit and, and the energy savings that will result, which I think both financially and environmentally are really the core. The workforce development is great, but also to demonstrate how all the stakeholders, which that, that Green Careers Pathway also includes employment and training, BOCES, SUNY Ulster, RUPCO itself, who have projects that are already on the drawing board, and to others. So, we're going to, I think, come back with an, an improve proposal. I'm not clear on the budget and that's why I was hoping that Dennis would have a draft with a budget. But I do know that if we utilize existing projects and add in an energy efficiency retrofit to existing projects, that that will, therefore require less ARPA funding, or the ARPA funding that was proposed can go further. And I see that there are people from the Executive branch, and please correct me if I mischaracterized anything if you're aware of that.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** I think you, I think you were right.

**Chairman Criswell:** Okay, great. So, basically we're just looking forward to seeing the next iteration of this proposal.

**Legislator Greene:** Yes. And I do have one question that maybe Amber or the ARP team could help with. I'm a little confused whether it really needs to be a new resolution, or an amendment to the existing resolution. And you know, that's really in Dennis's court, but I've heard mixed, I've heard different things and I, if there's any way to get clarity on that.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** Didn't the other Resolution pass?

**Legislator Greene:** I can't quite hear you.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** Didn't the other resolution pass already?

**Legislator Greene:** It did.

**Deputy County Executive Rider:** So, it's, I mean, so it would need to be a new resolution.

**Chairman Criswell:** Yes, that was my understanding.

**Legislator Greene:** Amber, you had a different take on it. I wanted to just,

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** It's a new resolution number. But the project, there was a project established, which is the ARPA Green Home Retrofit Project. So, the resolution would be to amend the project to increase the funding.

**Legislator Greene:** Got it. Thank you for that clarification. And I hope we'll be back with the, to you at your next meeting with some of these details and also some clarity about the stakeholder component because in addition to all the other benefits, demonstrating how different departments and agencies and workforce development, etc, can all work together, will really put us in good stead for IRA funding and some of the other funding. And just a reminder that New York State says that buildings are 32% of the greenhouse gases, greenhouse gas emissions in New York. So, addressing that directly is going to be expensive. But, you know, the benefits are going to be very real in terms of climate change. Thank you.

**Chairman Criswell:** Thank you so much for that, appreciate it. I just want to recap a couple quick things, and then we can get out of here. So, our total funding remaining right now is \$6,644,655. If all the proposed resolutions tonight are approved, that remaining funding would drop down to \$2,294,600. So, 2,290,466.55. So, a significant drop. And then we have a few other things that we are still looking at in terms of prioritizing. We talked about the community kitchens. We've talked about the meat processing facility. We're still have a couple of workforce development possibilities. One, including the film industry. One talking about nursing and EMTs. There's a few other things out there. Smart Communities. We talked about housing for



farmers. Legal services we just talked about. So, we still have a lot of, a lot of potential projects, and the money is definitely dwindling down. So, we're gonna have to prioritize and really try and figure out how to spend this last couple of million dollars. And then, as I said before, you know, we'll see if any other funds shake out and I liked what you said, Tom, about just having some contingency projects. Wouldn't be a bad idea if we actually, you know, really vetted them and, and created a really strong waitlist so that we don't have to sort of start from scratch if we do have money available. So, that's a really great idea. So, I will take that, and we'll make, we'll actually start a waitlist.

**Director of Economic Development Weidemann:** Chair Chriswell, if I could just interject quickly, I think that's a great concept, not only for the possibility of ARPA funds that are unused, but there, as Legislator Greene just pointed out, the IRA, the infrastructure bill, the CHIPS Act, I mean, there's so much federal money, that I think we should expect to funnel its way down towards local communities over the next three or four years that it might make sense to have a backlog of projects that could be useful in applying for applicant-, for grant funds for, from those programs as well. And I also wanted to just say, it's, it's an amazing committee that this group represents and it's always a pleasure to present to you all, and good job in, in spending down such a substantial amount of money on such wonderful projects.

**Chairman Criswell:** Thank you very much. And I really, I like what you're saying about, you know, this committee being one that is, can be, still be useful for other funds that come our way, because there is no other committee really set up for that on the Legislature. So, so, I really liked that. Anybody else have any old business that they'd like to bring up? Okay, great. Hearing none. Motion to adjourn, please.

**Legislator Nolan:** Molly Scott has her hand up.

**Chairman Criswell:** Oh, I'm sorry. Hi, Molly. I didn't see your hand.

**Molly Scott:** It's okay. I rarely raise it. So, I wanted to actually respond to what Legislator Corcoran had said because I thought it was a good idea. And regarding like the backup, or the backup projects, I guess, is the phrase that we're saying.

**Chairman Criswell:** Yeah, we were saying waitlist.

**Molly Scott:** Waitlist. That's right. Because I was thinking it might be a good idea if we almost like, smushed the two ideas, right? So, like you have a fund set aside for money that goes over, right? Or for projects that go over budget, and then whatever's leftover, you know, we have like something that's, that's like set, like another grant program or something like that, where it's like, so whatever is not used with, with money that spills over, we put towards like, another nonprofit round or another other sort of like grant program. So, that was just something that came into my noggin. So.

**Chairman Criswell:** That's great. That's great. Yeah, Tom.

**Legislator Corcoran:** With that said, after tonight, with \$2.2 million left and about 4 million in the line right now, there's probably no time to put a contingency money aside.

**Chairman Criswell:** I actually agree with you. I think that, you know, it's a nice idea, but,

**Legislator Corcoran:** It was, don't get me wrong. I was a great idea. It's just little late.

**Chairman Criswell:** No, no, no. I just always think about that in budgets, you know, I always pad my budgets, put a little aside, you know, just in case. You know it's gonna go over, so.

**Legislator Corcoran:** Listen, 34 became 2 million quick. So, we got 2 million and again, I'm sure in the queue right now there's over that sitting there.

**Chairman Criswell:** No question. No question. Great. Well, thank you all. Um, if I could get a motion to adjourn, I'll let you all on your way. Yes.

**Legislator Corcoran:** Motion to adjourn.

**Chairman Criswell:** Thank you a second, please.

**Legislator Lopez:** Second.

**Chairman Criswell:** Great. All in favor.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairman Criswell:** Excellent. Thank you. Thank you all again, have a great evening. Talk soon.

---

**Time:** 6:10 PM

**Respectfully submitted:** Amber Feaster  
**Minutes Approved:** October 12, 2022