

**Economic Development, Tourism, Housing, Planning & Transit Committee
Committee Meeting Minutes**

DATE & TIME: April 14, 2020 – 6:00 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing (646) 558-8656,
Meeting ID: 801 931 865
PRESIDING OFFICER: Chairman Brian Cahill
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Victoria Fabella, Jay Mahler, Fawn Tantillo
PRESENT: Legislators Lynn Archer, Thomas Corcoran, James Delaune,
Herbert Litts, III, Mary Beth Maio, Abe Uchitelle and Legislative
Chairman David Donaldson
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes

OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Laura Petit; Deputy County Executives Evelyn Wright; Sajaa Ahmed, Acting Director of Ulster County Area Transit (UCAT); Randall Leverette, Chairman of Ulster County Industrial Development Agency (IDA); Amanda Sisenstein, Friends of Kingston Transit Riders;.

Chairman Cahill called the meeting to order at 6:04.

Motion No. 1: Motion to Approve the Minutes of March 3 2019

Motion Made By: Legislator Corcoran

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Archer

Discussion: None.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Cahill, Archer, Corcoran, Delaune, Litts, Maio, Uchitelle and Donaldson

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 8

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Minutes Approved**

Resolutions for the April 28, 2020 Session of the Legislature

Resolution No. 8: Setting A Public Hearing On Proposed Local Law No. 1 Of 2020, A Local Law Requiring That Property Owners Of Multi-Family Dwellings Residential Rental Properties Located In Ulster County With Six Or More Units Have An Office In Ulster County, To Be Held On Tuesday, May 12, 2020 At 6:00 PM

Resolution Summary: This resolution would schedule a public hearing on Proposed Local Law 1 of 2020 on Tuesday, May 12, 2020 At 6:00 PM

Resolution No. 9: Establishing A Special Committee To Define Ulster County Housing Needs

Resolution Summary: This resolution would establish a Special 7-member committee to develop an Affordable Housing Master Plan and associated county policies.

Motion No. 2: **Motion to Postpone Resolution No. 8 and Resolution No. 9**
(with sponsor's approval)

Motion By: Legislator Litts

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Archer

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Cahill, Archer, Corcoran, Delaune, Litts, Maio, Uchitelle and Donaldson

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 8

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolution No. 8 and Resolution No. 9 Postponed**

Resolution No. 162 – Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Execute An Agreement With The New York State Department Of Transportation To Accept New York State Funds For Ulster And Dutchess County Public Transit Service (LINK) – Department Of Public Transportation (Ulster County Area Transit

Resolution Summary: Authorizes the Chair of the Ulster County Legislature is hereby authorized to execute an agreement to accept reimbursement for the operation of the LINK service (Project ID Number 8823.80.121) including Saturday Service in an amount not to exceed \$360,000.00.

Motion No. 3: **Motion to Adopt Resolution No. 162**

Motion By: Legislator Litts

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Corcoran

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Cahill, Archer, Corcoran, Delaune, Litts, Maio, Uchitelle and Donaldson
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 8
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution Approved**

New Business – Old Business (see attached transcript)

- Progress on Housing Committee
- Ulster County Industrial Development Agency (UCIDA)

Public Comment (see attached transcript)

- Amanda Sisenstein
-

Chairman Cahill asked if there was any other business, hearing none;

Motion to Adjourn

Motion Made By: Legislator Litts
Motion Seconded By: Chairman Donaldson
No. of Votes in Favor: 8
No. of Votes Against: 0
Time: 6:48 PM

Respectfully submitted by: Fawn Tantillo
Minutes Approved:

Economic Development, Tourism, Housing, Planning & Transit Committee
Committee Meeting Transcript

DATE & TIME: April 14, 2020–6:00 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by
Dialing (646) 558-8656, Meeting ID: 801 931 865
PRESIDING OFFICER: Chairman Brian Cahill
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Victoria Fabella, Jay Mahler, Fawn Tantillo
PRESENT: Legislators Lynn Archer, Thomas Corcoran, James
Delaune, Herbert Litts, III, Mary Beth Maio, Abe Uchitelle and Legislative Chairman
David Donaldson
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes

OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislator Laura Petit; Deputy County Executive, Dr.
Evelyn Wright; Sajaa Ahmed, Acting Director of Ulster County Area Transit (UCAT);
Randall Leverette, Chairman of the Ulster County Industrial Development Agency
(IDA); Amanda Sisenstein.

Cahill: Okay, so, I'll call the meeting to order here. And then I'll look for a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Corcoran: I'll make that motion to approve the minutes.

Archer: Second.

Cahill: Okay. All in favor.

Group: Aye. (8-0)

Tantillo: You're gonna have to tell me...

Cahill: Thank you. So we have three resolutions that...

Tantillo: ...Tell me who's making the motions and seconds, because I can't see everyone.

Cahill: That's a good point. Thank you. Yeah, let's, let's make a rule for the meeting that you identify yourself prior to talking so everyone knows, especially since we have folks on the phone without video.

Archer: OK. Lynn Archer seconded.

Tantillo: OK, and Tom, Tom Corcoran made the motion. Okay. Got it. Thanks.

Cahill: So, we have three resolutions on there. And I was speaking with Legislator Petite, and with John Parete today. They agreed to postpone these resolutions number eight and number nine, until we have a little bit more face time with each other. And, you know, and we don't have the COVID virus hanging over us. You know and having all the resources of the county being taking up. Not all the resources but a good amount of the resources for the county being taken up with that effort. So, we're going to postpone it with Laura and John's approval for another month if that's okay? Laura. Please concur if you agree.

Petit: Yes. That's Ok, I mean, I would like to, you know, just really make sure that we are moving forward with this. I mean, I know that we've got some obstacles, but we could have had a housing committee several months ago.

One of the constituents also suggested if we're going to be doing the upgrades to the IBM building, if we don't need it for COVID patients, perhaps we could use that as temporary shelter.

So, you know, it is my understanding that the County Executive is moving forward with doing another survey, so they can make plans for some resolutions coming forward but, I mean, sooner than, sooner than later. So, I agree we need more face time to have open discussions, but this is really important to both John and I, to make sure that before we, it turns into a real crisis, especially with the economy being so uncertain as it is.

Cahill: I just want to add that Deputy Executive, Dr. Wright, is with us this evening and she can give us a little bit of a brief update on where they are with that, with the county.

Petit: Thank you.

Cahill: We'll do that later on. If that's okay.

Petit: Thank you. Okay, I'm mute now.

Cahill: Okay, somebody want to make a motion to postpone those.

Litts: I'll make a motion that we postpone resolutions number eight and number nine.

Archer: Second. This is Lynn.

Litts: This is Herb, sorry.

Cahill: Thank you. Thank you, Legislator Litts. Thank you Legislator Archer, and then we're gonna move on to Resolution Number 162...

Tantillo: You need to vote.

Cahill: ...Authorizing the Chair of the legislature to enter into an agreement,

Tantillo: Excuse me. You need to vote. Sorry, you need to vote to postpone those.

Cahill: Oh, I'm sorry. All those in favor?

Group: Aye. (8-0)

Cahill: Opposed? Thank you, Fawn. Okay, so we'll go into Resolution Number 162 now and I promise we will vote on this.

Authorizing the Chair of the County Legislature to executed agreement with the New York State Department transportation to accept New York State funds for Ulster and Dutchess County public transit LINK, Department of Transportation, Ulster County Area Transit

Litts: Herb Litts. I will move the motion, 162.

Cahill: Is there a second?

Corcoran: Tom Corcoran. I'll second.

Cahill: Is there any discussion on this resolution?

Ahmed: Good evening, everyone. This is Sajaa Ahmed, the Acting Director of UCAT (Ulster County Area Transit). If you have any questions about this resolution let me know. It's basically, this service is actually, right now, it's suspended. It's our service to the Metro North Station in Poughkeepsie. There's a "do not exceed." It's revenue contract, so there's the "do not exceed" of \$360,000. We're working right now with our counterparts at the Department of Transportation to figure out how all operating revenue is going to work for the rest of the year. I will keep you guys posted.

If you have any questions, I am on the line before we vote on this.

Cahill: Actually, I do have a little bit of a question about it and I guess it doesn't have to do with this exact resolution but... sorry about that it took you guys off my screen, didn't I?...sorry.

It has to do with the ridership of that. How does that do? I drive to Poughkeepsie every day and I pass the bus multiple times, you know. And I'm wondering, what is the actual ridership on that is it pretty good or?

Ahmed: It's, it's doing well, it hasn't it's actually remained flat for the past few years. It's, I don't have it exactly in front of me but it's around covering around 20,000, a year, exact figures. But what it is. It's, we haven't, honestly, we haven't put in enough marketing aid into the service over the past few years so that's actually something we were looking at before this all happened. In partnership with the state, there is a, if you look within the language of the contract, there's a part that allows us to spend a little bit of money on advertising. And what we found, because we're still offering rides right now to essential workers is more so than people commuting into the city, there are a lot of people that are just using that service to get to Poughkeepsie. And we have essential workers that are working in the nursing homes in Poughkeepsie, and different areas like that.

So, it's doing well. We were able to increase the “do not exceed” on this contract and offer the service directly from Kingston to Poughkeepsie over the past few years, in addition to the commuter service from Rosendale, so it's doing well. I think we could have increased ridership if we weren't in the current situation. I don't know, honestly what will, what the results will be for public transportation where people are in close contact with each other but, so, to answer your question, it was doing well it could probably get some more press and we were actually working on a whole marketing strategy for, to increase ridership on the across the board on our service but especially this one that we're actually able to have with all the state support. And last year, the revenue from the stake was almost \$300,000. Basically, this contract is for the operating shortfall that is not covered by other parts of our revenue streams.

Cahill: Thank you very much for the update. I really appreciate it. Go ahead, Dave.

Donaldson: Does she think that they are going to collect the funding for that?

Cahill: I don't know that. That's likely, right? I mean there's no indication that the funding, funding is going to be cut for that, is there?

Ahmed: Right now, we're working with the New York Public Transit Association. There're no cuts for this year for operating assistance and there's a slight increase for upstate systems for that was approved in this past state budget. That could change, because our funding source for, especially upstate system, is linked to the Department of Health and we have weekly conference calls with them and I'm sure for next month, there'll be a group of resolutions.

Cahill: Thank you.

Donaldson: Thank you.

Cahill: Anymore questions on that resolution? I guess we need a vote here. All in favor?

Group: Aye. (8-0)

Cahill: Opposed? Opposed, no? Okay, it passes. Thank you.

For old business today let's give Dr. Wright an opportunity to speak a little bit about the progress, they're making on the Housing Committee. I know there has been some progress made in the last month, even though we've been distracted with other things. So, I'll let Dr. Wright have a few minutes here.

Wright: Alright. Thank you. So, I, I gave an update to Legislator Cahill last week and I wanted to share it with you as well. We are trying, as the county works through the COVID response effort, to keep progress going on some of the most crucial issues and housing is absolutely near the top of that list. So, Dennis Doyle and I have continued to work on the whole suite of tools in the toolbox that we've been looking at on housing. And so, we didn't feel that it was really possible or appropriate to try to put a committee together at this point. Instead we've been trying to work on advancing the things or we have kind of behind the scenes and building block work to do. And we're looking to get a resolution for you on a couple of them for the next cycle.

So, one of them is that we've been in further discussion with the City of Kingston about expanding the land bank to county wide. We think that's a really important tool for us to have. Doing some research on different ways that the communities around the country have been structuring joint City/County Land banks, there's a few examples throughout the state. And so, what we're gonna ask for from you all next cycle is essentially a memorializing resolution that calls on the Executive and to have a dialogue with the City of Kingston about finding an appropriate structure for that. So, there's issues to work out in terms of the structure of the board, the disposition policy, staffing, you know, funding and so on. We'd like to formally begin that dialogue with them. We started putting some, together some thoughts on what we what those issues are but really need to begin a dialogue with them about it. And the other is that we have started looking at county owned properties that might be suitable for housing developments and would like to sort of get your approval to go ahead and make that investigation as well. So that's, that's what we're looking at right now trying to get those things lined up so that when we can really get back to the committee process, we've got more tools further along.

Cahill: So, how is Mr. Doyle making out with the law, with the IDA (Ulster County Industrial Development Agency) that will allow the IDA to fund multiple dwelling, multiple housing dwelling, I guess that's what you call it, I don't know. I know that we discussed that a couple of different times, right?

Wright: Yeah, you know I am not sure whether Dennis had had that discussion with, with them. I can check on that.

Cahill: All right. Does anyone have any questions for Dr. Wright?

Donaldson: Yeah, I do. Dr. Wright, could you give me an understanding what's the difference between the land trust and land bank?

Wright: Sure. That's a really good point because I think we, we want to also investigate setting up the land trust capability.

So, if the land bank is a mechanism to essentially clear title on properties and get them back on the market. So, it used in in different ways and different communities. In many communities, it's, it's used as a way to address vacant properties and what used to be called "blight". That's not so much the issue that we're dealing with here but it's, it's a mechanism for getting properties back into productive use. Usually properties that had been foreclosed on but the land bank has more powers than that it can also purchase properties and so on. So that's what it's really about.

The Land Trust is a mechanism for keeping properties that can be acquired in a number of ways permanently affordable. So, in most models, the land trust owns, keeps ownership of land that housing is built on and either leases or sells the housing itself. And so, the Land Trust is able to create policies around the permanent affordability of that housing. Whereas, if the land bank or anyone sold an affordable house and you didn't have a mechanism to keep it permanently affordable, the next time it got sold, you'd lose that affordable property. So, many communities around the country are using land banks and land trusts together, as, as ways to get properties that are not on the market back into the market in a way that keeps them permanently affordable.

And that's, that's something that the Kingston land bank has been discussing in conjunction with the Kingston land trust. That very often, land trusts are community based and community driven organizations. They frequently have boards that consist of residents in the properties and it may be that it's, you know, while we have one County Land Bank, we may want to have many land trusts in the county. It may be something that's better done at a community level, and maybe even a self-defined community level. I think that's open for consideration. And so it may be that the county may have a role, perhaps in working with some community partners on the funding side of it, in helping set up some capacity to, to help multiple land trusts kind of do their technical work, so that they can focus on the community driven aspect of their work. So, that's something that we're early in exploring, but I think it could be a very powerful model for us.

Donaldson: Thank you.

Cahill: Any other questions for Dr. Wright? So, we can expect a couple of resolutions from the Executive in this committee next month, in regard to this?

Wright: That's right. Potentially, one combined resolution with both of those things in

Cahill: OK.

Donaldson: The Executive and I have had a number of discussions on that. In fact, I had discussion with you, too, Evelyn. You were there. So, I'm hoping that the committee is basically very similar to what the discussions that we had and it's not, you know, please to keep me abreast of what it is. Any changes and so on.

Wright: Yeah, absolutely. We were intending to proceed with the design that we talked about as soon as we can and you know if we want to have some discussions in the meantime about potential members to reach out to and how exactly we're going to appoint those members, we could go ahead and do that so that we're ready to make those invitations, just as soon as we think it's practical to do so.

Donaldson: Perfect.

Cahill: If anyone on the committee has any names that they'd like to bring forward, please do that, please do so, and we'll get them in front of all of us we can look at them together and see how that works out.

The only thing I'll add to that is in our next meeting I think I'm going to invite David, sorry, Dennis Doyle and you to the meeting to just give us like a, you know, like a checkpoint kind of thing where we are, and how things are progressing. Because, you know, we really, you know, we have to be able to continue to move forward even though we're in this COVID crisis we still have to do the business of the county and this is something, as we all agree, is a high priority and I don't want it to get lost in the sauce here. So. So, you know, in our main meeting we hopefully will be able to have, you know, somewhat of a progress report and then put something a little bit more firm in motion as far as the committee and other things like that.

Wright: Right.

Cahill: Thank you very much.

Donaldson: Brian?

Cahill: Yes, sir.

Donaldson: Are you finished with that? Can we move on to the IDA?

Cahill: Yes, sir, We can do that. I guess I'll bring that as Old Business or any other old business and I guess the IDA would be considered Old Business, right?

Donaldson: It could be considered old or new. It depends on your point of view.

The IDA. Right now, we are continuing with the appointees that we had because they continue to serve due to the continuity of office. And we do have to either, you know, reappoint all of

them. Some of them. None of them. Whatever we feel that we need to do. So, I would hope that all the members of this committee are looking at the IDA appointments that we have right now. So, we've got to make a decision on how we're going to move forward with those appointments because we should be doing them. Normally they would have been last month or this month. You know, we usually take a month or two to get them done. But of course, you know, under the crisis things have changed, but I would hope that we can get that done by next month's meeting.

Cahill: As a matter of fact, Dave, I was gonna suggest let's, let's get those names forward and let's try and get those appointments done for the May meeting. I think we could do that. It's a month away, right? That's plenty of time to get through the folks, get the resumes who are interested and folks who, who are you and others who want to bring forward. We have plenty of time to do that, right?

If we need to call a meeting to review those, we'll do that. Right? But I think that it's in our best interest to get that done by the May meeting.

Donaldson: Now you did have an email sent out and all the existing members said that they wish to return to their current

Cahill: Fawn, you did, and they all agreed they want to come back?

Tantillo: Yes, sir. Yes, they all ask to be reappointed.

Cahill: Yes, so we'll consider that as well. Right?

Archer: Brian?

Cahill: Yes.

Archer: Hi, Lynn Archer. I'm hoping we can just reinstate everyone, given the current environment. And I think it would be difficult to try to bring on new people this go around, although normally I would say yes, we want to interview, and all of that. With all of that. we're a little bit behind in the process. And given the fact that, you know, we're going to have some huge challenges going forward. I think continuity of the current regime, at least for this year, it helped, hopefully, helping us through some challenging months ahead. I think it's probably easier and safer to keep who we have in place so instead of trying to interview people through zoom and I think this would be a lot more difficult, given the current environment.

Cahill: Thank you.

Donaldson: I see where Legislator Archer....I can understand her point. But we do have some concerns that we will need a very flexible IDA and I'm concerned if they are going to be able to be flexible and I think a conversation with the members needs to be very blunt and to the

point. That we need some flexibility and they need to find a reason to do things rather than reasons not to do things. What they seem to be doing in the past couple years, it's all about not doing things as opposed to actually pushing to do things. I do I certainly don't want any rules or regulations broken. But, as you know you know and everybody understands, just like the Constitution of the United States there's ways of interpreting things and there's a loose construction and a strict construction of the interpretation. Right now, we need a loose construction.

Archer: Well, as I think I've said it before, and I've said it to a number of folks that, you know, you bring the bring the team to, you bring the IDA Board together, with the Office of Economic Development, with our standing committee, you bring all these people together, I think there's a lot of knowledge, experience and expertise. And when you ask people to be part of a solution you get a better result when you bring people together and work through those things. So, I can't impress enough about what I think is critical. Given the players here that I think it could, I think we could reap a lot of benefit of bringing them together now and start to plan about, okay, so, when it opens up again, what can we do, how can we support businesses, how do we help them, you know, there's fits in place today with the SBA loans, but what's going to happen when, you know, it's, you know, time to open the doors again. What help do they need. How have we prepared to help support that? I think, you know, those are some of the things that by bringing everyone together, could create some ideas and generate some ideas and people I think are always want to be a part of helping and be part of a solution than being an obstacle. So, just food for thought.

Cahill: Well, one thing I think we can keep in mind is, you know, I don't think you have to replace everyone if there are, you know, people that we think might be a better fit in this environment. We should also consider that. Right? We all agree that it's going to be a difficult environment going forward. And, you know, experience does matter. And so of course you don't get rid of everyone but maybe you do replace some individuals on the board or maybe, you know, I just don't think we should rule that out. If we have candidates that are presented to us that are, you know, viable candidates and bring a lot to the table then we could consider them. I mean that's, you know, there's a reason why we appoint them every year. Correct?

Donaldson: Or every two years.

Cahill: I'm sorry, every two years. Sorry. Every term. Right. Any other comments on the IDA board at this time.

Petit: Yeah. Chairman, if I may, I just to follow up on Chairman Donaldson's comments. I mean, we do have to be careful, The IDA has a specific, you know, as part of their charter, rules or requirements, they're supposed to follow. And it's well within our rights to do you know if I tried to put it through to do a deviated pilot. But we do have to be careful I mean, the IDA was created for industrial, for job creation and if ask them to be, I'm not quite sure what flexible means, I guess it depends on how you know housing as some other issues go through. But, you know, I mean if, them, then why not us? So, if we're approving something

that may deviate from there, basically, what they're supposed to be doing. Then why not a hotel that only employs five or 10 people? So, I, I think, you know, before we consider replacing people just because we need them to be more flexible, we have to take a good look at what they're expected to do, and then perhaps, you know, we have to look at another type of committee like the, like we had UCDC at one time.

Cahill: Thank you very much. Any other comments at this point. OK. So, then we'll move on to new "New" business, I guess, other new businesses or new anything anyone wants to bring up at this time. Okay, thank you.

Is there any members of the public on the phone that would like to speak I know that we have at least one dial in number from outside to the committee and the legislature?

Sisenstein: Hi. This is Amanda Sisenstein.

Cahill: I'm sorry, could you speak up again I didn't quite hear what you said. Sorry.

Sisenstein: It's Amanda Sisenstein. Can you hear me?

Cahill: Yes. Okay, go ahead.

Sisenstein: So, I just wanted to follow up with a Legislator Petit's concerns at the beginning of a meeting about what to do with people who are experiencing homelessness during this time. It is something that I know is my only kind of loosely fits with this committee, I don't know specifically what committee deals with this issue.

Cahill: I think the Social Services Committee would probably be more appropriate committee for this issue.

Sisenstein: Sure. I think it would be, I also think it would need to be in collaboration with a lot of the Direct Relief that's happening right now isn't actually through DSS. And I think there's gonna have to be a community wide partnership that helps deal with this issue and as Legislator Petit has been suggested just been potentially the old IBM building, if that is not actually needed for hospital beds, could be converted into temporary housing and/or treatment for people who are experiencing symptoms and our public.

You know there's some very, very basic things that that really put a community at risk and people do work homeless right now we have to remember right now that all social amenities are pretty much down. To be able to clean themselves, able to shower, wash their hands, use the bathroom, all of those places are shut down right now.

Cahill: So, here's what here's what I'm going to suggest at this time, since this is, you know, really not pertinent to this committee. Right now, I we really don't have anything we can do as part of this committee to help with that issue as we speak, you know,

Sisenstein: Well, I disagree.

Cahill: I just wanted....

Sisenstein: A partnership with the IDA for example where...

Cahill: The IDA is not going to solve the COVID homeless problem at this point, I think it's an issue that maybe we should be directing to Executive's COVID team. If it's an issue that is prevalent in the community that people are homeless, and they are positive, well that's an issue I'll guarantee you, 100%, that the Executive would like to be aware of and be able to help with. So, I would recommend calling the COVID hotline and expressing concerns for people who are homeless and do need a place to take a shower and have potentially tested positive, you know, that to me is the what the hotline is for. Right. And I would suggest that we utilize that when

Sisenstein: I would suggest that when you extend public to comment you allow the commenter to speak and not interrupt them.

Cahill: Okay, well we have a three minute...

Sisenstein: ...a genuine partnership with the IDA involving property tax breaks...

Uchitelle: Point of order. As a point of order, this is, this is public comment and she shouldn't, she could talk about Big Bird if she wants to talk about Big Bird or anything else so she should have her 3 minutes.

Cahill: I can also shut down public comment as the Chair of the committee. I'm the only chair of the committee I am aware of, that allows public comment, especially during ZOOM meetings at this point right now. And I, you know, it's a repetitive comment that we've heard, we've had three meetings I've heard the comments three times from people so you know there's a place where you know it's appropriate and there's a place where it's not appropriate. And I think right now we, we certainly understand, and I made a recommendation as Chair of the committee, what the public commenters should do. And it certainly isn't going to be resolved on this committee. And that's my opinion.

Sisenstein: You are not allowing to public comment. If you were to extend public comment and then immediately redact it, that is not allowing public comment. Obviously...

Donaldson: Wait a minute. May I say something? You made, Amanda, you made a comment. They listened to it. He responded to it. That is public comment. It's not...

Sisenstein: No. Actually, response is inappropriate during public comment. Especially when I haven't even finished...

Donaldson: You are wrong. On the legislative body, it's a different game than in the Legislative committee. In the committee, public comment is often discussed back and forth, totally different than the meeting of the whole. Which would turn it into a nightmare if you allow that to go back and forth. For the committee meeting, if the public, you could make a comment, and if the chairman the committee wishes to speak on that comment or ask you other questions on the comment or has an opinion on that comment, he certainly has every right to do so.

Sesenstein: Well, even if I can see your point, interrupting somebody before they're actually even gotten to their comments. Certainly, there's not there's not even a committee level, they don't work for legislative body. I haven't even actually gotten to the point of what I'm trying to say, which was to suggested encouraging partnership with the IDA to potentially give property tax breaks to entities, whether they be hotels, whether they be Airbnb, whether they be, you know, any other kind of entity that could potentially house people work currently houseless could be given tax abatements to incentivize them to lending their facilities to house currently. I really feel pulled into the purview of this committee, but I wasn't even able to get to that because I was so rudely cut off.

Cahill: So, thank you for your comments. Legislator Litts.

Litts: I would suggest that as Chairman, in the future for your public comments, you should have a set time limit: Two minutes, three minutes, whatever it is. the public can express their concerns and opinion for those three minutes. We can take it under advisement. We could respond if, if you must. But that's all I get is three minutes, and then we move on to the next public comment, or we move on with the meeting. You can set those rules.

Cahill: Thank you, Legislator Litts. And I can also, I would also suggest...Thank you very much Legislator Litts, I would also suggest that if you'd like to submit it in writing, you can do that, too. And we would welcome that. And would become part of the record as well.

And legislator Archer.

Archer: Thank you. I just want to step back a second to the IDA of just, just for the purposes of inter how we're going to move forward. If we're opening it up to additional candidates, we have in the past had a process where we've interviewed everyone including existing members who wish to stay. Which means that if we're going to do that, and you wanted to do something for the next month, it would have to be done quickly in advance of resolution timeframe or at least get done before, our next meeting so we could vote on it. But it was always an open interview where everyone was looked at, and then there was a discussion around who we were putting forward so if that is deviating or changing, I think it's important to have a conversation about it.

Cahill: I disagree. I guess if they're existing members would we need to interview them again? If they're members and we're going to reappoint them?

Archer: Well, if you're at if you're if you're there was discussion that others may be considered and put forward. So my recommendation is, and this is what has been done in the past, if in fact you're opening it up to a potential other candidates that everybody should go through the interview process including those already sitting on a board, and that has been our practice in the past. So, that is just kind of highlighting what our practice has been all along on the, on the IDA board.

Cahill: OK, thank you very much.

Donaldson: Brian?

Cahill: Yes, sir.

Donaldson: Yes, I certainly understand that but, the, if you're going to reappoint someone, and it's the understanding that that person is going to be reappointed. Why would you interview them? I mean sometimes it's a, I mean I've seen that happen with the RRA where you are bringing in all these people in the interview and then again after they've been on the board for so many years, or two terms, three terms and then you're interviewing them it's kind of insulting. When you're actually spending an awful lot of time and volunteer to serve on these boards and then you're looking to be reappointed and they agreed that they're going to be reappointed or somebody that you feel that shouldn't be reappointed then I guess they could be interviewed, but I don't think you need an interview every single body that everybody may agree with.

Litts: Mr. Chairman?

Cahill: I'm going to do this so I can see, Go ahead.

Litts: Okay. Um, we know because of the times, things are not normal. But if we're going to entertain some additional candidates, new candidates for position on, on the IDA. I think at very least we should have everyone supply a letter of their interest for either reappointment or appointment, with a copy of their resume, because there's several people on this committee that have not interviewed any of the people, whether they they've been there for decades or not. So at least everybody's given a fair shake. And then as a committee we can determine on those that we want to interview and vote in person virtually. People that are, that we know that are long standing, that that everybody knows they've done a great job yet to bring them in and, you know, interview them might be a somewhat of a slap in the face, maybe. But we make that decision after we have everything that need.

Cahill: We do have a letter from each one of them saying they do want to come back already right, Fawn? We do.

Litts: There are several people on this committee that don't know them, at least if there was a current resume that I people on the committee could avail themselves.

Cahill: I don't disagree with you.

Archer: I guess my point is if you are going to be hand picking who you want to stay on it, who you don't, it's not happening that everyone has the opportunity of stating their case, I think is a disadvantage and if you're pre determining who you're really moving out. If you have ideas of who you want to move out on paper, the best way to do this is to interview everyone and look at these individuals against any potential new ones and have a meaningful conversation. But if you're already decided who you don't want and you're going through this and you're just going to remove them, and consider someone else, then I think that we have now taken the process and created something very different from what we had in the past

Donaldson: May I comment?

Cahill: Go ahead, Dave. Yeah.

Donaldson: I think, I think Herb hit the nail on the head, I think we need to get the resumes from everybody that either wants to serve or is serving and wants to come back. I think we have some of the resume on file already. Maybe what we can do.

We could do is actually request either updated resume, or they can just, you know, if they don't have an updated one, we can operate on the one they had or what have you. if there are other people that are looking to serve, we get a resume from them and then we can take a look at them and then we can make a decision through those resumes like Herb pointed out, on who we would and some people you don't want to. You don't need to interview.

Some people may be up in the air and say, well, yeah, we want that person. There may be some differences there, but I mean if there's a pretty strong stance for some people to returned, then they return. So, I mean, that's the way I kinda look at it I agree with Herb, but I think that's what we should do I get the resumes made sense and we can get an idea. And then we'll decide

Wright: Legislator Cahill?

Cahill: Yes.

Wright: Could I make a comment from the Executive's perspective?

Cahill: Sure.

Wright: I think our concern has been, not so much with the flexibility of the IDA, but certainly with the effectiveness over the recent period. The number of businesses served, the

number of businesses that have ever approached them and not been able to get assistance and so I would just ask that you're looking at this, that one criteria, you might, might think about is what the existing numbers diagnosis is of why the efficiency and effectiveness was poorer recently and what they would do to fix it. That's our, that's our big concern we need all the tools in the toolbox functioning right now.

Leverette: Might I speak for a second?

Cahill: Introduce yourself to everyone because I know you weren't on

Leverette: This is Randall Leverett, I am the Chairman of the IDA.

If, if you permit me to, to speak to the, the efficacy, or the effectiveness of the agency over the past couple of months. I think we've done quite well. We've had four projects come before us.

The agency is designed to review applicants as they come in. It is not the agency's responsibility to search or look for participants for inducement because at the end of the day we are in fact, looking at providing tax incentives that need to be hosted in other municipalities. So it should not and probably isn't designed to be used as a tool where it is the answer for every single problem. Each applicant that comes in to us, goes through a rigorous process of review. And not everyone meets the standard in order to be graduated to inducement.

So, the notion that we should be churning out applicants who come through the agency isn't necessarily correct. And I would venture to guess that when you look at if we began to turn out applicants that weren't necessarily eligible, we would have a very, very hard time in passing muster and it would be actually an embarrassment to the County and the Legislature and your constituents when the New York State Comptroller or the Office of ABO (NY State Authorities Budget Office) started reviewing and auditing the materials and it looked as if we're just giving things away because every business that comes in that needs help and the IDA is just granting them the assistance that they seek.

It is, it is a rigorous process that we've established. One that is more rigorous than existed in the past. I'm proud of what the agency has done considering the transition that it is trying to go through. We are in effect trying to make things better, so that they operate a bit more efficiently. And, you know, it is a tool in the economic development toolbox, but as I've always said, you know, a trowel and a backhoe both are used for digging, but both tools are not appropriate at the same time, or all the time, for the same types of things. So, that's my comment there.

Cahill: Thank you very much. Any more comments tonight?

Litts: If not, I'll make a motion for adjournment.

Donaldson: I'll second it.

Cahill: All in favor.

Group: Aye.

Cahill: Thank you everyone. Have a good night.
