

**Energy & Environment Committee
Meeting Minutes**

DATE & TIME: August 31, 2020; 6:15 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing (646) 558-8656,
Meeting ID: 93973 5349 5811
PRESIDING OFFICER: Chairwoman Manna Jo Greene
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Jay Mahler, Fawn A. Tantillo. Laurie Lichtenstein
PRESENT: Legislators Al Bruno, Peter Criswell, Laura Petit and Mary
Wawro
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes

OTHER ATTENDEES: David Gordon, Legislative Minority Counsel; Evelyn Wright, Deputy County Executive; Frederick Wadnola, Joanne Myers and Charles Landi, Board Members, and Tim DeGraff, Controller of the Ulster County Resource Recovery Agency (UCRRA); Josephine Papagni and Shabazz Jackson.

Chairwoman Greene called the meeting to order at approximately 6:51 pm and lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Motion No. 1: To Approve the Minutes of August 3, 2020
Motion Made By: Legislator Criswell
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Wawro

Discussion: None

Voting in Favor: Legislators Greene, Bruno, Criswell, Petit and Wawro
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Minutes Approved

Resolutions for the September 15, 2020 Session of the Legislature

Resolution No. 323 - Declaring Intent To Act As Lead Agency Under The State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) For The Review Of The Draft Ulster County Local Solid Waste Management Plan

Resolution Summary: Ulster County Legislature will prepare a Full Environmental Assessment Form and circulate a notice of intent to be lead agency pursuant to 6 NYCRR § 617.6(b)(3) to the other involved agencies in the development and approval of the Ulster County UCRRA's Local Solid Waste Management Plan.

Motion No. 2: Motion to discuss Resolution No. 323

Motion By: Legislator Petit

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bruno

Discussion: See attached transcript.

Motion No. 3: Motion to Approve Resolution No. 323

Motion By: Legislator Bruno

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Criswell

Voting to Postpone: Legislators Greene, Bruno, Criswell, Petit and Wawro

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Approved**

Resolution No. 242 -Approving Ulster County's Local Solid Waste Management Plan

Resolution Summary: This resolution will approve a 10-year Local Solid Waste Management Plan

Motion No. 4: Motion to discuss Resolution No. 242

Motion By: Legislator Criswell

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bruno

Discussion: See attached transcript.

Motion No. 5: Motion to Postpone Resolution No. 242

Motion By: Legislator Bruno

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Wawro

Voting to Postpone: Legislators Greene, Bruno, Criswell, Petit and Wawro

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolution Postponed with the consent of the sponsor.**

Resolution No. 265 – Establishing A Zero Waste Implementation Plan for Ulster County

Resolution Summary: This resolution would approve a Zero Waste Implementation Plan to approach zero waste by removing items commonly found in Municipal Solid Waste using a variety of techniques

Motion No. 6: **Motion to discuss Resolution No. 265**
Motion By: Legislator Criswell
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bruno

Discussion: See attached transcript.

Motion No. 7: **Motion to Postpone Resolution No. 265**
Motion By: Legislator Criswell
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bruno
Voting to Postpone: Legislators Greene, Bruno, Criswell, Petit and Wawro
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution Postponed with the consent of the sponsor.**

Resolution No. 302 - Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Execute Grant Agreements And Documents With The Dormitory Authority Of The State Of New York (DASNY) For The Funding And Construction Of A Rooftop Solar Installation At UCAT And Amending The 2020-2025 Capital Program And Establishing Capital Project 574 -Department Of Environment

Resolution Summary: This resolution will amend the 2020-2025 Capital Program and Capital Project No. 574- UCAT Rooftop Solar Installation for an additional \$100,000.00 and the 2020 Ulster County Capital Fund by the same amount

Motion No. 8: **Motion to approve Resolution No. 302**
Motion By: Legislator Bruno
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Wawro

Discussion: See transcript

Voting in Favor: Legislators Greene, Bruno, Criswell, Petit and Wawro
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Approved**

New Business:

Old Business:

Climate Smart Committee update (see transcript)

Chairwoman Greene asked if there was any other business, hearing none;

Motion to Adjourn

Motion Made By: Legislator Bruno
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Wawro
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 0
Time: 8:04 pm

Respectfully submitted by: Fawn Tantillo & Laurie Lichtenstein
Minutes Approved: October 5, 2020

**Energy & Environment Committee
Meeting Transcripts**

DATE & TIME: August 31, 2020; 6:15 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing (646) 558-8656, Meeting ID: 93973 5349 5811
PRESIDING OFFICER: Chairwoman Manna Jo Greene
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Jay Mahler, Fawn A. Tantillo. Laurie Lichtenstein
PRESENT: Legislators Al Bruno, Peter Criswell, Laura Petit and Mary Wawro
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes

OTHER ATTENDEES: David Gordon, Legislative Minority Counsel; Evelyn Wright, Deputy County Executive; Frederick Wadnola, Joanne Myers and Charles Landi, Board Members, and Tim DeGraff, Controller of the Ulster County Resource Recovery Agency (UCRRA); Josephine Papagni and Shabazz Jackson.

Chairwoman Greene 00:02

It started and other people if they join, Jay will tuck them away somewhere. So, I would like to call to order the August 31 meeting of the Energy and Environment Committee. And Fawn, would you quickly call the roll please?

Fawn Tantillo 00:27

I will. Chairman, Chairwoman Manna Jo Greene.

Chairwoman Greene 00:31

Present.

Fawn Tantillo 00:32

Deputy Chair Mary Wawro.

Mary Wawro 00:34

Here.

Fawn Tantillo 00:36

Al Bruno.

Legislator Bruno 00:37

Why, yes, I am.

Fawn Tantillo 00:39

Peter Criswell.

Legislator Criswell 00:40

Here.

Fawn Tantillo 00:41

And we're all here. And Laura Petit.

Legislator Petit 00:44

Here.

Fawn Tantillo 00:46

I also just want to take a moment and find out, we have a caller at 6071. Can I get your name?

Josephine Papagni 00:53

Sure. It's Josephine Papagni and Shabazz Jackson.

Chairwoman Greene 00:57

Okay.

Legislator Bruno 00:59

Hey, guys.

Chairwoman Greene 01:04

Okay with that, I would like to ask that we stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

All

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Chairwoman Greene 01:37

And has everyone had a chance to read the minutes of the August 3 meeting? And could, I would entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

Legislator Bruno

I'll make a motion we approve the minutes from the August meeting.

Legislator Wawro

Second.

Chairwoman Greene 01:58

All in favor?

Committee Members 02:01

Aye.

Chairwoman Greene 02:02

Anyone opposed? Motion carries.

And then tonight's resolutions. Let's start with the first resolution, Resolution No. 242: Approving the Ulster County Local Solid Waste Management Plan. And that actually relates directly to Resolution No. 323.

:37

And we have been notified that the county legislature needs to do a SEQRA (State Environmental Quality Review Act) process before taking action. And so, that resolution is declaring intent to act as lead agency, under the State Environmental Quality Review Act, for the review of the draft Ulster County Local Solid Waste Management Plan. And I expect there may be some questions. So, the order might be to, before we decide what we're doing about Resolution No. 242. To ask for a motion, for purposes of discussion to move Resolution No. 323 for purposes of discussion, so we can discuss that and then decide what to do about 242. Does that make sense?

Legislator Bruno 03:52

Yeah.

Chairwoman Greene 03:53

I see some nods. Okay.

Legislator Petit 03:54

I'll make that motion.

Chairwoman Greene 03:58

Great. And the second?

Legislator Bruno 04:00

I'll do it.

Chairwoman Greene 04:03

For the purposes of discussion, I think it probably makes sense to ask Attorney Dave Gordon to just summarize the research and the correspondence that has led to Resolution No. 323. The SEQRA resolution for the local Solid Waste Management Plan, unless somebody else has a comment before we go, or a question. And I think maybe getting a little background would set the stage well for this discussion.

Frederick Wadnola 04:46

Can I say something Manna Jo?

Chairwoman Greene 04:51

Yes, please, Fred.

Frederick Wadnola 04:52

Well, I like David to be able to explain this because we have we have two emails, one from DEC saying that we don't need the do SEQRA. And he well knows as an attorney, it is no action. So we're not taking any action with the Solid Waste Plan. It's just a plan. If and if we did anything, if we took any action, then of course, we have to have SEQRA. But I don't understand why he's saying you need SEQRA for the plan when DEC came back, from two separate people at DEC, and said it wasn't necessary. And now all of a sudden David says it's necessary. So, I'd like an explanation with his interpretation of the SEQRA process.

David Gordon 05:39

Okay, well for that, I'm happy to do that, Fred. First I just want to set explain to everybody, and the committee, especially, the relationship of the two resolutions because Manna alluded to it, but it wasn't clear.

We have two resolutions before us. One of them would approve the Solid Waste Management Plan. And the other, would, essentially, start the SEQRA process for the Solid Waste Management Plan, which would be on the distribution of our intent to be lead agency.

The basic point for you guys is we should only pass one. And the whichever one you pass depends on whether you believe that this is subject to SEQRA. Which is what I would advise.

If you believe it's subject to SEQRA, we should circulate a Notice of Intent to be lead agency. If you don't, then you're free to go ahead and consider the local Solid Waste Management Plan. So it's really kind of either or.

If you recall the last meeting, we were considering the resolution to pass the Solid Waste Management Plan when Amanda LaValle observed that a Solid Waste Management Plan is subject to SEQRA. And she had some pretty good points about it. And I later verified that she was correct. There's a long line of law that indicates that a Solid Waste plan is subject to SEQRA.

And to answer one aspect of Fred's question, you know, there are certain plans, certain things that you know, are not going to result, the next day, in specific environmental impacts, good or bad, or otherwise, no physical impact, but they're just plans. In some cases, they're their Type 1 Actions. And a good example is a town comprehensive plan, Even for that matter, town zoning ordinance is not going to, is not going to resolve the next day in dirt being moved. And if you look at the first item, if you look at the first item in the Type 1 list, there are some plans that are subject to SEQRA and effective Type 1 Actions, and one of them is what's called a Comprehensive Resource Management Plan.

And in prior years, these Local Solid Waste Management Plans are considered Type 1 Actions under this category. So, it's just not true that because it's simply a plan, any future actions are going to be subject to SEQRA that therefore the original plan is not subject to SEQRA. Sometimes that is true. But in this case, it's not true. And Amanda was correct. And there was a there are a lot of Solid Waste Plans that have been subject to SEQRA over the years.

Now, as I understood the RRA's position on this, both coming into the meeting, and also we did some substantial looking into it after the meeting. The position was essentially, and by the way, Fred, I want to get to your comment that there were two DEC officials that commented that it was not something to SEQRA. And I found, we have the communications from one of them, but not the second one. And in fact, the second ones that we were communicating with, which was a much higher level, DEC General Counsel's Office indicated that it was. But what happened after that, essentially, the position of the agency...

Unidentified off-screen speaker 09:06

What's that Matt. Matt?

David Gordon 09:10

Excuse me.

Chairwoman Greene 09:11

Oh, is who is 8454?

Fawn Tantillo 09:20

Who is the caller? 1750?

Legislator Petit 09:23

Can we move every?

Fawn Tantillo 09:27

I just need to find out who? Who the caller is at 1750.

Legislator Petit 09:39

Is that Joanne Meyer? Do you know Manna Jo?

Chairwoman Greene 09:44

I don't know. It's 845-532-1750. Could you unmute, tell us who you are and then go back on mute, please. And I can't check while I'm on the Zoom call, So alright, Dave, please continue. We'll, we'll figure it out.

David Gordon 10:14

Okay. There were a number of, there were several justifications that were that were mentioned by agency folks in emails etc. But the primary one was the one that was discussed by, I think, some directly some agency folks, but more than that, it was done by Mark [Swyka] and by the DEC associate engineer, who was I believe was responsible for reviewing the agency's Solid Waste Management Plan.

And I called Mark because essentially Tim DeGraff had suggested that in an email after the meeting, I spoke to him at length. And then subsequently, I spoke to the DEC engineer who was responsible for review, I believe responsible for reviewing the agency's management plan. In part because Fawn reached out to her. And so, there were just a number of communications, these are the people we should speak to.

And I understood, very much, what the main agency position was on this. And that was that in prior... There's two there are two sets of... It's important understand there are two sets of regulations. There's SEQRA regulations and there's also Solid Waste Management regulations. And the agency, the approval of the Solid Waste Management Plan is under the Solid Waste Management regulations.

In a prior set of regulations, there was a requirement to submit certain SEQRA documentation to DEC as part of the approval process, not all SEQRA documentation, which has certain secret documentation. And in the most recent regulations, they don't reflect that anymore. That requirement to submit a SEQRA finding statement is not in the current regulations for approval of a solid waste management plan. Based on that, the DTC engineer, and other folks, believe that therefore, that they were essentially exempted from the SEQRA process entirely.

I didn't think that that was true. And so, I asked her whether her opinion was based on her own opinion, or whether there was any sort of DEC guidance on that. Any sort of... because it's a very significant opinion. It means that all that whole previous history of parent SEQRA reviews, environmental impact statements, would have been essentially abrogated, simply because you don't have to submit a finding statement as part of your application process anymore.

And what happened next was that... I was just looking to see if she was going on any, any guidance that she had gotten from attorneys or even from higher ups in her department, Solid Waste Management Department. And what we got next was an opinion from the attorneys, which actually, that's not something I even asked for, only if she had had one.

But they wrote back and they clarified that the change in that regulation did not, actually, did not exempt the agency from doing a SEQRA review. And that just clarified and confirmed what we had already thought, which is that there were two different sets of regulations: the SEQRA regulations, and the Solid Waste Management regulations. And the fact that the Solid Waste Management regulation had changed, didn't put this thing on the Type 2 list. And it was therefore in the same position as it was before, you just didn't send anything to DEC, and that the engineer [inaudible] her role.

Unidentified off-screen speaker 13:34

I'm sorry, I didn't hear anything. [Laughter]

David Gordon 13:38

I'm sorry?

Fawn Tantillo 13:40

You can keep going, it's somebody's phone or something.

David Gordon 13:44

And so, that was basically, that was basically that. We had we looked very carefully into the...There were other comments as well. I think one person, I think was Charlie, had mentioned that DEC approval of this Solid Waste Management Plan indicated approval SEQRA review, and that's just not true.

And when you think about it, to understand it more fully, is that DEC does not typically review SEQRA. It does not approve of SEQRA reviews. If you're on, for example, a city planning board, or city council, and you do something similar to SEQRA, like subdivision approval or zoning law, you don't send that up to DEC, and they don't approve it. SEQRA is a separate, separately jurisdictional requirement, that you have to do unless you're in the Type 2 list, and this just isn't. And it turned out that the opinion that you had originally gotten from DEC. The DEC engineer was simply not correct. And so, it's a SEQRA. That's basically the bottom line.

We had, we looked at everything that the agency submitted. I was in contact by email with Ken. I sent him a couple of messages on this. And both times he came back with a very cursory statement that we're not submit to it. And we've looked at the, we've looked at all the, you know, arguments. And it's clear to me, that based on the logic of the law subject to SEQRA, and these confirm that.

So, Fred, I'm interested in the second opinion that you mentioned that you've got an DEC. Because we only saw the one from the associate engineer, Ms., I think her name was Paola Munar Marino, I can't remember, it was a Spanish name. But we both looked at it, and I talked to her, at some length. And so we do understand the contention. It's just not correct.

Frederick Wadnola

But what about the email from Chris Horan?

David Gordon 15:40

What's the one I'm talking about.

Frederick Wadnola 15:41

Yeah. Well, his he is he his email said that it wasn't necessary either. Unless there was a specific action that were going to take place under SEQRA.

David Gordon 15:52

That's not what it said. I mean, I'll pull it up...

Frederick Wadnola 4

Okay.

David Gordon 15:54

... if that's helpful.

Chairwoman Greene 15:57

Hold on a second. Could you actually, if it's not too much trouble, just read the closing sentence of his memo because I think that's where it was made most clear. And Fawn, you were able to send that over to the agency, beyond Dave's communication with Ken Gilligan, before you left, were you able to send?

Fawn Tantillo 16:29

Yes.

Chairwoman Greene 16:29

So, the agency has both correspondences. And if Dave would just be... and I want to stress while he's looking...

David Gordon 16:40

I have to pull it, I have to pull it up.

Chairwoman Greene 16:43

Hold on one second. I just want to say something for clarity and context. It's not the Legislature's place to decide what the agency did, or should have, could have, would have. That's the end agency's responsibility. But it is our responsibility to take legal and appropriate action if we're, as we are being asked to approve the Local Solid Waste Management Plan.

So, what we primarily were asking attorney Gordon to look at is, what action, you know, whether or not the legislature needed to do a SEQRA process on the resolution that's been in front of us for a while now. And he did thorough research... and I don't know if you've been able to find that one closing paragraph.

David Gordon 17:50

I'm looking now, Manna, going through my emails.

Chairwoman Greene 17:56

While you're looking, I'd like to first ask the members of the committee, you know, to share their response. And then we can also acknowledge anybody on the agency who would like to participate in this discussion. But know if any legislators...

David Gordon 18:21

Yeah, I just want to echo...

Chairwoman Greene 18:22

You found it?

David Gordon 18:23

No, not yet. I just want to echo what you said, Manna. This is not, we're not commenting at all what, what the agency did. We need to do what we need to do. And so, you know, you know, the Agency can take its own steps and making some judgments. But you know, we're doing what we need to do.

I'd also point out that as I'm looking for this, just for the agency's information, and as Manna well knows, and many people on the committee know, we ran into this exact problem last year, in different context, where we passed very important resolution that actually passed a local law. And we later discovered that we had not done SEQRA on it.

In fact, we discovered it in the same way that we discovered here, because the county administration told us. And there was also, and that meant that there was, although I don't mean to be pejorative about it, there was an implicit threat of a veto. And there was also obviously a threat of a lawsuit. And we immediately, although it was very important, we, we rescinded that approval, we rescinded the law, we did our SEQRA review on it, and we passed the law.

So, this is something that we take pretty seriously. In part because, especially when the County Executive tells us this, when the administration tells us, which is what happened here, we understand what that means. They're looking at this separately, they have their own intelligence on it. And it something we take very, very seriously.

Fawn Tantillo 19:44

I have the email if you want me to read the last paragraph.

David Gordon 19:48

It's actually the second paragraph.

Fawn Tantillo 19:51

Okay.

Frederick Wadnola 19:55

What is this? What is this Fawn, the email from Chris Horan?

Fawn Tantillo 19:58

Yes.

Frederick Wadnola 19:59

Okay.

David Gordon 20:00

What date? Fawn, what date was that was that the 14th.

Fawn Tantillo 20:09

I use the one I'm looking at was a follow up one that was sent on the 17th.

Frederick Wadnola 20:15

Okay.

Fawn Tantillo 20:20

But the last paragraph, "An action is subject to review under SEQR if any state or local agency has the authority to issue a discretionary permit, license, or another type of approval for that action. SEQR also applies if an agency funds or directly undertakes a project, or adopts a resource management plan, rule, or policy that affects the environment. (See 6 NYCRR 617.2). The County's adoption of a LSWMP involves "agency planning and policy making activities that may affect the environment and commit the agency to a definite course of future decisions" and is an action pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.2(b)(2) that is subject to SEQR."

David Gordon 21:11

That's right. And he also he said it in a different way...

Frederick Wadnola 21:14

That's my point, David. If we make any action, then yes, we have to do SEQR. But to have the plan, the basic plan approved. I just, you know, according to our attorney, and I know that you and Ken have, you know, might be at loggerheads over that. But if you don't have any action, you don't need a SEQR, only when an action comes into play.

David Gordon 21:40

Fred your, Fred frankly, you are miss reading this communication. I thought the part that Fawn read was reasonably clear, but it can lead you to other aspects of it. One is two paragraphs above that, at the end of the second paragraph. He says this, the last two sentences. "The department no longer requires the submission of a SEQR finding statement for an LSWMP." So, it's restating the fact that for that approval process, you no longer have to submit a finding statement, you do one less.

This is the kicker, "However, this regulatory change does not provide a blanket SEQR exemption, as the local agency continues to have the obligation to consider SEQR in its planning actions as discussed below."

The fact is, he's clarifying that it is. And also, I want to point out again, there are certain planning actions that are subject to SEQR. It's not true that all planning actions are not subject to SEQR, certain ones are, and it's covered in the first item in the Type 1 list.

Frederick Wadnola 22:45

I agree with you. I agree with you on that. And that's what I'm saying. But the plan is not any ongoing action, until we act, until we have a plan in action.

David Gordon 22:57

Fred for years, and Amanda said, this is the first thing that she said in the meeting and I later verified that she's correct. And you can do it by getting on the internet and just Googling it. Solid Waste Management Plans have long been subject to SEQR. They long... most of them are Type 1, they are Type 1 Actions. They're... the internet is full of them. I downloaded them. They are.... a Solid Waste Management Plan is a Type 1 Action, and it has been for at least a decade. And they show up on, and they show up on the... they show up when you Google them.

The idea that because you're not presumably, to kind of paraphrase, that because you're not moving dirt with this resolution, that you're not, you know, that the trucks aren't rolling out tomorrow, that it's not subject to SEQR is true sometimes, but it's not true in this instance.

During the call last week, I said, the first thing I said to Amanda was my interpretation, that didn't look at this specifically, she had done with respect to the Solid Waste Management Plan, but I looked at it respect to the Zero Waste Implementation Plan. And I thought that that was not subject to SEQR, and she just shook her head and said, "This is." And she was right.

Frederick Wadnola

So, she does she have a law degree now too? Amanda?

David Gordon 24:07

I do.

Frederick Wadnola 24:08

I know you do. I love you, David.

David Gordon 24:12

I'm sorry, Fred. It just is what it is.

Chairwoman Greene 24:17

I'm going to put a... I don't usually stop a discussion, but I think we're going around in circles. I think we have to, again, I'd like to hear from...

David Gordon 24:31

Let make one point.

Chairwoman Greene 24:33

But I want to hear from the committee at this point.

David Gordon 24:37

Okay.

Chairwoman Greene 24:47

Legislator... any of the committee members have... you know, my sense which I still stated earlier, is that a higher authority at DEC has told us that we have to do a SEQR process. That's my... after reading, and discussing, and hearing the arguments on both sides. That was the conclusion I came to and I don't know... Peter, Legislator Criswell.

Legislator Criswell 25:17

Our attorneys saying the same thing, correct?

David Gordon 25:22

Yes.

Chairwoman Greene 25:23

Yeah.

Legislator Criswell 25:24

Okay. Thank you.

Chairwoman Greene 25:33

Legislator Bruno, or Legislator Wawro, or Legislator Petit. Do you have any comments?

Legislator Petit 25:42

I mean, if our attorneys saying we need to do this, I really strongly feel that we should start moving forward with it and not hold it up in committee. So, we can start getting a handle on the process. Yeah, I mean, that's it. So, I think we should... I mean, do you need a motion on the SEQR? The environmental review resolution? Do you need that motion?

Chairwoman Greene 26:14

Yeah, but before you do, I just want to be sure that the committee has had a chance to speak and ask us questions. And I see Legislator Bruno has his hand up. So, hold on, hold off for a minute on an actual... and I want to say that... well, go ahead, Legislator, Bruno, please.

Legislator Bruno 26:40

I'm agree with Legislator Petit. I think we have to rely on our counsel. And I think that's what, that's what they're paid for And that's what we have to rely on. So, I agree.

Legislator Wawro 26:56

I agree.

Chairwoman Greene 26:56

Okay. Well, thank you. Fawn, please.

Fawn Tantillo 27:01

I just wanted to clarify one thing, David can correct me if I misunderstood him. But if we just declare ourselves lead agency on the... at the Session, then we have 30 days to... the clock starts ticking, if no one else responds. But if the RRA sends a letter saying that they don't want to be lead agency, can we begin the process... can we move the process along more quickly, that we don't have to wait the 30 days?

David Gordon 27:32

Well, let me ... Yes, a couple things. I'm not sure I understood, that it was it was posed in the best way. First of all, we don't declare ourselves lead agency in this resolution or coming up. This is a Notice of Intent to be lead agency. We're proposing it. And we send it out to the other involved agencies, which in this case, is the RRA and DEC. They have 30 days to respond. If they don't respond within 30 days, then we're automatically the lead agency. Or, what agency sometimes do is they respond to me, they say, Sure you can be lead agency. And the benefit of that is that we have all the agencies respond sooner than 30 days, then we can be lead agency, as soon as we get the response from the last one, that gets us actually started sooner. If an agency such as, for example, the RRA were to object. Or to say that they wanted to be lead agency, then we have a process where we can, it just starts a process of choice. And we can pick, choose, and see who's in the best position to the lead agency. And if we can't agree at that point, ultimately, the DEC Commissioner can decide that question.

So, but without going there, it's a 30-day period, after which we would automatically become the agency. But if we hear from people sooner that say that, that it's okay, which often does happen, we can move forward as soon as we get the last approval.

Chairwoman Greene 28:53

And before we call for a vote, I'd like to just underscore that, I think there's really widespread support for acting as quickly as possible on the Local Solid Waste Plan, but it would help, and I mentioned this when I visited the agency, at your meeting, and I just really want to underscore that. If you decide not to, to allow the

county to be lead agency on the action that it would take with regard to approving the Local Solid Waste Plan, then that can happen more quickly than if there is either no response or a challenge. And I was trying to make that point, and I'm not sure I articulated it well enough. So, I wanted to reinforce that because this is by no means a stall mechanism, a mechanism to store an action. It's that we are required. I think there's consensus that we and we'll see when we take the vote, but that we're required to do SEQRA. And so, we wanted to do it as expeditiously as possible. And the other things that relate to that will come up later in the discussion with regard to the Zero Waste Plan, etc.

And I also want to appreciate the fact that, you know, several board members, the Chair, and the Interim Executive Director are here, because it's difficult to be sort of a liaison running back and forth. And when you hear the conversation firsthand, then, you know, I think that's a good step in the right direction of improving communication. I really want to stress those two things.

And at this point, if there's no other, if there are no other questions, I will entertain a motion on Resolution Number 323, regarding SEQRA.

Legislator Bruno 31:25

I'll make that motion.

Chairwoman Greene 31:27

Okay, Legislator Bruno. And seconded by Legislator Criswell.

Chairwoman Greene 31:34

All in favor of declaring intent to act as lead agency for the SEQRA review of the Ulster County Local Solid Waste Plan, please signify by raising your hand and saying, "aye."

Committee Members 31:54

Aye.

Chairwoman Greene 31:58

Okay, the motion carries

So, with that, I think, I don't know, I'm never clear about whether we have to postpone, or can we just hold Resolution No. 242?

Fawn Tantillo 32:17

I think you should postpone it until you until the action is taken.

Chairwoman Greene 32:22

Okay.

Legislator Bruno 32:23

Yeah, I agree with that, because... I'll make a motion to postpone that.

Legislator Wawro 32:28

Second

Chairwoman Greene 32:30

Second. Okay. All in favor?

Committee Members 32:34

Aye.

Chairwoman Greene 32:35

Anyone opposed? All right, the motion carries.

Now the next motion on the table also relates to solid waste. And it's a motion to establish a Zero Waste Implementation Plan. And I did go to the agency and say that my observation is that the Recycling Oversight Committee has been working on a document. And it's my understanding that the agency has also been working on a document.

And I would prefer that we not be in the position of legislating anything around solid waste that the agency has responsibility for implementing without the agency's participation. We have the authority to do that. But I don't think that would bode well, for the actual implementation of the plan.

If we're all working together. The plan is going to get implemented and we'll be able to divert as much waste as possible. And keep the Charlie Landi Landfill (laughter) You'll excuse me, Charlie, but I fully expect to name it after you at some point. But it... the landfill that is cited and built will last a lot longer if we do our homework now and put a very clear, implementable Zero Waste Plan into place.

Some remember, our two documents, there hasn't been the level of collaboration that I had hoped for. And, you know, I've spoken with Legislator Petit, who's working on the Zero Waste Implementation Plan, and I personally don't think it's ready. Plus, we will have to do SEQRA on that, or we may have to do SEQRA on that, as well. But, you know, I'd like to ask her to speak, and anyone else who wants to speak on. So, let's entertain a motion on Resolution 265 for the purpose of discussion.

Legislator Criswell 35:13

I'll make that motion

Legislator Bruno 35:16

I'll second it.

Chairwoman Greene 35:18

Okay, and so, for purposes of discussion, I guess we should just vote and on purpose of... no, we don't have to vote on purpose of discussion, right, we can just move forward? Okay.

We're all indicating that we want to discuss this motion. And I'd like to start with a sponsor, Legislator Petit, if you want to comment on, you know what I've just said, or anybody else has said.

Legislator Petit 35:52

Well, the Recycling Oversight Committee has opted, you know, we've decided we've put quite a bit of a work into it over the last several months, having meetings more than once a month. We did have multiple organizations come in, who are very supportive. We had the IDA. We had Ulster Chamber. We had Ulster Soil and Water, and some of the county department heads who oversee environmental and economic development. So, we felt it was ready to come out of committee so it could be discussed in Energy and Environment. And we're, you know, as a sponsor, and as a group, we're certainly open for more discussion.

But, you know, I would really like to see buy-in from the Resource Recovery Agency. I had hoped that through their Zero Waste Subcommittee that they set up that we would see, you know, more of a, I guess, a willing to move forward. You know, upgrades to the MRF (Materials Recycling Facility). Or, you know, finalization of their composting project or because, you know, again, it's going to be really important when we're citing a final, choosing a final technology, such as landfilling, that we limited as much as we possibly can. And with that the state has a bill that just went through the Assembly, I believe it's in Senate, or vice versa. So, the state is looking to see 85% waste diversion. So, this is the wave of the future.

The agency in their proposed capital budget did not put in funds. The upgrades to the MRF were operational, it was for scaling for a belt, you know, wasn't for an optical sorter. There's also, as Legislator Greene had pointed out, we didn't see anything in there for feasibility studies for the technology. So, that that's my concern.

I think Zero Waste is, is the way to go. We've been doing it at New Paltz, we've tripled our revenues and reduced our waste by 75%. And, you know, I'm open for input. This is a real living document. And we'll probably have to be looked at every five to 10 years

Chairwoman Greene 38:21

Or every two years as every agency reviews their own Local Solid Waste Plan.
Yes, please. Legislator Criswell.

Legislator Criswell

Yes,, I just wanted to publicly thank Interim Executive Director DeGraff for a really great tour of the facility. And we had a good conversation about this exact subject. And he was telling you that they're working really hard on Zero Waste Plans right now. And what my hope is, is that this really is a collaborative process, and

that we can find a way to everybody get on the table. Talk about what's already being done, talk about what the goals are, and to create a really, really solid document that is very specific, has measurable goals, and has timeframes, and that we can all agree on and move this forward as quickly as possible.

Chairwoman Greene 39:16

Great. Anybody else? Tim, please go ahead.

Timothy DeGraff 39:25

Yeah, I want to thank Legislator Criswell for participating in the tour and coming out and speaking to us, hopefully, learned a lot and enjoyed his hard hat. One of the things that coming into this a little bit late to the game, being the controller, and trying to wrap my head around Zero Waste, what does it mean? What does it mean to the agency? What does it mean to the county? You know, I started digging into some research.

And one of the issues that I have found with this that really concerns me for the county is the initial steps to Zero Waste for large diversion. In the beginning relates to, one, food waste. Which we are already doing. The county already has a law, the state has a law coming into effect. We've put a lot of money this past year into expanding our compost operation at the same time mitigating odors. So, we've accomplished goals on our end, in the Solid Waste Management Plan already.

And then the other, that I'd really like to see us all start concentrating more on the food diversion aspect, as opposed to this concept, or this label of Zero Waste. And I think we all can agree that food diversion is a big ticket here. The other part where the large diversion came from, was these private companies, Norcal Waste out in the West Coast, who rebranded themselves as Recology. They were doing, number one, the collecting themselves, they were doing the collection themselves. So, I'm wondering how we would get these large trash companies to start collecting, for instance, food waste. And one of the other items that they started doing is converting recycling over the single stream.

As we've learned in the past 10 years single stream is it's the main reason why the recycling industry has completely collapsed. So, I'm really at a loss. And I'm not bringing this up to be contentious. I'm bringing it up because, as I said, I'm late to the game. And as I'm starting to learn this, I'm trying to wrap my head around it and rationalize it. And I just don't see how rationally we can truly divert. We're doing the food waste, so we would agree on that. That's fine. But then the second part of it seems to be single stream, and that we know, does not work.

As far as the upgrades to the MRF. We're concentrating right now on like I said, expansion, the compost program, and we have plans in place. We just received our first drawing today, to create a full blown recycling education building, that will also include a demonstration area to start bagging our food waste. To start bagging the compost, I'm sorry. And this is a big deal because I think education is really, really important. And I think the investment in education, and the food waste diversion, is the most important first step, before we get into anything else.

I'm going to continue to learn. I'm going to continue to look into it. But this is, that's my feelings right now. I really wish we could concentrate more on the food diversion aspect. Get out into the community for more backyard composting. And I know Angie has gotten several grants in the last six months with regards to food waste, food scraps recycling and recent most recently a P2I grant [NYS Pollution Prevention Institute] as well. So, we have other plans to expand education from that standpoint.

So, you know, we're open to listening. We're obviously, we're already doing some of this stuff, but I really like to stress the point that I wish we could all just concentrate on the food waste diversion first. Thanks.

Legislator Petit 43:04

I do have a comment on that Chairwoman. Isn't it true that about 90% of your food waste is coming up from Westchester? I mean, are you considering focusing more on Ulster County so we can divert that out of our waste stream?

Timothy DeGraff 43:19

Yeah. And then if I can respond to that, that was one of the things I had stressed with regards to the Solid Waste Management Plan that I want to see included. I wanted to see us, because our, you know, I've heard people talk about savings with regards to the food waste. Technically, you can't count the savings on transport and disposal because it's not the county's waste, you know, the food waste. So, yeah, that's why I stressed let's start concentrating, you know, within our county and diverting that food waste, I just, I personally find it to be the most important right now. And like I said, you guys put a law together. Let's work on that first before we get into anything else. And let's, you know, do all we can with that.

Legislator Petit 44:01

That that is actually is in the Zero Waste Action Plan. Food waste diversion is in our one to five year goal. So, it is, it's there.

Timothy DeGraff 44:13

And that's great. That's great.

Legislator Petit 44:15

Yeah. So, good. We collaborated.

Timothy DeGraff 44:18

See.

Chairwoman Greene 44:22

That's a process I would like to define so that we are all on the same page by the end of the year. And a lot of good work is being done at the agency, by the agency, with regard to food waste.

The generator will either have to compost on site and there's a lot of education that would go into that. Or hire a hauler that will take it to a composting facility. Or higher a hauler that has a composting facility. And there even when we did the stakeholder meetings, there was a suggestion, and it's come up several times that for example, the Route 28 corridor, you don't want four different haulers driving all the way out and back on Route 28. And there are some large generators out that way. And the businesses themselves said they would get together and contract one hauler, which would be much more efficient to manage the food waste for those who are not managing it on site, as for example Frost Valley is doing, and Mohonk Mountain House, and others

But, so, I am, you know, looking for a process where we can have we can't have the full in depth discussion at the committee meeting. But we could do what we did to develop the Solid Waste Law. I mean, the Food Waste Diversion, Large Generator Composting Law.

And we really did work together. The agency hosted those meetings. We can do virtual meetings. But to look at the various documents that are being developed and see if by the end of the year, and really it should be November, and ideally even October, so, that we can do the SEQRA process and have enough time. And Fawn has been very helpful in figuring out how to how to sort of backtrack from a goal of having a completed plans or a plan by the end of the year. And so, you know...

Frederick Wadnola 47:06

Can I say something, Manna Jo?

Chairwoman Greene 47:08

Yeah, please.

Frederick Wadnola 47:10

You know, if the county would have a truck to pick up food waste, you could pick up from the jail, you could pick up from the prisons, you can pick up from all kinds of places and bring it out to the RRA. It in the transportation, of getting the food waste out, so we can use it on our composting pile. And you could divert a lot of things out of the waste stream and get it out to our composting operation.

Chairwoman Greene 47:42

Any comments on that? I happen to agree, but if in this, you know, it does raise a lot of questions for the county itself, to provide that service. And I'm not sure how the haulers would feel about it. Some might welcome it, others might feel like it was an infringement. I thought...

Frederick Wadnola 48:05

Maybe if you bought us a truck, maybe the RRA could do it. Because we don't have the money to buy a truck to bring the food waste out. Because we don't have any bonding authority anymore.

Chairwoman Greene 48:20

Anybody else?

Frederick Wadnola 48:22

There's a good way good way to look into it.

Fawn Tantillo 48:26

I believe our jail is dehydrating their food waste.

Chairwoman Greene 48:30

That's true. Which is still compostable and may even have a higher and better use. But there's a real good reason to dehydrated at the jail so there's less in-the-now and less food waste sitting and waiting to be picked up. Amanda looked into that and, you know, came up with a solution that is really pretty specific. Not that it couldn't work in other places, but be because the security is extra.

Frederick Wadnola 49:06

We need to think outside the box if we're going to really be innovative.

Chairwoman Greene 49:17

Mary, were you ready to say something? Okay. Peter, I thought you might be.

Legislator Wawro 49:33

That's what I was doing. I was muting. Sorry, Peter.

Fawn Tantillo 49:37

Chairman Greene, I do like your idea of taking this conversation offline and getting into a real brainstorming session where, you know, you can hear what's going on already, throw out ideas and really kind of pull it together. So, I think that's a great idea.

Legislator Bruno 49:55

I agree. I agree.

Chairwoman Greene 50:00

It would be open to the committee members, the Recycling Oversight, it would be similar to what we were doing with the Solid Waste Planning Commission where we had everybody represented.

Chairwoman Greene 50:12

And so, at this point, I would like to ask if Fawn would be willing to coordinate with the agency, just to set up an initial meeting, we can look at the various documents, and we can see where there is consensus, and where there's, you know, somebody might feel that there's a section that they're not comfortable with. And we can see what the group decides and really dig down. And then come back to this committee a month from now with a report and, hopefully, may make progress.

Chairwoman Greene 50:55

Peter, I saw your hand.

Fawn Tantillo 50:56

I was going to say most that we need to keep that sense of urgency. So, we can move this forward. So, I appreciate what you just said. So, I think one good really productive meeting, consolidate it, move it forward.

Chairwoman Greene 51:11

Excellent. And the Chairman has asked for another tour. And I saw quite a few people interested. Quite a few legislators who are not on either, any of these committees, but are interested. So, there's a high level of interest. And I think, we're moving very constructively in the right direction.

And I also want to appreciate Legislator Petit, and with Fawn's help, for reaching out to county agencies and departments. And their response was positive. And there were many things they felt they could do to contribute to, you know, a waste diversion strategy. And we have that documented and we can build upon that. Including even the IDA is looking at restructuring the matrix by, just slightly, but in the direction of promoting more sustainable practices. And that came out of that conversation.

Needless to say, we have a climate crisis. So, in addition to the need site a landfill and not be trucking are waste to Seneca meadows. There is a, you know, a mandate to address the climate crisis and this is a very important climate solution.

So, let's see either Fred or Tim, who would the agency would be the point person? And Fawn, are you willing to take that responsibility to try to set up a joint meeting?

Fawn Tantillo 53:10

Sure, I will do whatever you need me to do?

Timothy DeGraff 53:14

I could just... Sorry, I just wanted to say if I was wondering if, in order to kick this off rather than having the committee's all meet, if Legislator Petit is available, since she already has a zero waste facility, maybe Angie and myself can get together with her and, and we could tour that facility, and kick the ball off that way, and deal directly with her, rather than get everybody together first. That way, if we... were probably going to have more questions than anybody else, or I know, I will. So I would like to recommend having that happen first.

Legislator Petit 53:53

But I think each community is different. We did ours based on the New Paltz community, but yeah, Absolutely come out. I'll show you numbers, and spreadsheets, and whatever else you need.

Timothy DeGraff 54:04

You know, I like that. Okay.

Chairwoman Greene 54:10

It's great. Legislator Bruno.

Legislator Bruno 54:13

I actually, I have a question for Mr. Wadnola. He made a comment, it's kind of like, I'm chewing on, about the county buying the RRA trucks to do food composting. Am I correct? What you what you said, Fred?

Frederick Wadnola 54:30

No. I said maybe the county would buy a truck, and pick up the food waste, and bring it out to our composting operation. Because you have so many sites you could pick up. The jail, the Community College. I mean, I don't know what they do with their food waste, but I'm sure read an awful lot.

Legislator Bruno 54:48

Okay, so my question to you, at face value, is why can't the RRA make those pickups

Frederick Wadnola 54:55

Because we don't have a truck to do it. Buy us a truck and I'm sure I could get them to go and do it, Al.

Legislator Bruno 55:02

Okay, I'm just trying to put things in perspective. I thought that was like your job.

Frederick Wadnola 55:07

I mean, we lost our bonding authority several years ago. We had a bonding authority at the agency. And I think it was three or four years ago. No, it was before my time. It was maybe five years ago, where the agency gave it back to the legislature. We had a bonding authority of \$40 million, where we could go out and site for landfill and so forth. Now, everything, whenever we need money, we have to come to the legislature and ask. And that's why Chairman Donaldson, in his State of the County Address, said that he had an item there that the county is going to have to spend some money to build a landfill because it's going to have to be all County, you know, funding.

Legislator Bruno 55:51

I'm just trying to understand because I understand that my ignorance is not...

Frederick Wadnola 55:56

Yeah, no, no...

Legislator Bruno 55:57

I mean, I got... I'm trying to figure it out. Because the RRA, at face value, I thought that was their job. And if the county's going to do it, then why do we need the RRA?

Frederick Wadnola 56:07

Well, if you want to make it a county department, take it back.

Legislator Bruno 56:10

I'm just trying to figure it out. You understand where I'm going with this.

Frederick Wadnola 56:14

Yeah. I mean, you know, we just we don't have the money.

Legislator Bruno 56:18

If you guys have all the equipment. You guys run the transfer station and the sorters and all whatever trucks you have. I see the blue trucks all over the road. You can dedicate one truck to pick up food waste?

Frederick Wadnola 56:31

No, we don't. We use every truck in us out there, believe me. And I, I invite you to come with Chairman Donaldson. He has eight legislators already signed up for the tour. Come with...

Legislator Bruno 56:44

Honestly, Freddie, I would love to do that. And mind you, these are questions. These are not accusations.

Frederick Wadnola 56:51

I know. I know.

Legislator Bruno 56:52

And I work at a health care facility which doesn't jive with the timeframes of your tours.

Frederick Wadnola 56:58

Well, I tell you what, when you when you have a day off, or you want to come over after work. We'll guarantee you a private tour.

Legislator Bruno 57:06

I would love to come over on a Sunday or a Monday.

Frederick Wadnola 57:10

That's fine. You let me know when you're available and I'll get you the tour.

Legislator Bruno 57:14

Okay, thank you very much.

Chairwoman Greene 57:19

Anybody else? Any other comments?

And, you know, I've made a note of, you know, part of that deeper discussion offline should include the question of a truck, and financing, and how that would affect the haulers. I mean, I think that's part of the conversation. These are all really good points.

And the fact that we're in communication is very encouraging. So, and Tim is going to... Tim and Angie will meet up with Laura and kind of bring us a step closer. And I'm going to read over both documents and try to apply my experience, which isn't current, but it has some depth. Anything else on the Zero Waste Implementation planning process?

I want to ask if a Board Member Meyers or Deputy Evelyn Wright, or Josephine and Shabazz, before we go on to the next resolution, which is a different topic. Is there anything you want to add? We do want to move on but I also want to give you a chance.

Deputy Executive Wright 58:51

No, thanks, Manna. And this is Evelyn.

Chairwoman Greene 58:55

Yes, please.

Shabazz Jackson 58:58

Oh, this is Shabazz. I think the offline meeting is a great idea to push this forward. And I would also like to extend an invitation to coordinate it through to Laura, to look at look at our Zero Waste process and be able to add that to the to the discussion of a demonstration project. I think that to have a successful demonstration really puts Zero Waste on the table. Right now, it is an idea. It's a philosophy. But there's several places in the county that have the demographics that would make a very good demonstration site and we would see what we can get as a recycling rate. So, that's basically my comment.

Chairwoman Greene 1:00:14

And I want to encourage anyone on the committee, this committee is pretty central to the progress of these pieces of legislation, to visit the New Paltz Reuse and Recycling Center, and also to visit the Greenway facility. The more we can learn from each other, I think, the better the outcome is going to be. And I'd really like to

see us be a shining star in terms of other counties looking to Ulster County to say, "Oh, look what they did there."

So with that, I'm going to entertain a motion to postpone Resolution 265, Establishing a Zero Waste Implementation Plan.

Legislator Criswell

I'll make that motion.

Legislator Bruno 1:01:09

Second (raised hand).

Chairwoman Greene 1:01:11

Second by Legislator, Bruno All in favor?

Committee Members 1:01:17

Aye.

Chairwoman Greene 1:01:19

Anybody opposed? Okay, that motion passes.

Now on to a different subject that is dear to my heart. And that is Resolution No. 302: Authorizing The Chair of The Ulster County Legislature To Execute Grant Agreements and Documents with The Dormitory Authority of the State of New York (DASNY) For The Funding and Construction of a Rooftop Solar Installation at UCAT And Amending The 2020-2025 Capital Program And Establishing Capital Project 574 - Department Of Environment.

And you can see I'm beaming. Comments aside, any... Well, first I would entertain a motion to move forward with this for purpose of discussion.

Legislator Bruno 1:02:31

Move (raises hand).

Chairwoman Greene 1:02:31

Legislator Bruno, and second?

Legislator Wawro 1:02:33

Second (raises hand).

Chairwoman Greene 1:02:36

Second by Legislator Wawro. Any comments on this, Resolution No. 302? Yes, please.

Legislator Petit

I this is a very good resolution and I support it.

Chairwoman Greene 1:02:55

Thank you. And no other comments? Let's oh, please Legislator Bruno.

Legislator Bruno 1:03:04

Actually, I'll second with Legislator Criswell.

Chairwoman Greene 1:03:14

Okay. All right, is that is the extent of comment?

Deputy Executive Wright, do you have anything to add on this? Looks like there's a lot of support for it. But I just want to give you a chance if there's any, you know, from the administration.

Deputy Executive Wright 1:03:38

We're as excited that it's going ahead as you are.

Chairwoman Greene 1:03:44

Okay, great. With that, I'd like to call the question on Resolution No. 302. All in favor, please signify by raising your hand and saying aye.

Committee Members 1:03:54

Aye.

Chairwoman Greene 1:03:54

All right. Anyone opposed? Okay, Resolution No. 302 passes. And then is there any new business?

Okay, let's go to old business. Solid Waste Planning Commission. I think we've talked about that.

Fawn, please.

Fawn Tantillo 1:04:22

I wanted to make sure you saw we sent out, late this afternoon, the building, Environmental Building Report. I haven't had a chance to look at it myself yet, but it looks it's got some exciting information in it. So, take a look at that when you...

Chairwoman Greene 1:04:41

It's really long report. I took some time with it. I haven't read it cover to cover but I've also asked Amanda and Nick Hvozda who did the majority of the work on that, if they would summarize that at the Climate Smart Committee meeting. Because it really relates very directly to the mission of the Climate Smart Committee, and then we can report back to Energy and Environment.

Let's see. I think we've touched a lot on Solid Waste Planning. We're not going to formally reconvene that commission. I don't see any, any reason to do that. I think we have a good plan moving forward. And I'm very grateful.

But in terms of the Climate Smart Committee, I just want to say quickly that we were meeting regularly, sharing information, and it was kind of like a house on fire. That's a bad analogy these days. But, you know, there was just a lot of energy. And it's very much needed, as the global climate crisis is getting clearly worse every day.

And then COVID hit. And I would have thought that it was easier for people to participate by just going to their computer then driving 25 miles to Kingston to a meeting and given you know, the size of this county, that was happening. So, I asked the Climate Smart Committee members, myself, Peter, Betta Broad, and Cal Trumann, and also woman from Gardner who's very interested in promoting 100% participation in the county's climate smart initiatives. And, you know, for every municipality in the past, to adopt the climate smart pledge, and create a Climate Smart Committee, which is often just a subcommittee of the Conservation Advisory Committee. And, and really get active.

And so we, over the weekend, really did a lot of outreach and let people know and let the supervisors in municipalities that hadn't been participating, or were participating but had fallen back because of the chaos of this pandemic. And so I think we're going to have a really valuable meeting. And I just want to mention that there's a group called Boat Builders, that is offering a grant, and they didn't give us an idea about how much the grants would be, but...

Multiple speakers 1:07:23

[Inaudible, hot mic]

Legislator Petit 1:08:10

Okay, great.

Chairwoman Greene 1:08:13

Thank you. And so, that's coming up. There's also probably at the next meeting, I don't think we'll have time to at the meeting this Thursday, but there's an interest in a special kind of concrete I think, sequesters carbon, or doesn't release carbon. We'll find out more about it at a future meeting, but that will have implications for the county, as well.

And last but not least, the administration, the executive branch is planning to recertify. We are one of the highest, best certified Climate Smart, not just committees, but counties in in New York State. And so, there are a list of specific actions that we can take that will move us, at least just secure, Evelyn, its Silver, am I correct?

Deputy Executive Wright 1:09:28

I think that's right. Yeah.

Chairwoman Greene 1:09:31

Yeah. And to at least maintain Silver, and maybe even go to the next step. But Ulster County has been doing really well. And that Building Energy Report that Nick Hvozda put together is a real reflection of the leadership that the Department of Environment has taken consistently.

So again, this is a partnership being between the legislative branch and the county committee, which actually, Legislator Petit created, the County Climate Smart Committee, which is the Climate Task Force for Ulster County. So, we're working together, and we'll be doing certain events and taking certain actions and recommending certain actions. And after we have our next meeting, it'll be more clear, I'll be able to articulate that better, but I just wanted to report that back.

Any other information? And this is just an aside, it's not in not old business or new business, but I have the privilege of mentoring 25 people, and this cohort happens to be in The Greater New York Metropolitan Area. Last time I'm going to project everybody was up here in that same Valley. But it's part of... we trained 6,000 people in July, and in August for training in additional 4,000 people. So, 10,000 people around the world will be trained in Climate Reality. Which is, you know, you'll probably remember the inconvenient truth that Al Gore brought forward, which states the problems. But the beautiful thing about the Climate Reality training is it also focuses on the solutions. And so, people all over the world will be working on their, in their communities to do what we're doing here, right now with solid waste, and energy, and a new solar system, etc. So, I'm very appreciative.

And I want to just remind the agency, it would probably expedite things if you decided that it made sense for the Legislature to take lead on the SEQRA process as we move forward. But, and that's not to say, that if your attorney advises otherwise, you know, we'll certainly acknowledge that. But I think it's the best way to expedite moving forward.

Any, any other last minute comments or? Well, I just want to say how appreciative I am. And we will move forward and work together and that's what's going to get noticed, that's Gold Star rating.

I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Legislator Bruno 1:13:03

I'll make that motion.

Chairwoman Greene 1:13:06

Okay, second, Legislator Wawro.

Chairwoman Greene 1:13:09

All in favor?

All

Aye.

Chairwoman Greene 1:13:11

Thank you all very much. Anyone opposed? Okay. meeting is adjourned at 8:04 pm, Considering that we got a late start, we did great. Thank you.