

**Laws & Rules, Governmental Services Committee
Regular Meeting Minutes**

DATE & TIME: December 20, 2021 – 6:00 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meetings, Meeting ID: 851 0951 5753
By Phone (646) 558-8656
PRESIDING OFFICER: Chairwoman Bartels
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Jay Mahler, Deputy Clerk
PRESENT: Legislators Gavaris & Heppner
ABSENT: Legislator Roberts & Ronk
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes

OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Archer, Cahill, Delaune, Greene, Litts, Petit, Uchitelle & Walter, Legislator-Elect Maloney, Clerk of the Legislature Fabella, Legislative Counsel Ragucci, Minority Counsel Pascale, Deputy County Executives Contreras, Milgrim & Rider, County Attorney Johnson, Director Weidemann and representatives from Harris Beach – UC Department of Economic Development, Insurance Officer Whitney & Deputy Lovetre – UC Insurance Department, Comptroller Gallagher & Deputy Comptroller DiMarco – UC Comptroller’s Office, Jamie Capuano – SUNY Ulster Community College, Mid-Hudson News correspondent

Chairwoman Bartels called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM

Motion No. 1: Moved to APPROVE Minutes of the November 15th Meeting

Motion By: Legislator Heppner
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Gavaris & Heppner
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 3
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Minutes APPROVED

Chairwoman Bartels advised the members that she would be taking some Resolutions out of order to accommodate Department heads in attendance.

See attached transcript

Resolutions for the December 21, 2021 Session of the Legislature

Resolution No. 610: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$905,634.00 Entered Into By The County – NCACOMP, Inc – Insurance Department

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with NCACOMP, Inc. in the amount of \$905,634 for self-insurance and workers compensation services from January 1, 2022 – December 31, 2024.

Motion No. 2: **Resolution No. 610 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION**

Motion By: Legislator Heppner

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Gavaris & Heppner

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 3

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

LATE Resolution No. 649: Approving The Advancement Of Capital Projects For The Ulster County Community College

Resolution Summary: This resolution approves capital projects for SUNY Ulster County Community College in the amount of \$9,042,638.

Motion No. 3: **Resolution No. 649 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION**

Motion By: Legislator Heppner

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Gavaris & Heppner

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 3

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Chairwoman Bartels recognized Director Weidemann to make a presentation to the committee in relation to Late Resolution No. 650 - Authorizing The Required Steps For The Transfer Of Certain Real Properties Owned By Ulster County And Located At The Site Known As IBM Tech City East, Town Of Ulster, To The Ulster County Economic Development Alliance, Inc.

See attached transcript.

Resolution No. 376: Authorizing The Termination Of A Lease Agreement With CPR Kingston, LLC Bank For Space Used By The Board Of Elections

Resolution Summary: This resolution terminates a lease with CPR Kingston, LLC for office space used by the Board of Elections at 284 Wall Street, Kingston.

Motion No. 4: **Resolution No. 376 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION**
Motion By: Legislator Heppner
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: See attached transcript

Motion No. 5: **MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution No. 376**
Motion By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: See attached transcript

Motion to postpone withdrawn

Disposition: **NO ACTION TAKEN**

Resolution No. 395: Setting A Public Hearing On Proposed Local Law No. 7 Of 2021, A Local Law Amending The Code Of The County Of Ulster In Relation To Evictions, To Be Held On Tuesday, January 4, 2022 At 6:30 PM

Resolution Summary: This resolution sets a Public Hearing to provide the public the opportunity to offer comments on Proposed Local Law No. 7 of 2021 on Tuesday, January 4th at 6:30 PM.

Motion No. 6: **Resolution No. 395 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION**
Motion By: Legislator Heppner
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: See attached transcript

Disposition: **NO ACTION TAKEN**

Resolution No. 551: Adopting Proposed Local Law No. 8 Of 2021, A Local Law Amending The Code Of The County Of Ulster, Chapter 304, Solid Waste, Article IV, Food Waste Prevention And Recovery, In Relation To Composting

Resolution Summary: This resolution adopts Proposed Local Law No. 8 of 2021

Motion No. 7: **Resolution No. 551 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION**
Motion By: Legislator Heppner
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Gavaris & Heppner
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 3
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 552: Calling Organizational Meeting Of 2022

Resolution Summary: This resolution sets the date and time for the Organizational Meeting of the Ulster County Legislature to be held on Monday, January 10, 2022 at 6:30 PM.

Motion No. 8: **Resolution No. 552 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION**
Motion By: Legislator Heppner
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: See attached transcript

Motion No. 9: **Motion TO AMEND Resolution No. 552 to change the date of the Organizational Meeting from January 4th to January 10th**
Motion By: Legislator Heppner
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Gavaris & Heppner
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 3
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Amendment ADOPTED**

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Gavaris & Heppner
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 3
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED AS AMENDED**

Resolution No. 557: Setting A Public Hearing On Proposed Local Law No. 9 Of 2021, A Local Law Amending The Code Of The County Of Ulster, Chapter 131, Vehicles, County, Article I, Sustainable Green Fleet Policy, In Relation To Strategies And Goals, To Be Held On Tuesday, January 4, 2022 At 6:30 PM

Resolution Summary: This resolution sets a Public Hearing to provide the public the opportunity to offer comments on Proposed Local Law No. 9 of 2021 on Tuesday, January 4th at 6:30 PM.

Discussion: See attached transcript

Disposition: **NO ACTION TAKEN**

LATE Resolution No. 650: Authorizing The Required Steps For The Transfer Of Certain Real Properties Owned By Ulster County And Located At The Site Known As IBM Tech City East, Town Of Ulster, To The Ulster County Economic Development Alliance, Inc.

Resolution Summary: This resolution authorizes various steps required pursuant to sections of the Not-For-Profit Corporation Law of the State of New York (the “LDC Act”) to transfer county owned property at Tech City East acquired by Ulster County by tax foreclosure under Article 11 of the Real Property Tax Law to an LDC.

Motion No. 10: **Resolution No. 650 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION**
Motion By: Legislator Heppner
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: See attached transcript

Motion No. 11: **MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution No. 650 to a Special Meeting on December 21st at 6:40 PM, or immediately following the Public Hearing**
Motion By: Legislator Gavaris
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Heppner

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Gavaris & Heppner
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 3
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution POSTPONED**

LATE Resolution No. 651: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$500,000.00, Entered Into By The County – Accucare N & H Inc. – Department Of Health

Resolution Summary: This resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment with Accucare N & H, Inc. in the amount of \$500,000 to increase funding for COVID-19 related nursing services

Motion No. 12: **Resolution No. 650 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION**
Motion By: Legislator Heppner
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Gavaris & Heppner
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 3
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Chairwoman Bartels moved on to the Forthcoming Local Laws portion of the agenda. See attached transcript.

Chairwoman Bartels asked if there was any old or new business. See attached transcript.

Adjournment

Motion Made By: Legislator Gavaris
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Heppner

No. of Votes in Favor: 3
No. of Votes Against: 0

TIME: 6:55 PM

Respectfully submitted: Deputy Clerk Mahler
Minutes Approved: February 10, 2022

**Laws & Rules, Governmental Services Committee
Regular Meeting Transcript**

DATE & TIME: December 20, 2021 – 6:00 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meetings, Meeting ID: 851 0951 5753
By Phone (646) 558-8656
PRESIDING OFFICER: Chairwoman Bartels
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Deputy Clerk Mahler, Deputy Clerk
PRESENT: Legislators Gavaris & Heppner
ABSENT: Legislator Roberts & Ronk
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes

OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Archer, Cahill, Delaune, Greene, Litts, Petit, Uchitelle & Walter, Legislator-Elect Maloney, Clerk of the Legislature Fabella, Legislative Counsel Ragucci, Minority Counsel Pascale, Deputy County Executives Contreras, Milgrim & Rider, County Attorney Johnson, Director Weidemann and representatives from Harris Beach – UC Department of Economic Development, Insurance Officer Whitney & Deputy Lovetre – UC Insurance Department, Comptroller Gallagher & Deputy Comptroller DiMarco – UC Comptroller’s Office, Jamie Capuano – SUNY Ulster Community College, Mid-Hudson News correspondent

Chairwoman Bartels called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, great. Welcome to the December 20th meeting of laws, rules and Government Services Committee. Clerk Mahler. Do you mind taking attendance

Deputy Clerk Mahler

Sure thing. Chairwoman Bartels

Chairwoman Bartels

Here

Deputy Clerk Mahler

Deputy Chair Roberts, Legislator Gavaris

Legislator Gavaris

Present

Deputy Clerk Mahler

Legislator Heppner

Legislator Heppner

Here

Deputy Clerk Mahler

And Legislator Ronk. You have three members present, two absent.

Chairwoman Bartels

Great, thank you. Um, I will entertain a motion for approval of the November 15 regular meeting minutes and transcript.

Legislator Heppner

So moved.

Legislator Gavaris

Second

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. Is there any discussion on the meeting minutes and transcript? Hearing none, all those in favor of accepting the motion? Aye? Opposed? Okay, passes unanimously. We still have more people joining.

So what I'm going to ask if everyone will bear with me is that we take Resolutions 649, which is late Resolution approving the advancement of capital projects for the Ulster County Community College and Resolution 651 out of order. That's the approving of the execution of a contract amendment for oh, no, that's okay. Let's, let's we have, let's do 649. That's 610 and 649 out of water. So because we have Dorraine Whitney, here with us, and Jamie Capuano from the college and that way we can get the two of you out. I mean, you're welcome to stay for the full presentation. But given that that might take a little longer, and I'd like to give another minute for any other Legislators that may be joining us to join. So can we begin with Resolution number 610? If there's no objection? None? Resolution 610 is approving the execution of a contract for \$905,634 entered into by the county NCACOMP insurance department. Motion.

Legislator Heppner

Move it.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. And a second.

Legislator Gavaris

Second

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. Thank you. moved by Legislator Heppner, seconded by Legislator Gavaris. Miss Whitney, thank you for joining us. Do you mind just explaining the Resolution to us for the record?

Director Whitney

Sure. On what this is, is it's our contract with our third party administrator for our workers compensation program. So it's the Ulster County self insurance plan. And we've been with NCA comp since 2014. We had initially had a three year contract, which we did renew, we added two amendments, and it ended up being five years. So we've decided to stay with them at this point. And so this is the beginning of another term of this, there's nothing really too much different in the pricing. I mean, it's a little bit higher than it was. What we're doing, though, is it's, it's inflated, of course, in a regular way that you know, medical bills are still costing more. Generally workers comp costs go up each year. And we found that their program is really effective. We've been working very well with them. And I feel that the fact that we've been keeping our budget relatively level the last couple of years, if not reducing it a little bit. I I've been very happy. And I think we all agree that they're a good team and the county has been working very well with them to cover our comp our worker's comp.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. And this is something you discussed in some detail in your budget presentation to us as well. Are there any questions regarding this Resolution? Okay, seeing none, all those in favor of Resolution 610? Aye. Opposed? Okay. Passes unanimously. Thank you very much for joining us.

Director Whitney

Thank you too.

Chairwoman Bartels

Moving on to Resolution 649 approving the advancement of capital projects for the Ulster County Community College. Entertain a motion.

Legislator Heppner

I'll move it

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. Moved by Legislator Heppner, seconded by Legislator Gavaris. Thank you Miss Capuano for joining us. Do you mind just telling us a little bit about this? I think we know why it's late. But even if you could speak to that as well.

Legislator Gavaris

Second

Jamie Capuano

Sure. Thank you. So this Resolution is a Resolution that the state requires that we submit with our capital plan for the upcoming state budget. So in order for our projects to be included in the executive budget, they require this Resolution passed by the board. This is late we missed a, sorry. We missed. Sorry. So we just had miscommunication on our side in terms of getting this Resolution to the board at the budget vote, but typically this Resolution would come after the capital project approval at the budget vote. And that's when you would typically see this Resolution. Again, it's just in support of the capital project, we'd be coming back to the full Legislature for the approval of any advancement of capital specific capital projects within the plan. This does not authorize the funding, just the advancement of the projects for SUNY and division of budget approval.

Chairwoman Bartels

Great. Any questions on the Resolution? All those in favor? Aye. Opposed? Passes unanimously. Okay, thank you very much.

Jamie Capuano

Thank you.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, we will now return to the to the top of our agenda. First thing that we had on the agenda is a presentation from Director Weidemann, Department of Economic Development. It's regarding a Resolution later in our packet, it has to do with the transfer of what's known as enterprise East, Tech City East, the former IBM site. So I'm going to turn the floor over to Director Wiedemann. And thank you very much for joining us. And I also want to thank the county attorney for, for joining us and being present to answer any questions, should they arise.

Director Tim Wiedemann

Thank you, Chairwoman Bartels, pleasure to be here. I also want to thank our team from Harris Beech, who have been advisors to UCEDA through the process, who are also with us tonight. And I'm going to share my screen if I might, I think Jay gave me the power. So let me do that quick here. Can everyone see my presentation now?

Great. Alright, so I, you know, I think it's probably helpful for me to walk through some of the kind of background and details of the proposed transaction here. Many of us have had phone calls and discussions, and we had a public forum with Town of Ulster citizens a week or so ago. But to just give you the all the the, the full picture, and some minor updates, as things have evolved over the last several days and weeks, as things are kind of constantly evolving, figured I'd run through this. And there's a lot of information packed in here. So if at any point, there's something you want to discuss further, feel free to stop me. And then also, we'll be sure to have some time at the end if there's general questions and discussion. So if that sounds okay, Ms. Chairwoman?

Chairwoman Bartels

That sounds great. I may not be able to see if people, if there's an urgent question during perhaps people could put it in, in the chat, I'll try to monitor it. Because we're sharing screens, I won't be able to see everyone, but we certainly will take time at the end. So if you could just note your questions. And ideally, we'll take them at the end unless they're urgent.

Deputy Clerk Mahler

And if I can interrupt before you get cooking Director Weidemann, I'm gonna let in a caller I'm not familiar with if you could just give me two seconds. Good evening, "Call in user one". Could we please have your name for the record?

Director Whitney

Hey, it's Dorraine again, I got cut off on my on my video.

Deputy Clerk Mahler

Oh. Okay. Thanks Dorraine

Director Whitney

Sorry about that.

Deputy Clerk Mahler

Go ahead, Tim. Sorry.

Director Tim Wiedemann

No worries. Alright, so we've been through this part of the story. But just to remind everyone of where we've been, it's been a rough quarter century at the former IBM site. I won't bore all of you who know the story as well or better than I do with all the details of the challenge that we face there. But a reminder that we've spent a lot of time talking about what could have been at this site, thinking and dreaming about what would be in the future. And I think this is an exciting moment where we're really turning the page into a new chapter in the history of this site. And so it's no surprise that we have received initially an RFEI submission for national resources that evolved. Subsequently, to learn that there was a discussion with Allen Ginsberg to purchase the remainder of the east side of the campus.

And so this is kind of outline and, you know, describe the details of what's proposed in that, uh, that purchase by national resources, which has formed a special purpose LLC called I Park 87, representing their intent to use their I-Park brand to redevelop the former IBM site. And so you know, a lot of exciting things that are in the future. But before we can get to those things, the matter at hand, is the transaction to provide site control. Ultimately, from Alan Ginsberg over to national resources and their, I-Park 87 LLC.

So a reminder of where that will go once it's completed, or at least where it's slated to go. National Resources has indicated an intent to invest up to \$200 million dollars in redevelopment of the site. And they expect to create a campus of mixed use commercial, industrial, and even residential and recreational uses, which would support up to 1000 new jobs, and would really focus on sustainability as the model for the campus. And so all of that, I mean,

I think if you have a pulse that all sounds exciting, we would probably agree on that. But the question is, how do they get there, and when do they get there, and what does it take to get there, and so I'm going to walk you through the gist of that here tonight. You all are familiar that back on December 1, we received a signed order from Judge Rounds. That was a stipulation of settlement on the foreclosure proceeding. So, back in July, the county started the foreclosure process on these parcels on the east side of the campus. National Resources subsequently approached the county to assist with their proposed acquisition since this was in foreclosure. And ultimately, the Settlement Agreement became the roadmap for the foreclosure to proceed, and for a sale that would result in the transfer back to national resources at the end of the deal.

And a reminder that what is in front of us now is the only option on the table other than continuing to pursue the foreclosure proceedings that we had initiated. And so if no settlement can be reached on the foreclosure, that means the foreclosure process continues to proceed. We're confident and I think, thanks to the due diligence and hard work of the county attorney's office, well positioned to succeed in that foreclosure process, and expect with high degree of confidence that eventually the judge would rule in favor of the county on that foreclosure proceeding. But unfortunately, that might not be the end of the story, a transfer of the properties to the county could get held up by a legal process that could involve things such as a bankruptcy proceeding, or you know, piecemeal sale of the properties and a number of other possible scenarios that could slow down that process of getting site control through foreclosure. And in the meantime, this is the rough part, is that we know that the properties have been declining.

But the speed at which they're likely to climb is is, is, you know, what would be expected to increase if we're in the limbo state of a foreclosure proceeding that's ultimately going to result in a successful transfer of the properties, but a delaying tactic by the current owner to try to hold on to the value of the asset as long as possible, which would really throw the properties into a state of limbo, we would see continued no tax payments on the properties. further deterioration of the buildings, which notably for some of them could mean increased environmental concerns, and no economic activity on the site and all the lost kind of opportunity costs that that represents in terms of potential economic activity. And ultimately, that continues the vicious cycle that we've already seen, really kind of eating away at the bones of the site. And that only makes it harder to revive the site once we finally find their way out of that vicious cycle.

And just to be blunt about it means that the liabilities will continue to accrue on this property as they have been in the past, and probably with increasing speed over the next several years if we don't find a way to settle this and get somebody responsible to own the properties and invest in them. So the terms of the proposed sale is to first purchase the remainder of Ginsburg's properties indicated in yellow on the map. Now that's over 160 acres and includes the master parcel that underlies the industrial condo parcels there that you can see as faint yellow lines that surround the footprints of buildings. The green is the properties that the county foreclosed on previously in 2019, and that have since been transferred in surplus to the LDC. And then the light blue are the ones that were purchased by a clothing wholesaler and distributor called Mio Marino from Allen Ginsburg several months ago. The purchase price is proposed to be \$12 million, which would be paid in \$5 million in cash payments over five years, plus a credit of \$7 million for the cleanup of the environmental issues caused by Mr. GINSBERG during his tenure.

And you know, this is something that we've talked a little bit about since the first presentation of the terms but just to make it clear and be direct about it. There is a second payment that's made by Mr. Kotter to Mr. Ginsburg, in the amount of \$4 million. That is not a windfall to Mr. Ginsburg, but is instead required in order to disentangle the properties from him. There's a lot of encumbrances, including debt that the properties are securing. There's liens and judgments against the properties. There's outstanding bills to the property manager and for utilities. And then there's closing costs and that amount that would be paid in this separate deal is to cover those costs. The purchase ultimately requires the buyer to complete cleanup and to start redevelopment, which is handled through some development milestones that I'll walk through in a minute. And if those milestones aren't met, then the property would revert back to the county.

So those milestones, the first milestone that the developer would be required to complete is to enter into what's called a bonafide prospective purchaser agreement that's with EPA. Right now, Alan Ginsburg is under a uniform administrative order, which is basically an enforcement action by EPA that says you must clean up this to our specifications. If Joe and national resources I-Park 87 are to step into Alan's shoes and complete the cleanup they can't do so until they're under an enforcement instrument like a bonafide prospective purchaser agreement with EPA. And so the first milestone is to say, Look, you have to do that you have to get under an agreement with EPA to do the cleanup. And the milestone is to set that within six months and if that's not met, then to revert the property.

The second milestone is to remediate the the asbestos piles to EPA satisfaction. Ultimately, it's an EPA enforcement action. And EPA is the one that's going to govern whether or not that's completed successfully. Our milestone is that that needs to be completed within 12 months. And then the third milestone is to rehab or demolish building one, which is the giant building behind the clock tower building in fairly bad shape and in need of remediation. And to do that, again to EPA specifications, and to EPA satisfaction as part of the enforcement action as well. And the milestone there is to complete that within 24 months.

And then finally moving past the cleanup, and starting to chip away at the redevelopment of the site in earnest. We have a final milestone to finance 100,000 square feet of either new or rehab space on the property within the five year window of payments to the county, that's kind of our recapture window is the five years and it would end with this milestone. So the steps that we've completed to this point, just to kind of lay them out there, and then I'll talk about the remaining steps. Back on December 1 Judge Rounds issued that order and stipulation of settlement that was the roadmap for the foreclosure and sale. And then on the second, the county Legislature passed a Resolution to authorize it to accept the deeds and to set a public hearing. On the 12th we had a forum with Town of Ulster citizens, which was well attended and had some good questions, got a chance to discuss this and share some of the basic deal structure and terms during that conversation.

And now we're moving into the remaining steps that include the Legislature's public hearing tomorrow evening at 630. And that a Resolution 650, which is on the agenda for tonight, but I understand Legislator Bartels, will be pushed to a joint session of laws and rules and ways and means tomorrow after the public hearing. And then ultimately, if it passes through committee taken up by the full body at the regular session meeting tomorrow evening. And then either that night, actually, we have a UCEDA special meeting that night that if the Legislature does authorize the transfer to UCEDA that the purchase and sale agreement would be authorized by UCEDA tomorrow night as well, which sets up the execution of the purchase and sale agreement on the following day.

So those are kind of the big picture steps that have been taken, that remain to be taken, I want to talk about, this may get, I apologize if I got a little carried away in my PowerPoint presentation. But I think there's a lot of mechanics in the way that this works. And it's not just a straight sale, if it was a straight sale, we probably wouldn't need to be here tonight. There's kind of a complicated series of transactions that have to happen in order for this to occur. And a lot of the questions that I've gotten both during that public forum and in conversation with you all has to do with this sequence of steps and how this all actually works. And I think it also sheds light on why it's all structured the way it is because ultimately, the series of steps are really important to take in sequence.

So the first step here, I mentioned that there's this separate deal between national resources and Alan Ginsburg, that's ultimately what allows Mr. Ginsburg to surrender the deeds to the property. And so once that that that agreement is reached, then the properties and the deeds will be turned over to the court, ultimately awaiting a judgment. And once that judgment is in place, then the foreclosure action proceeds. And so those properties then are foreclosed on and Alan's out of the picture. That's important, like I just want to impress the reason that this is set up in the sequence that it is, the first thing that happens is we get Mr. Ginsberg out of the picture. Obviously, that's been a challenge for past deals, and it's important to make sure that we can move ahead without his further actions or concerns or, or decisions to be made in the future.

So then, once that happens, the court would issue the judgment awarding the properties to the county. So the county receives the deeds. And then the county files those deeds and authorizes, potentially tomorrow night, the transfer of those deeds to UCEDA. Once that occurs, then UCEDA has to actually vote to accept the deeds, they would do that tomorrow night's meeting if the Legislature approves the transfer, and then UCEDA and I-Park 87 can execute the purchase and sale agreement. And once that happens, then subsequent to that in the first quarter of 2022 the deeds would actually transfer to I-Park 87. In the meantime, there would be a license agreement that allows I-Park 87 to have control and ultimately to take responsibility for the property so that it's not UCEDA's to pay bills to manage the tenants all that kind of stuff. And so then at the end of this, the real kind of purpose of it is that the annual payments those \$5 million in 1 million increments would be paid to UCEDA but then passed back as per the surplus Resolution that proceeds of a sale would be returned to the county and so those annual payments would flow back to the county. And UCEDA would monitor those redevelopment milestones and if there was a need to revert would have the authority to revert the property back to county control.

So that's the sequence that's hopefully helpful. I would appreciate feedback, if any of that's confusing, but that's I think, you know, at the level of detail that we've gotten and ultimately ready to move this forward with the Legislature's blessing on the surplus Resolution. So just before I end, there's a lot more information that we've posted up on the county website, including details from the original RFEI submission, the master plan for the campus, a map of the parcels included, all of that, as well as an FAQ document are up on the county website at the link that's there. And since we're still in the public hearing window, we have been sharing Vicky, I'm sorry, I don't think you're on the call, but we've been sharing Vicky's email so that folks can submit their comments if they choose to to the Legislature.

That's it from me, Legislator Bartels. So I'll pass it back to you.

Chairwoman Bartels

Great. Thank you very much. Jay, do you mind taking back over the screen so I can see everyone at once or at least the bulk at once. Okay, I see Legislator Walter has a virtual hand up.

Legislator Walter

Thanks, Tim, just in those drawings. So, and correct me if I'm wrong, because I don't have it in front of me. But it was that it was 12 million, but then 7 million is back to them to deal with the cleanup. So that leaves the five is that, I just didn't see it in the cartoon. But so it [inaudible] But that's how it works is essentially they give us 12 in a way, and then we give them back seven. And then but we don't actually do that transaction. But that's it was really a 12 million, right?

Director Tim Wiedemann

If I might, yeah, the the way that it's envisioned is that there's a \$12 million purchase price price with a \$7 million upfront credit provided against that purchase price, which leaves the balances 5 million paid over five years, there is a condition in the purchase and sale agreement for a true up at the end of the five years. So if they can't, they have to provide receipts and invoices and all documentation on their expenses for cleanup. And if that came out to say 6 million, then they would owe an additional million dollars in purchase price bringing the cash purchase price up to 6 million.

Legislator Walter

And then could you just explain so say they defaulted? What happens to the cleanup and that, is that then stays as our responsibility? Is that correct?

Director Tim Wiedemann

That's correct. If if we choose to revert, if they fail at the milestones, then we have the choice to revert. So it's clear that if we decided to give them more time, if there's some reasonable explanation of why they weren't able

to meet those milestones, that would be an option. But if we did revert, then it would be back into county control. And we would ultimately seek a more responsible party to complete the cleanup. Either if the county chose to do it itself or to seek another, another developer to complete the cleanup. And ultimately, let me just point out that until the cleanup is complete to EPA satisfaction, Alan Ginsburg remains liable for the cleanup. And so one avenue there would be to continue to pursue Alan for the cost of the cleanup. He would be obligated to do that. And as you know, EPA has, I'd love to use the term purse, pierce the corporate veil. And so ultimately, he's personally and potentially criminally liable if he doesn't comply.

Chairwoman Bartels

And if I might just jump in and for point of clarification, in the event that they spend more than the \$7 million credit that is that's on the developer that doesn't there's no, okay, just confirming

Director Tim Wiedemann

The credit is not more than 7 million. It could be less if they can't prove that they've spent 7 million in cleanup costs, but it can't be more.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. Does anyone else? Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris

Thank you. Maybe you can help me with this. In the, there was an FAQ sent around. And in there is a question related to how was how were they chosen? And it says they weren't because it's not county owned. But that's not true. It is County owned so I'm confused over that statement.

Director Tim Wiedemann

So point of clarification, and tell me if I miss you on this in any way. But the parcels in question here. There are two or three of them that are county owned from a foreclosure action, Clint would have to help me, maybe five years ago. Those are our parcels that have not been actively marketed recently, I think they were actually attempted to auction and there were no bidders on the auction years ago. So just to clarify, the county really does not own the majority of these parcels on the east side. So we weren't seeking buyers. We were not seeking bidders or developers to enter into anything here. We sought partners on the west side of the campus for the enterprise West Campus. And out of that seeking became aware of the fact that national resources was interested both on the west side but really because they had started negotiations with Alan on the east side. So we weren't in a position to choose the partner on the east side. On the east side the partner kind of chose us. They went to Alan and started to negotiate a deal, realized there was a foreclosure proceeding, and so in order to come to any conclusion on that deal, they would need to enter into discussions with us.

Legislator Gavaris

Okay, it still doesn't answer. I guess it sort of answers why you didn't go out to with another you know, RPI are trying to find another interested buyer. But it doesn't answer it at the same time, there was no attempt other than putting up the auction block to do this before. So I don't know if we're limiting ourselves. And I don't think we are. But I'm just playing devil's advocate here. And I could see where this could be questionable.

Director Tim Wiedemann

Yeah, I understand. I think I understand where you're coming from grappling with, is there some better option out there? Or at least, you know, could there be? You know, I think that's a dangerous slope, because that's ultimately, you know, I think that the, the, the narrative that has made it hard to ever take action on this site, is that there's somehow some better offer out there. And ultimately, I think that better offer has, has never materialized, materialized to date. And, and it seems unlikely that it's just out there hiding, especially at this point.

Chairwoman Bartels

Any other questions at the moment? Comptroller Gallagher.

Comptroller March Gallagher

Tim, could you just speak to the status of parcel 270? Which I understand is the parking lots parcel. I'm a little bit confused. It is named in paragraph one of the settlement agreement. What is the status that parcel right now? How will that parcel throat, flow through your diagrams? Thank you.

Director Tim Wiedemann

I don't have the map in front of me. So you might have to help me remember which one is 270? Anybody have the map?

Deputy Executive Rider

I think she is referring to the master parcel.

Director Tim Wiedemann

So yeah, so the master parcel is a part of the transaction. It comes with a management agreement that flows with the parcel, whoever owns it is responsible to uphold the conditions in terms of that management agreement. It is a part of the transaction envisioned here it is one of the parcels that Alan would surrender, withdraws foreclosure objections, and that would go through the float foreclosure process. And then ultimately, after the Resolution to surplus, the property moves back to UCEDA then would be part of the purchase and sale agreement. Maybe that's not answering your question.

Comptroller March Gallagher

Is the parcel part of the foreclosure. Is that is the master parcel part of that foreclosure?

Director Tim Wiedemann

Yes, it is.

Chairwoman Bartels

And again, for clarification on on both questions from comptroller Gallagher and from Legislator Gavaris, those, those parcels that are part of the foreclosure are not yet owned by the county, they are in the process of foreclosure.

Director Tim Wiedemann

Correct.

Chairwoman Bartels

I just want to be clear for the record. Legislator Gavaris

Legislator Gavaris

Clarification question. Is as long as everything goes according to the plan, is there any anticipation of having to come to the Legislature and ask for money for anything towards this?

Director Tim Wiedemann

I am hesitant to ever answer that question again. But I think it's safe. And I'm looking at Clint, I think it's safe to say that no, there wouldn't be an instance, this is one where the the plan is to offload them as quickly as humanly possible to this developer to take responsibility for the cleanup efforts and to not have the county or UCEDA have to shoulder that burden.

Deputy Executive Rider

If I can just add, and that Tim brought up the license agreement that allows national resources to take kind of ownership now, meaning they'll be the ones plowing the parking lots, they'll be the ones paying utilities and everything else, while the deeds are, you know, have in that 90 Day pause or however long.

Legislator Gavaris

We will have to pay the taxes at least some portion of it like with enterprise West. No?

Director Tim Wiedemann

No, no, this is envisioned to you know, basically, it's this part is kind of like a standard closing that. Basically at the closing, there will be a reconciliation of taxes owed. But ultimately, the you know, the \$12 million back taxes number that we throw around is basically current as of December. And so if this all happens in December, then likely the properties all transfer over and I-Park 87 will be responsible for taxes immediately.

Chairwoman Bartels

Can I ask, does someone have the the number the annual number, the annual tax payments that the county is currently making to make the the town and the schools whole?

Director Tim Wiedemann

I don't have the number. My recollection is that the amount to make them whole is somewhere around \$600,000. But I would have to fact check that and also remember that we in a sense, we don't make ourselves whole so there may be a higher actual tax liability than that. That's just the town and the school district liabilities, but I'd have to double check.

Chairwoman Bartels

Could we could we before tomorrow's meeting get that get exact number? I mean, I think it is important to note that in the absence of this, I mean, it's something we've been doing on an annual basis, you know, for as long as these properties have been in default, but in the absence of an agreement, that would continue to be our responsibility. I'm seeing I see no hands at the moment, I'm going to ask another question, the purchase and sale agreement, it's going to have the explicit requirements that you laid out the six month, 12 month, 24 month, and the five year requirement, those are all going to be laid out in the purchase and sale agreement between UCEDA and the developer. Is that correct?

Director Tim Wiedemann

That's correct.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Greene?

Chairwoman Manna Jo Greene

Um, I just want to check. I've asked this a few times. But I want to be sure that we're only talking about enterprise East, and that there are no strings attached to Enterprise West.

Director Tim Wiedemann

Yes, that's correct. And good question. That is true. This is only on enterprise east, the purchaser through national resources, their parent entity remains interested in negotiating some sort of arrangement to be a developer development partner on the west side. But that has not been negotiated. And this has no bearing on that.

Chairwoman Bartels

I don't see any other hands. I do have another question. Regarding in the in the slide, you talked about the I think, I believe in the settlement agreement it's called the developer agreement and the \$4 million to disentangle and pay down debts and closing costs. Is it, is it anticipated, that that is going to be paid directly to the creditors? Or is it going to flow through the corporation? And will there be specific strings attached to to ensure that it's actually used to pay the creditors rather than to enrich, the, I don't know if it's a company or if it's if it's Alan Ginsberg, personally.

Director Tim Wiedemann

So, you know, I wish that I could say more about it. But it's ultimately a private deal between two private parties. I think the best that I can say is what's been relayed to me by national resources to explain that that amount, which includes \$2.5 million of debt that needs to be paid, which is secured by the properties, about \$750,000 of back bills, including the management company's bills, a \$634,000, EPA lien for the piles they covered them with tarps, and then the closing costs. So I think that's a adds up to almost exactly 4 million, a little shy of 4 million. So it leaves me to believe that there's some small amount that ultimately Alan or his attorneys require, but, but ultimately, it gives me confidence that what we're talking about here is the necessary things for national resources to actually be able to move forward with clean title to secure financing for their work.

Chairwoman Bartels

Comptroller Gallagher.

Comptroller March Gallagher

I understand that through the \$7 million credit, the taxpayers will be you know, basically assisting in the cleanup costs of the property, is there anything in the purchase and sale agreement that speaks to double dipping, if the developer is able to obtain other resources from taxpayers, like brownfield tax credits, etc, to pay for cleanup?

Director Tim Wiedemann

I don't believe that that's been contemplated. Ultimately, I think that whatever the resources that are available and legitimate for funding this kind of work, I'm sure that the developer is eager to explore those and use those to complete the work. As we've mentioned before, EPA estimates the cost to be a minimum of \$7 million, and estimates go up to 12 million. So I think there's a substantial amount of work here that probably will require many sources in order to get completed.

Chairwoman Bartels

Go ahead

Comptroller March Gallagher

So if, if the developer is able to obtain resources that are taxpayer dollars from state or federal sources, that should weigh in to what comes back to UCEDA, for Ulster County taxpayers. Otherwise, taxpayers are paying twice to clean up the property.

Director Tim Wiedemann

You know, I, I would see that as I would differ in that opinion. I think that there are many sources out there and ultimately, a project of this scale would normally use multiple sources. So but I understand and hear what you're saying.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Litts, I've got you in one sec. I just want to follow on comptroller Gallagher's comment. Well, first of all, again, just a question. that that concern would be addressed in the purchase sale agreement, because that's where the details will be drawn up regarding regarding that, the how the financial figures are going to flow. Correct? So that's something that could still be contemplated in that agreement.

Director Tim Wiedemann

I would say that that feels like an incredible ask at this late juncture to try to make it clear that there's somehow no provision for them to pursue other funds that are specifically designated for cleanup activity that that seems challenging.

Chairwoman Bartels

Can I just, I mean, I may be speaking for Comptroller Gallagher and you can, you can stop me, but I guess she's touched on something I thought of. When you talk about that, I guess you called it the true up at the end of five years. My my thought, and I could have been reading it wrong. But my thought was that that true up, would be an analysis of what the developer actually spent in the cleanup, not if the developer received 12 million in in state, or federal funding or some outside funding well, particularly taxpayer funding for the cleanup that that wouldn't apply toward the seven because it wouldn't have been out of pocket for the developer. So, am I misunderstanding you, Comptroller Gallagher?

Comptroller March Gallagher

No, that's correct, that it would factor into a true up calculation, because the developer already would have been reimbursed for those expenditures,

Chairwoman Bartels

they wouldn't have been developer expenses, not that the developer shouldn't or couldn't pursue all avenues possible in order to, to to get those to get those funds. And certainly, if there were outside funds available, more power to them. Even even other taxpayer funds, I just, I didn't anticipate that that would be a part of a final calculation. Let me let me go to Legislator Litts because he had his hand up, and we can revisit

Legislator Herbert Litts, III

I want, I wanted to weigh in, in this discussion, because he gets credit for \$7 million towards the cleanup. That's not a freebie he has to supply us all his bills and everything that he has spent to recoup that \$7 million. So if he gets a grant, and he's paying, and it's getting paid for by taxpayer dollars. That's not his out of pocket expense expense. So he's not going to receive a credit against the 7 million that we're crediting him, if it's not out of his expenses.

Chairwoman Bartels

Is that, Deputy Executive Rider.

Deputy Executive Rider

I'll just say in any developers calculation on a on a deal like this. They're fully aware of different funding sources. And when they are coming to the table with negotiations, they're going to be thinking that those are all part of kind of bear expenses. As Tim said, this is kind of late in this process, not that we can't consider it or UCEDA can't consider it. But you know, they are taking the ability of getting federal and state funding probably as an option for some of this. If there happens to be a EPA or DEC grant that opens next month that none of us were aware of. I don't know that we should say, okay, that's part of your 7 million if they get funded in that. I'm not sure that makes a lot of sense.

Chairwoman Bartels

Comptroller Gallagher

Comptroller March Gallagher

I'm not asking that the developer don't take not, doesn't take advantage of state or federal dollars. In fact, if they receive state or federal dollars, I would say that would protect Ulster County taxpayers because then those portions of the credit that we're giving will flow back to UCEDA as as payment. I I think, you know, what I'm talking

about is that that that be taken into consideration that taxpayers taxpayers not pay this developer twice for the same cleanup. I hear what you're saying that the cleanup costs may way exceed the \$7 million. I've asked for documentation on the cleanup costs. I haven't received that. And, you know, to the extent that you guys are saying this as last minute, I'm sorry, you know, this is on your timeline. And I've been trying to insert myself in every stage of this process with little to no information available. So you know, I get it. I get that a lot of this is under a confidentiality to make it go. But this is the time to ask questions. If not now then when so I'm sorry to present a difficult question. It's not to stop the developer from getting state or federal dollars, it's to make sure that taxpayers don't pay \$14 million for a \$7 million cleanup. And I honestly I think the developer would see the logic in that. So I asked you to take that back to the table and and and I'll bring it to UCEDA as well, tomorrow. Thank you.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Archer, and then Legislator Walter.

Legislator Archer

So I guess my question is, I mean, did not, we have the attorneys here that drew up the agreement. Can we not get clarification from those who drew up the contract to ensure that to everyone's point that the taxpayers aren't paying for this twice?

Director Tim Wiedemann

If I might, I think I think the point is taken under advisement Legislator Archer, and I would expect and respectfully request time to discuss it with our attorneys and figure out how we might incorporate that, but I appreciate the point. It's well received. I understand, you know, the concern that it would be, you know, in the worst case scenario, a terrible disservice to taxpayers, if \$14 million was spent on \$7 million worth of expense. So I understand.

Legislator Archer

And so we will get a clarification prior to having to to decision this tomorrow.

Director Tim Wiedemann

We will bring it to the attorneys and discuss it and have one answer one way or the other for you.

Legislator Archer

Thank you.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter

Yeah, I mean, I'm not to belabor the point. But I guess my way of just asking the same question is, are they expected to tell us about other funding? I mean, that's what it would all come down to is if if there, the expectation is any other funding that they receive? Are they, are you assuming they'll tell you about that?

Director Tim Wiedemann

Well, obviously, in order to to accomplish this goal, it would be necessary to know the sources, not just the uses, and so that would be I guess, envisioned in how this would be implemented. But, again, I think we need time to digest it, to figure out if there's a reasonable way to accomplish it in the purchase and sale agreement.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Cahill

Legislator Brian Cahill

Thank you, I just want to throw this out there, I just think, um, you know, at this point, and yes, I understand that it's on the timeline that is presented by the folks involved in this transaction. But I think throwing something in there at this late in the game that may hinder the sale of this parcel is a big mistake. Because if Mr. Kotter and national resources walk away, there was no lineup of people looking for that site before. And I don't anticipate a lineup of people looking for that site afterward.

And by the way, we will become fully responsible for everything, you know, in the end, if we let this deal fall through, and I think, you know, putting, you know, additional requirements on what has been a fairly well negotiated deal, and I'm not sure if there are additional or not even, I'm just saying, if it does come down to that, I think that's a very negative thing. And it says, sends a very bad message about Ulster County overall, that we get this close to the end of a transaction, and now we're throwing all kinds of monkey wrenches in there to prevent it from completing.

I just, I just think, you know, Mr. Kotter has proven to be so far a very reputable businessman. And I don't think he's looking to take advantage of anyone anywhere. And if there's an opportunity for him to do things the right way, he's going to do them the right way. And, you know, we do have the, in the agreement that he has to prove, where, who, where and how much he paid to get rid of that. So we'll see where that goes. But I think adding anything additional at this point, it's a big mistake, and we will live to regret it. That's my prediction.

Chairwoman Bartels

Just I don't see another hand. I'm just gonna weigh in and say that, you know, I'm, I am and I have been supportive of this agreement. Since since I heard about it. I, you know, I think this is important to have a public forum where we can discuss it. But I have to say, I didn't even think to ask that question, because I just assumed, and Legislator Cahill just said it. I just assumed that an analysis of expense would be the developers expense, that, you know, as, as Legislator Litts, who's also on the UCEDA board, said that was my assumption that there was going to be an analysis of real expense. And should that real expense exceed 7 million there'd be there'd be it'd be on the developer and it should it be under the money would come back. It never crossed my mind that if the developer received the, all of the funding from state funds, the that we would then reimburse the developer, we would allow that 7 million credit to stand because that wouldn't be developer expense. So it just never occurred to me to even ask that question until today because because I was operating under the assumption, that that's what we were talking about developer expense. So I don't even think about it as something new. Yes, Director Weidemann.

Director Tim Wiedemann

Just to be clear, I have no reason to believe that the developers pursuing public sources for this cleanup. So, you know, I hear you, and I think this is exactly the value of a conversation like this is kind of thing kind of, you know, the devil is in the details. And so trying to figure out if there's some piece of this that we can strengthen. And, you know, I respect that I just ask that you understand that we, this is a very complex deal. And as the pictures hopefully got, at least across the the complexity of the moving pieces here, I, you know, want to just indicate that we will review this, do everything in our power to make sure that that possibility, which I would say is I think, you know, Legislator Cahill's said that the developer seems to be a responsive and responsible corporate citizen that I would expect would not want to put themselves or the county in that position. But ultimately here, we want to make sure that we don't end up foreclosing on a deal because of some, some issue that we can resolve in some other way, if necessary, but but again, my assurance is that we will talk with the team and figure out if there's some way that we can incorporate something that provides that protection.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. Are there any other questions? Okay. All right, seeing none. Thank you very much for the presentation for the opportunity to ask questions. It's very helpful. And thank you, everyone who's, who's present it to hear the presentation as well. So seeing no other questions, we're going to move into Resolutions. Back into Resolutions

starting at the top Resolution number 376 authorizing the termination of a lease agreement with CPR Kingston, LLC bank for space used by the board of elections. Moved by Legislator Heppner.

Legislator Heppner

Move it

Legislator Gavaris

Second

Chairwoman Bartels

Seconded by Legislator Gavaris. Legislator Gavaris. Do you want to speak on this?

Legislator Gavaris

Can I just take a motion to postpone this to next month's meeting? Or to the next meeting?

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, can we, can I suggest we're going to have this come up a couple times in in this meeting in terms of postponing things to the next, can we take no action? Can I request that we take no action? And then I know some of the sponsors for some of the Resolutions that are here. Let me just speak to this entirely now. So there's been a debate and a discussion about whether or not it's proper to postpone at, proper end allowable, to postpone a Resolution from one legislative session into the next legislative session. there's disagreement among counsel on on the subject. And while we're not conceding the point on on that front, we are prepared to act in a collegial manner and bipartisan and take no action on several of the Resolutions that have come up with the anticipation that they will be reintroduced in the next session. I also want to state for the record that they're, one of these Resolutions is setting a public hearing. After debate between legislative counsel and minority counsel, I believe there, we're, we reached a consensus that that is allowable, but we the plan, which is not yet before us, is to do the same with that Resolution again, spirit of bipartisanship and collegiality, we are going to take no action and anticipate that that Resolution as well will be reintroduced in the next session. So the the Resolution has been moved and seconded. I would I'd like to, to propose that we take no action. Do we need to withdraw the motion and the second or,

Deputy Clerk Mahler

[inaudible] I have amotion on the floor from Legislator Gavaris to postpone, which I would love for him to withdraw

Legislator Gavaris

I withdraw it. Yes.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. And then as far as the motion for discussion, I think we can just move on. Is that correct?

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

Yep.

Chairwoman Bartels

Yes. Okay. So um, and it is the, Legislator Gavaris, I'm fully anticipating you'll reintroduce it at the first, next meeting of laws and rules. And I and I look forward to the ongoing discussion. next Resolution is Resolution number 395 setting a public hearing on proposed local law number seven of 2021 a local law amending the code of county of Ulster in relation to evictions to be held on Tuesday, January 4, 2022 at 6:30pm. Motion for discussion.

Legislator Heppner

I'll move it

Chairwoman Bartels

Second, my Legislator Gavaris. Okay. I propose that we take no action on this Resolution. If that's okay with the sponsor who is present. I get the thumbs up. Okay. So full anticipation that this will be reintroduced in the coming session. Resolution number 551 adopting proposed local law number eight of 2021, a local law amending the code of the county of Ulster chapter 304 solid waste article 4 food waste prevention and recovery in relation to composting.

Legislator Heppner

Move it

Chairwoman Bartels

Motion. Thank you.

Legislator Gavaris

Second.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. Seconded by Legislator Gavaris. Is there any discussion? The sponsor is here as well. Okay, seeing none, all those in favor? Aye. Opposed? Passes unanimously. Resolution number 552, calling the organization organizational meeting of 2022. Motion.

Legislator Heppner

I'll move it.

Chairwoman Bartels

Second, there's been some discussion about amending the date of the meeting to January 10. Just confirm that that is the correct date. Legislator Heppner, is that the correct date? Yes, January 10. Last day that we're available to have it, gives us a day for a snow day in case we need it if we are in person. So I'll entertain a motion to amend.

Legislator Heppner

I'll make that motion to amend it.

Legislator Gavaris

Second

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. All those in favor of amending for January 10th. Passes That passes unanimously. So on the Resolution as amended. All those in favor?

Committee Members

Aye.

Chairwoman Bartels

Passes. Okay. Resolution number 557. Setting a public hearing on proposed local law number nine of 2021, a local law amending the code of the county of Ulster chapter 131, Vehicles County Article One sustainable Green Fleet policy in relation to strategies and goals to be held on Tuesday, January 4 2022 at 6:40pm. Motion for discussion

Legislator Heppner

Can I just take no action?

Chairwoman Bartels

We could just take no action if you like. For the record this this it's anticipated that this will be reintroduced in the coming term. It's the Resolution that I spoke about. Okay, now we we did 610, 649. So moving on to Resolution 650, authorizing the required steps for the transfer of certain real properties owned by owned by Ulster County and located at the site known as IBM Tech City East town of Ulster to the Ulster County Economic Development Alliance, Alliance Inc.

Legislator Heppner

I'll move it

Chairwoman Bartels

Second for discussion.

Legislator Gavaris

Second

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, so I would like to entertain a motion to postpone this to the joint meeting of laws and rules and ways and means to be held tomorrow evening, December 21. Do we need any more detail than that in the postponement?

Deputy Clerk Mahler

Your meeting is scheduled for 6:40 if you want to roll that in there? 6:40 or immediately following the public hearing.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, to be held tomorrow, December 21 at 6:40 or immediately following the public hearing. What? Okay,

Legislator Gavaris

I'll move that

Chairwoman Bartels

Moved that. Second.

Legislator Heppner

Second.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. All those in favor?

Committee Members

Aye.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. And Resolution number 651, approving the execution of a contract amendment for 500,000 entered into by the county Accucare N&H. Inc, Department of Health, move for discussion.

Legislator Heppner

Move it.

Legislator Gavaris

Second.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. Second. Deputy Executive Rider, do you want to speak both to the content and to the late?

Deputy Executive Rider

Yeah. So we realized after the Resolution deadline that the the amount left in this contract was not going to make it until the February session when you'd be able to vote again. We are these are the the the contract that we use for contract nurses to help at our vaccination pods and for case investigations at the health department.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. Are there any questions? Okay, seeing none on the Resolution. All in favor?

Committee Members

Aye.

Chairwoman Bartels

Opposed? Passes unanimously. Okay, you have a note that a petition to discharge was successfully executed for Resolution number 550 which was adopting proposed local law number 6 of 2021 a Local law repealing local law number two of 2013 establishing the Ulster County school based Mental Health and Safety Act of 2021. That'll be on tomorrow's agenda. Is there any old business anyone would like to discuss? Any new business? Okay, I want to I want to thank the members that are here and I will reach out to those who are not for a great term. Thank you for your diligence and your work on the committee and thank you to our our regular guests from the executive's office and the comptroller. We appreciate your participation in these meetings throughout the year, so. And of course, thank you to our our counsel and minority counsel. And of course the county attorney. We appreciate seeing you here today. Thank you, everyone. Have a wonderful holiday. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Legislator Gavaris

So moved

Chairwoman Bartels

Thanking you Chair Bartels, I'll make that motion. Thank you. All those in favor of adjournment. Aye. Alright. Have a great evening everyone. Happy holidays.

Legislator Herbert Litts, III

Be safe. Stay healthy.

Chairwoman Bartels

Happy New Year.