

**Public Works, Capital Projects & Transportation Committee  
Regular Meeting Minutes**

**DATE & TIME:** April 5, 2022 – 5:15 PM  
**LOCATION:** Powered by Zoom Meetings, Meeting ID: 886 9068 1787  
By Phone Dial (646) 558-8656  
**PRESIDING OFFICER:** Chair Laura Petit  
**LEGISLATIVE STAFF:** Nettie Tomshaw, Legislative Employee  
**PRESENT:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan (arrived 5:26 pm), Stewart  
**ABSENT:** Legislator Litts  
**QUORUM PRESENT:** Yes

**OTHER ATTENDEES:** Legislator’s Joe Maloney & Brian Cahill, Comptroller March Gallagher, Comm. Brendan Masterson, Deputy Comm. Finance Dean Rylewicz, Deputy Comm. Capital Projects Robert Parete – Department of Public Works, Director Dennis Doyle, Amanda LaValle - Planning, Deputy County Executive’s Marc Rider & Chris Kelly, Director Nathan Litwin & Asst. to Dir. Molly Scott – Recovery & Resilience, Acting Director Loren Johnson – UCAT, President Ernest Hunt Catskill Mtn. RR, Hank Gross Mid-Hudson News, Richard Gerentine, Emily Hamilton REPCO, Cheryl Schneider, Rashida Tyler

Chair Petit called the meeting to order at 5:18 PM.  
Pledge of Allegiance

Presentation – Loren Johnson, Director UCAT – Vision for UCAT (See attached transcript)

---

**Motion No. 1:** Moved to **APPROVE** the Minutes of the March 1, 2022 Meeting of the Public Works, Capital Projects & Transportation Committee

**Motion By:** Legislator Fabiano  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Stewart

**Discussion:** None

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 3  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** Minutes **APPROVED**

---

Resolutions for the April 19, 2022 Session of the Legislature

**Resolution No. 177:** Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$234.00, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00 Entered Into By The County – New York Communications Company, Inc. – Ulster County Area Transit

**Resolution Summary:** This resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment #3 for \$234.00 causing the aggregate contract plus amendment amount to be in excess of \$50K with NY Communications Co., Inc., adding two radios and related equipment to the lease. 100% county, Amd. Term. 5/1/22-10/31/22.

**Motion No. 2:** **Moved Resolution No. 177 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Stewart

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 3:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution No. 177**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Stewart

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 178:** Updating Ulster County Area Transit Substance Abuse Policy

**Resolution Summary:** This resolution updates the Ulster County Area Transit (UCAT) Substance Abuse policy to insure compliance with both Federal and State regulations.

**Motion No. 4:** **Moved Resolution No. 178 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Stewart

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 5:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution No. 178**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Stewart

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 96:** Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program – Amending Capital Project Nos. 597, 599, 600, 601, ~~602, 603~~, And 604 Ulster County Recovery And Resiliency Projects – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Finance

**Resolution Summary:** This resolution amends the Capital Improvement Program reallocating ARPA funding to Capital Project No. 604 for Water Infrastructure in the amount of \$5,000,000.00.

**Motion No. 6:** **Moved Resolution No. 96 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Fabiano  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Stewart

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No 7:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution No. 96**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Fabiano  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Stewart

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Litts, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 3  
**Votes Against:** 1 (Nolan)  
**Disposition:** **Resolution Adopted**

---

**Resolution No. 161:** Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program – Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 633 - Marbletown Water Infrastructure Expansion – ARP Infrastructure – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

**Resolution Summary:** This resolution amending the 2022-2027 Capital Improvement program to establish and fund Capital Project No. 633 for the Marbletown water infrastructure expansion using ARPA funds, \$1,500,000.00.

**Motion No. 8:** **Moved Resolution No. 161 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Disposition:** **Take No Action**

---

**Resolution No. 162:** Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program – Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 634 - Grady Park Construction, Town Of Marbletown – ARP Infrastructure And Trails – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

**Resolution Summary:** This resolution amends the 2022-2027 Capital Improvement program establishing and funding Capital Project No. 634 Grady Park Construction, Town of Marbletown for ARPA Infrastructure and Trails and amending the 2022 Capital Fund Budget. \$1,000,000.00

**Motion No. 9:** **Moved Resolution No. 162 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 10:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution No. 162**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 163:** Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 631 – A Geothermal System For Silver Gardens Senior Housing Development – ARPA - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution establishes and funds Capital Project No. 631 for the Silver Gardens Senior Housing Development / RUPCO project in the Town of Lloyd. \$600K

**Motion No. 11:** **Moved Resolution No. 163 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Fabiano  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Nolan

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 12:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution No. 163**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Fabiano  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Nolan

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 164:** Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$600,000.00 Entered Into By The County – RUPCO, Inc. – Department Of Finance

**Resolution Summary:** This resolution approves the execution of a contract with RUPCO, Inc. awarding funds to the Sub-recipient for the purpose of aiding in constructing a portion of the Silver Gardens Housing rental development. \$600K 100% Federal, Term 4/20/22 – 10/1/24.

**Motion No. 13:** **Moved Resolution No. 164 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 14:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution No. 164**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 165:** Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 629 – ARPA Brownfields Redevelopment – Planning Department

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution establishes and funds Capital Project No. 629 using ARPA funds for brownfield redevelopment. \$1,000,000.00

**Motion No. 15:** **Moved Resolution No. 165 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 16:** **Moved to Adopt As Presented Resolution No. 165**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 166:** ~~Establishing And Funding~~ Capital Project No. ~~632~~ 598 – Crisis Stabilization Center, Purchase Of 368 Broadway – ARPA - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution funds Capital Project No. 598 for the Crisis Stabilization Center building / property acquisition of 368 Broadway using ARPA funds. \$2,000,000.00

**Motion No. 17:** **Moved Resolution No. 166 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Stewart  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 18:** **Moved to Adopt As Presented Resolution No. 166**

**Motion By:** Legislator Stewart  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 167:** Adopting A Negative Declaration For The Demolition Of The Former Ulster County Jail Located On Golden Hill, And Establishing And Funding Capital Project No. 630 - Demolition Of Jail Golden Hill- ARPA – Department Of Planning

**Resolution Summary:** This resolution adopts a negative declaration for the demolition of the former UC Jail located on Golden Hill and establishes and funds Capital Project No. 630. \$1,500,000.00

**Motion No. 19:** **Moved Resolution No. 167 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Fabiano  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Nolan

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 20:** **Moved to Adopt As Presented Resolution No. 167**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Stewart

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 175:** Reestablishing The Ulster County Trails Advisory Committee – Ulster County Legislature

**Resolution Summary:** This resolution re-establishes the 14 voting member UC Trails Advisory Committee. The committee will advise and report back to the Public Works, Capital Projects and Transportation Committee as to its findings, conclusions and recommendations on an annual basis by March 1<sup>st</sup> of the preceding year.

**Motion No. 21:** **Moved Resolution No. 175 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Fabiano  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Nolan

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 22:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution No. 175**

**Motion By:** Legislator Fabiano  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Nolan  
  
**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 176:** Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$121,600.00 Entered Into By The County – Creighton Manning Engineering LLP – Department Of Planning

**Resolution Summary:** This resolution approves the execution of a contract for \$121.6K with Creighton Manning Engineering LLP for the development of the Town of Ulster Route 9W corridor management plan. 100% Federal, Term 4/1/22 – 9/30/23.

**Motion No. 23:** **Moved Resolution No. 176 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Fabiano  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Nolan

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 24:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution No. 176**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Fabiano  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Nolan

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 179:** Establishing Capital Project No. 628, Galeville Bridge Replacement, Town Of Shawangunk – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Public Works (Highways & Bridges)

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 628 for the Galeville Bridge replacement in the Town of Shawangunk and amending the 2022 Capital Fund Budget. A Bond resolution will be required. \$110K Engineering Costs. A Bond resolution will be required.

**Resolution No. 181:** Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$99,720.00 Entered Into By The County – Creighton Manning Engineering LLP – Department Of Public Works

**Resolution Summary:** This resolution approves the execution of a contract for \$99.7K with Creighton Manning Engineering LLP for design services for the replacement of the bridge which carries Galeville

road (county road 19) over the Wallkill River in the Town of Shawangunk. 100% county. Term 5/1/22 – 4/30/24.

**Motion No. 25:** **Moved To Block Resolution Nos. 179 & 181 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 26:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution Nos. 179 & 181**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolutions 179 & 181 ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 182:** Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$150,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Town & Country Bridge and Rail Inc. – Department Of Public Works

**Resolution Summary:** This resolution approves the execution of a contract for \$150K with Town & Country Bridge and Rail Inc. for shotcrete repair services for disintegrated concrete on various bridges and large culverts. 100% county, Term 5/1/22 – 4/30/23.

**Motion No. 27:** **Moved Resolution No. 182 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 28:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution No. 182**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 183:** Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$80,700.00 Entered Into By The County – C&S Engineers, Inc. – Department Of Public Works



**Resolution Summary:** This resolution approves the execution of a contract for \$80.7K with C&S Engineers, Inc. for design services for the public safety radio tower on Tonche Mountain. 100% State, Term 5/15/22 – 8/15/23.

**Motion No. 29:** **Moved Resolution No. 183 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 30:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution No. 183**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Petit, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** None  
**Votes in Favor:** 4  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

---

**Resolution No. 184:** Authorizing Track Removal Within The Ulster And Delaware Railroad Corridor To Allow For The Connection Of The Ulster County Ashokan Rail Trail At Boiceville To Route 28A As Proposed By The New York City Department Of Environmental Protection For Replacement Of The Boiceville Bridge Over The Esopus Creek (Cat-252 Project) – Department Of Public Works

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution authorizes track removal within the U&D Railroad corridor to allow for the connection of the UC Ashokan Rail Trail at Boiceville to Rt. 28A as proposed by the NYC Department of Environmental Protection for the replacement of the Boiceville Bridge over the Esopus Creek. All track removal (approx. sixty feet) will remain the property of Ulster County and shall be stored in a location just north of the removal.

**Motion No. 31:** **Moved Resolution No. 184 FOR Discussion**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Discussion:** See attached transcript.

**Motion No. 32:** **Moved to Adopt Resolution No. 184**  
**Motion By:** Legislator Nolan  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Fabiano

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan, Stewart  
**Voting Against:** 1 (Petit)  
**Votes in Favor:** 3  
**Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Resolution ADOPTED**

**New /Old Business:** See attached transcript

**Adjournment**

Chair Petit asked if there was any other business, and hearing none;

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Stewart

**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Nolan

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

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**TIME:** 7:50 PM

**Respectfully submitted:** Legislative Staff, Nettie Tomshaw

**Approved:** May 9, 2022

**Public Works, Capital Projects & Transportation Committee  
Regular Meeting Transcript**

**DATE & TIME:** April 5, 2022 – 5:15 PM  
**LOCATION:** Powered by Zoom Meetings, Meeting ID: 886 9068 1787  
By Phone Dial (646) 558-8656  
**PRESIDING OFFICER:** Chair Laura Petit  
**LEGISLATIVE STAFF:** Nettie Tomshaw, Legislative Employee  
**PRESENT:** Legislators Fabiano, Nolan (arrived 5:26pm), Stewart  
**ABSENT:** Legislator Litts  
**QUORUM PRESENT:** Yes

**OTHER ATTENDEES:** Legislator's Joe Maloney & Brian Cahill, Comptroller March Gallagher, Comm. Brendan Masterson, Deputy Comm. Finance Dean Rylewicz, Deputy Comm. Capital Projects Robert Parete – Department of Public Works, Director Dennis Doyle, Amanda LaValle - Planning, Deputy County Executive's Marc Rider & Chris Kelly, Director Nathan Litwin & Asst. to Dir. Molly Scott – Recovery & Resilience, Acting Director Loren Johnson – UCAT, President Ernest Hunt Catskill Mtn. RR, Hank Gross Mid-Hudson News, Richard Gerentine, Emily Hamilton REPCO, Cheryl Schneider, Rashida Tyler

**Chair Petit**

We get the 5:18, meeting of the Public Works Capital Projects and Transportation committee. Today is April 5th. Let's see who can we pick on. Dean Fabiano would you please lead us in the pledge.

**Committee Members**

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.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

I don't have attendance on here. I think Legislator Nolan had asked last time that we do it, but

**Chair Petit**

That's your call. I looked at everybody's - nobody else had it on their agendas. So but I would be happy to put it on going forward if you'd like. And I'll take attendance if you prefer.

**Chair Petit**

Know, I think we're good for that. So I'm looking for a motion to approve the minutes of our March 1, 2022 meeting. Legislator Fabiano seconded by Legislator Stewart. Any amendments changes? Comments? Hearing none, I will call the vote All in favor?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Any opposed? We have two absent. (For the record -Legislator Nolan arrived at 5:26 PM) Okay. The next do you need a second Mr. Johnson to acclimate, we can move on to a resolution or are you ready to give us your presentation?

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

Good to go.

**Chair Petit**

Okay. All right. So it's my pleasure to introduce our new director of UCAT, Loren Johnson.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

All right. Well, thank you Chairwoman Petit, for inviting me to speak to the committee tonight. And each of you should have received operational debriefing ahead of time, just give me a thumbs up if you guys were in receipt of that. I put together a little one pager for you to kind of follow along with me. As requested, 100 day vision, it is a little premature to kind of give you what will become of UCAT in 12 days. And so what I wanted to provide you guys with is a little insight of the process that I will undertake here, leaving UCAT to acclimate to the changes of the county as we move forward together, universally. And so that is framed by three main goals that we will set to accomplish over the next 90 days roughly.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

The first one is conduct a comprehensive operational assessment of essential areas within the department. So it's very important for me to get a baseline understanding of our operation as a whole when it comes to our fleet. I know we have three new electric vehicles in use right now currently. But as we are looking to change and adapt our equipment, and equipment refresh in certain areas, and the department is very important that I understand that. So we understand how we're moving forward with that.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

The other area is our personnel review that encompasses the big elephant in the room, which is the recruitment process of new drivers and personnel, and making sure that we're filling those vacancies that we have there. I believe right now, we had a total of roughly about 10 or 12 vacancies that's there. And I want to make sure that our recruitment process, how we're marketing our jobs that's out there and available for the public to apply towards is available, so they are essentially aware about it.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

Other area with the personnel is also our efforts to retain our retention programs that we have in place, not only to you know, cultivate a positive environment, but also put the clear focus of retaining the key talent that we need to be successful and serve the community at large.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

And finally, the big piece of it is professional development. Just as we're introducing new technology into our operation. You know, that requires us to reinvest into our mechanical team so they are knowledgeable, to be able to properly service those equipment's in those vehicles as we purchase those new things. As well as our drivers as our demographics are changing, we hope to incorporate a larger demographic and usage of our system. We need to focus on things about how we are providing that customer service experience and giving our drivers those skill sets, those soft skills as needed to interact with the public in a very efficient, courteous and professional no matter

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

along with that is also just doing a clear technology assessment. I believe it was roughly about 10 years ago that the county did a huge investment in the software system here at UCAT. But there has been little to no upgrades and understanding of how to utilize that system, and the direction of where we're trying to hit with the county as a whole. And so really doing a technology assessment, making sure that we're up to date with things. I did have the pleasure of meeting with a group earlier today. And we talked about some of our outdated practices, and how those are not no longer practical for this day and age of our new riders that we're hoping to gravitate to our system.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

The other area that I kind of want to touch on and a goal that I have is to execute a service risk assessment, essentially, to identify systemic findings and develop the operational plan to improve our overall system. This is really centered around making sure that we're in full compliance with FDA regulations. As you note that is on the agenda today, we have resolution, I believe, is Resolution 178. And that was as a result of an audit that took place last January, where we had some findings and the department worked with safety, and Diane Beitel on developing our policies and making sure those are in line. What I want to make sure is that now that we have an understanding of those rules and regulations is that our operating procedures are in line with those policies and procedures across the board. So that we are not operating at a risk to the county as a whole. Other things like that, as I mentioned standard operating procedures, you know, systemic issue, common in many operations, is folklore. Where things are this past long word of mouth, this is how we've always done it with no clear documentation of how it was done or how it needs to be done and the frequency of that. And so our goal is to take those three key functions from each of the positions within the agency, and document standard operating procedures so we have a good template that we can monitor on a regular basis to know that we are doing the work accordingly and in alignment with our rules and regulations as a whole in our county policies as well as UCATS.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

The last area, which is the overarching goal for us is to develop a progressive transitional plan. And really the meat and potatoes of this is really to take in all of the information that we're going to be gathering

over these next three to four months. And formalize a plan that will serve as our strategic transitional plan and our guide over the next several years. And really adopting what you as legislation body and from the county exec office sees as the clear goals and pass for us as UCAT, to follow to help bring about a new service as a whole. And of course, I never leave a opportunity without asking for help.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

And I will be remiss if I didn't ask you guys that helped me with expediting the communication. You guys are at the forefront and you guys are hearing from your various constituents across the county. And I am open and willing to listen, take those notes and really prioritize our needs so we have a collective approach to create a win win situation. And as I said earlier, with the group I met with, you know, we have a good operation. We have good people working here. But I will not let good keep us from being great. And so that's what I have to share for you guys a little gloss over. But I'm more than welcome to entertain any questions that you guys might have. Or if you know you guys want me to come back at a later date to give you an update, see how we're going along. I am more than happy and willing to do so.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you very much, Director Johnson. Do we have any questions or comments or from any of our legislators and please let the record show that Legislator Nolan joined us about five minutes ago or so.

**Legislator Nolan**

Thank you very much and I apologize Loren Johnson if you already covered this, but the last conversations I had with previous UCAT, directors and staff emphasize the difficulty finding drivers. Did you already address that? Or could you say a word about that, where the where UCAT is in terms of meeting its quotas of having drivers for all the routes.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

Absolutely. Right now we have about approximately 10 to 12 vacancies. And for the most part, those are all are part time positions. Which means when we have a call, we are kind of scrambling very short to have someone pick up some extra hours to make those coverages and everything because the part time positions those vacancies is essentially our sub pool to cover when people are off or call off sick vacation time. And as we get into, you know, warmer temperatures, more people are apt to take vacations and everything. And so we are, just onboarded one new driver this past week, and we interview a new driver last week. And hopefully we'll get her on board here in the upcoming days or weeks here. But the goal here is really to work with, you know, the county's communications team, and really our own personnel currently, because they're our best marketing, to enlist, help others to join our team and everything. And so really, is really to come up with a comprehensive plan. I plan to work with the county exec. and provide him some insight of some options that can help generate interest in joining the UCAT team. And that also kind of dovetails and intersects with our retention program. Because if people see that we have a great culture and environment, work environment, we won't have to compete by the dollar as much as we would have to essentially say we want the best of the best in the best of the best are wanting to join our team, just because of how we treat our drivers and the environment that they have to work in.

**Legislator Nolan**

Thank you. I appreciate that very much.

**Chair Petit**

Any other questions from the committee? Legislator Maloney.

**Legislator Maloney**

I had talked to some UCAT drivers that I've known, some still there some not. I know the last union negotiation there were some upset union members in UCAT. And I hear you saying that a culture? A lot of generalized terms. I know you just got here. But we're not getting a lot of specifics. You know, we're going to make it it almost sounded like you were saying we're not It's not there's nothing monetary or fringe about what is making it hard for us to get good new people or retain them. But when I talk to current and former drivers, I am hearing that that is part of it. So do you not think that there's a monetary aspect to why we're so short and why it's hard to retain? And do you have any other specifics or tricks? You said you were going to be presenting options? What are those options? I know you've had this -you've done this kind of work before? So you've probably got some tricks up your sleeve? What are they specifically? Because I hear and I know you've just here, but what is going to be some specific approaches? And do you think what these drivers and workers at UCAT are being paid has anything to do with - you think you're just going to be able to make it a nice place to work and not ever have to deal with their pay that they're blatantly unhappy with it, especially with this last union contract? And do you know much about what they were upset with in their last contract?

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

So thanks for those questions. And so just to recap, so I can make sure I touch on each of your points. One is the difference between culture and monetary investments into our employees, you know, package. The other one was some specifics as far as you call it tricks, but I call it methods and generating interest into our work environment. And was there a third one? Was those the two I was just too I just want to make sure I touched on both.

**Legislator Maloney**

Do you know do you have you spoken to any employees and union members about the latest contract and what because to me, I feel like when we're having a hard time finding hiring people and then retaining them you know, it's nice to know that culture, those you know, methods that you're talking about to make everybody have a happy family. A lot of times it comes down to pay. And, you know, do you think that has anything to do with the issues that Ulster County has had with hiring and retaining?

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

I can start on the back end here. When it comes to pay, I've seen drivers leave an operation for 25 cents. That's the truth. And that's the reality of it. I have a strong belief that people don't leave a position. A driver's a driver. When they get that CDL license, that's their livelihood. So of course, they're going to shop around to go to the place that's going to maximize that investment that they have, which is that CDL license. And so that's why in this industry, you'll see people that will leave one operation and go to another operation for a .25 cent raise. I mean, that's just the nature of the beast. Now, are we talking about now, given the pandemic private industry, we're in a serious competition with private industry that can afford to pay a little bit more. And our question is, what can we sustain long term? Yeah, we could get a person in here. But what is the likelihood that that person that driver will stay for a long-term time. And when I say long term, multiple years, because the investment to train an individual bring them into our operation,

that's a very costly endeavor there. But what I would like to say is, we do have a good core group of drivers here that are very happy with the pay, quote, unquote. And when I say what the pay is the total package, the benefits that's associated with it makes a large difference, when you go from, you know, a UCAT driver, maybe to first student up the road or whatever, where you only working part time hours, and you're not getting all those benefits that we have as a county employee here.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

And so I think a lot of it is just educating the public in our potential applicants, what is the true dollars of the package that we're offering them? Because truly, if you compare salaries salary, yeah, we might not be at the top of the pack. But we add our fringe benefits on there, we're exceeding, probably at the top of the market rate. And so some people just don't need that when you got younger professionals entering the market. They're not really looking at, oh, do I have medical and health and benefits like that? They're looking at how much money am I bringing home? And so we have to make sure that we're cognitive of, you know, who is our driver? Who are those drivers that we're soliciting and marketing in there? And yes, it would be advantageous for us to have a, diverse offering that people will select from that more tailored fits probably towards their needs, yeah, I need more money I don't need benefits, you know. So but that's a deeper conversation that involves the union of which I wasn't a part of. But, you know, it does impact things. I will say that I've taken the liberty and every driver that I've met with thus far, I've challenged everyone in this operation, to come to me directly and tell me one thing, one thing, what's the top thing that you need me to address to improve to support you in your role here. And so we've been collecting that, okay. And my goal is when we have our root team meeting here in the next couple of weeks, is to present that. So I could see directly from my staff on the team, like what is the concerns they have, and quite honestly, when they start sharing with me some complaints when I'm talking to them in the hallways, or in passing, I have yet to have a person say something about the pay which, you know, anytime you are, so my role, they're getting paid this much, who's not going to raise their hand. I want more pay, alright. But that's not what they're voicing as a concern from what I'm hearing thus far. And so I think that's a good sign. And I've taught to everybody from the very person at the top of the list, the driver by the name of Ray, he's been here, what 24, 25, 27 years something like that, to people who just started in the organization and everything so it's there and I like to think that you have a core group of staff that are very committed to doing and being a public servant to this community. And I think that's what we should be looking for. Because anybody that leaves our organization for extra dollar in pay is not really committed to our mission, which is to be public servants to this community greater good as a whole. And I get that they need to make money for their families every day, and that's totally their right. But I think the people that's here and how UCAT has been built upon is people who genuinely care about this community. And I think that speaks volumes.

**Chair Petit**

We have a question by Legislator Stewart.

**Legislator Stewart**

Mr. Johnson, I was just curious if maybe you could briefly layout ideas that you have for perhaps increasing ridership on the UCAT system. Also, in related to that, I was wondering if there is a budget line in your budget that would perhaps allow for the building and maintenance of proper bus station - proper bus stops, rather. When I'm driving down 209, for example, I see people standing on the side of



the road in all kinds of weather. And it occurs to me that perhaps if we had proper bus stops, that might perhaps attract greater ridership. And this question, actually, I asked with a nod towards Deputy Rider and Deputy Kelly, because at our last meeting this this also came up. And I questioned the two town supervisors, so the two municipalities that I represent, and both of them thought that bus stops would be a good idea. So I was just wondering if you could elaborate on those two points?

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

I'll start with the latter question regarding the budget line and proper bus stops. To my knowledge, I did do a look over of our budget for the rest of this fiscal year. I don't think there's a project that is identified specifically for bus stops. But that is something that I can take a deeper look for and to and get back to you on a more direct answer. Regarding that, I think that is a need and to kind of dovetail back into your original question as far as increasing ridership. I think doing a bus stop analysis is part of my operational assessment. And pretty much using the technology to actually identify what stops do we have people riding and actually accessing and which stops do we not have people riding accessing, and really been looking at that as one of the key factors that we'll use to make some adjustments to our overall service offerings? Honestly, from what I've seen thus far, and is we have not adjusted the routes, post COVID. Okay, we can say that right? To what our new demand is, which means we are still having route service, the old model, or the model that's there, that's not really much of a mall as I hear. That used to be a very large economic place where a lot of people worked, and we transported people there. But with a lot of those stores closing, we don't have the ridership there is anymore. I can say that I did meet with BOCES leadership last week, last Friday to be exact. And we are going to be hosting some symposiums with them and business leaders that they have commitments from that want, you know, internships in our facilities. And as you know, BOCES has both, you know, the high school program for the youth. Also, they have the adult program there as well. And so we're looking at using that information, that data and they're giving me the data to let me know where exactly are the gaps and services. So we could then make a plan that really attracts the riders who need the service and everything. And so that's one way that you know, I'm looking at identifying of how we can increase the ridership is actually taking those buses in the routes to where those riders need to go and want to go. And I know we're looking at some things for our visitors when they do visit our county, I believe it's route 28, going out to the resorts and everything. That's something that we're looking at building out. And again, creating that flow of traffic, minimizing the traffic car traffic there, but also bringing visitors into various areas throughout the county.

**Legislator Stewart**

And I assume that SUNY Ulster would be one of your more-busy stops as well. Is that correct?

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

Absolutely. And across the board, and actually, I looked at some of the numbers the other day, you could look at some of the routes where we had anywhere from 1000 to 2000 riders a month. We are barely getting up to two or 300 riders a month. And so, you know, again, it's one re-educating the public that hey, we are here. Especially with coming out of the pandemic. We want to make sure that we're ready to receive those writer's ships and provide a quality service.

**Legislator Stewart**

Thank you for that.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you, Legislator Stewart, Legislator Maloney, and then we'll get moving on our resolutions.

**Legislator Maloney**

Yeah. To, uh, you know, I got one quick question at the end. But I would like to say as you expanded on your, on my questions, the second time, I did appreciate what you're saying. And that that was those are things I've heard in different departments. But UCAT was one of them. There was, you know, questions about how fair promotions were and how postings were visible to certain people and an aspect of favoritism. And that happens inside departments and at times, and if that has been your early approach, you get in there and make everybody feel like, every you know, that, you know, if there was if certain people had an opinion that there was a bit of a toxic environment or favoritism or not equal. And if you're going to come in and I think that will do something for retention, and, getting new people through positive feedback from people that are there.

**Legislator Maloney**

My last question, so I appreciate your answer there. And your early approach. With regards to going green with our vehicles. You know, there has been some chatter lately that and you weren't here for any of this. This is just I'm just asking for your fresh opinion and your experience on this topic when you're talking about buses and electric buses, hybrid buses. And there is some chatter that the buses we just purchased, there was, you know, we had different options. And there were some more expensive options that had capabilities of going further and handling other routes. The buses, we got, it seems like we're stuck just in the City of Kingston. And so it's kind of, you know, going green or expanding with these buses is kind of unavailable with this particular model. Do you have an opinion on the buses we bought? If you were here, would you have explored some of these other buses? I know there's something at a company out of California that it would have been more expensive, but the claim is that they would have been far more capable of handling other routes. I didn't know if you've had any experience with electric or hybrid buses and opinion on, you know, being able to handle this large county and whether or not we made the right decision are should change going forward. Maybe we made the right decision for the City of Kingston, but should we be looking at these other electric buses with the next buy?

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

Right? Um, I would say that I have not getting fully engrossed in it. But I have heard the concerns and am aware of the concerns about the range those vehicles can thrive on. You know, Will, that is our safety coordinator and oversees our mechanics back there in the back. I must say kudos to him. He is all over it. He gets the data every day. We're marking and measuring how long do those vehicles last when we take them out on certain routes? When we bring them in? How do we have to charge them do we charge them in the mid-day to bring them back up to a (inaudible) energy so last the rest of the evening, he is all over that 100%. And with any new technology, any vehicle, it doesn't matter which vendor that we went with. We were going to have some hiccups. And have we had hiccups with the new flyers that we have? Yes, but those are common industry standard hiccups that you have in learning the new technology and learning how to service that range of vehicles.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

The only thing that I would be very concerned about with the selection that we did make is that the majority of our fleet is Gilets. And now we're introducing a whole new manufacturer, which is different when you when you're servicing. I like to say having a model shop where you use the servicing a certain style of vehicle a certain manufacturer, you have that relationship already established there. And you kind of know what to expect with that vehicle. I do appreciate that we got three hybrids at the same time, because that allows us the flexibility to learn that vehicle a little bit more aggressively than if we just purchased one. So that was a great investment there. But on the backside of it, I think what was probably a misstep is really understanding infrastructure that was going to be needed to fully support that that vehicle in this county. And so that's something that's on my to do list to bring that forward to you guys of what it's going to take to maximize the use of those hybrid vehicles before we go out on next round and purchase more.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you. Do we have any other questions? Right If not, thank you very much. We will be having you back or you've done quite a lot on your plate. And, you know, we certainly from both, you know, just a convenience of having good public transportation we also would like to see more people participate in the system because it'll help our environmental impacts too. So thank you. Legislator Nolan.

**Legislator Nolan**

Yes. Just wonder if we wanted to take the UCAT resolutions at the top of the agenda as a courtesy to Mr. Johnson?

**Chair Petit**

Absolutely. Do we need a motion for that Nettie or can we just agree to take them out of order?

**Nettie Tomshaw**

Just agree. 178 is that the one?

**Chair Petit**

There was one with radios. What one with substance abuse.

**Nettie Tomshaw**

177 is UCAT.

**Chair Petit**

And 178 is UCAT. Okay. All right.

**Chair Petit**

So we'll take those out of order then Resolution No. 177. Approving the execution of a contract amendment for \$234 causing the aggregate contract plus amendment amount to be in excess of 50,000. entered into by the county with NYCOM. Its New York Communications Company for Ulster County Area Transit. I see a motion to move this forward for the discussion. I saw three hands go up. So Legislator Nolan and Legislator Stewart seconded.

**Legislator Nolan**

At 234,000 I think it's supposed to be that's a typo. I take it.

**Chair Petit**

What No, actually, I had a question on there, too. I'm like, why are two radios? I thought it was 127,000? I guess the two radios? Or \$234? Yeah.

**Legislator Nolan**

Where it's come before us?

**Chris Kelly**

Yeah. Aggregate on the contract.

**Legislator Nolan**

On the aggregate. Okay, thank you.

**Chair Petit**

I asked the same question last night. I'm like I thought and I was looking at the total contract and I said, Why are these radios so much money, but I guess they're not you can almost buy a bus for that. Okay. Thank you. See, it's not just me, it's the rest of the world. Okay. Is there any other discussion on this? Hearing none, I'll take a vote all in favor of Resolution No. 177.

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Four in favor, one absent. Oh, any knows? Okay, thank you.

**Chair Petit**

The next resolution is Resolution No. 178. Updating Ulster County Area Transit Substance Abuse Policy. I have a motion to move this?

**Legislator Nolan**

I'll move it.

**Chair Petit**

A second.

**Legislator Stewart**

Second.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Stewart. I think he just beat you Dean. This is for your - is his for the your CDL drivers who need to go in to get tested?

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

Actually know this is in response to our audit that happened in last January where there were some findings from the FDA regarding our policy. And so they gave us some recommendations. And of course, this all predates me. But my debriefing includes that we work with both Safety with Diane Beitel as well as the FTA on creating these revisions that was needed to be in full compliance. And here we are, with this resolution to make sure that we're good to go for our upcoming audit.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you. Do we have any other questions? Hearing none, I will take the vote on Resolution No. 178. All in favor?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Any opposed? No abstentions? Okay. So it was four with one absent. Thank you. So you're welcome to stay and enjoy the rest of the meeting with us. But um, thank you again for your input and your presentation.

**Loren Johnson UCAT Director**

Thank you so much for having me. I look forward to working with all of you.

**Legislator Nolan**

Same here, thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Okay, next on the agenda. We have Resolution No. 96. Do I hear a motion to move this forward for discussion? I'm sorry, should read it. Amending the 2022 -2027 Capital Improvement Program, Amending Capital Projects. And this has been - there's quite a few amendments on this resolution as presented initially. Projects 599, 600, 601 and 604. Ulster County Recovery and Resiliency Projects Amending the 2022 Capital Fund Budget. Now do I hear Motion to move it for discussion?

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Fabiano. Do I hear second? Legislator Stuart. Thank you. So again, there were some amendments of the last ones that we received, brought the total moved into infrastructure to 5 million and additional language to include water and sewer. And for a 33%. I guess we'll have Legislator Maloney explain that.

**Legislator Maloney**

That was important to most of the legislators that there was a matching aspect. That's how it was originally written. The executive through Chris Kelly was comfortable with 33. If there's a project that comes out that looks really good, and I need a little more than 33%, we can certainly turn it into a vote. I know Eric and Dean both have projects in their districts that are kind of ready to go and will end up happening, if

that will be basically voting on this this month. If this passes, which it did pass, ARPA had a decently high score and passed unanimously. And the following month, we would start voting on the different municipalities. I know Saugerties Shawangunk, town of Lloyd, Marlboro, Marbletown all have resolutions basically in. I think Saugerties is furthest along. There asked is completely within everything they're asking for looks completely reasonable and within what we have laid out as the parameters. So that that's how it would work. Eric, if Eric and Laura your Marbletown, infrastructure project waits, you guys postponed, you wait a month this gets passed and then you put it back in and we vote on it and it comes out of the mechanism we've created here. That's pretty much it if anyone else has any other questions.

**Chair Petit**

We do we actually have Legislator Fabiano, Legislator Nolan and then Deputy Executive Kelly. So Legislative Fabiano, we have you on mute right now? You got to get out of the mountains of Hawaii. And there we go. Okay.

**Legislator Nolan**

Volcanoes no doubt.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Can you hear me now?

**Chair Petit**

Yes, we can.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Okay, no, the only question I have. So there is \$5 million dollars that's specifically designated for water and sewer. For those projects, correct?

**Chair Petit**

Yes.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Okay. Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Well, that was easy. Okay, Legislator Nolan.

**Legislator Nolan**

I think that, thank you, Chair Petit. I think that this resolution is, um, it's not completely mooted by some of the resolutions in our packet tonight. But it conflicts with them. And I'm really very supportive of the infrastructure project brought forward by legislators Fabiano and Stewart. And they are ready to look at as projects. And they each call for 50% matching as I read them. So they don't really match with this resolution. This resolution pulls a number out of the air 5 million, that may be too little or too much. I'm supportive of the notion that we do fund infrastructure projects. But I think that with ready to go, ready to review projects in the packet that we should ask the sponsors here to withdraw this resolution. And let us

look at projects that are - that we can assess on their merits, and that may need more than 500,000 or less than that amount may need more than 33% or less than 33%. Um, you know, I understand a decision to guide a process. But the call for projects from this source of funding really went out last summer. And so I think we have had a chance for projects to come forward. We have some very good ones in front of us. And I'm prepared to move those projects forward. They would conflict with what's written in this resolution so I cannot support this resolution.

**Legislator Nolan**

And I think the sponsors have done a service by highlighting this area. But pushing on to you know, pass the resolution when we already have projects that fit it that are coming forward that that don't completely match it, just puts us in position of potentially having conflicts and I don't think really aids us here. So if this isn't in our way, then we just go forward dealing with projects that are ready to be assessed, ready to be funded, and ready to be completed. And I think that puts us ahead on the communities that are looking for these projects. I certainly don't support pushing back, ready to go projects for a month to talk about how we might fund them. We've got the funding source available, we have an infrastructure category already existing. So I'd like to use it and just move forward.

**Chair Petit**

So I did have Deputy Director, Kelly, next.

**Legislator Maloney**

Could I just answered that and then kick it to Chris, because I also have a question for Chris, that he could expand on with whatever else he has.

**Chair Petit**

Yeah okay.

**Legislator Maloney**

So with regards to what I just heard from Legislator Nolan, this was actually a collective -what you're seeing before you is kind of a collective agreement from the majority of the legislators and the executive side. Actually, when you mentioned the Saugerties, what they're asking for, it's a million-dollar project, they're asking for 300,000. It's exactly within what we're saying. And one of the reasons I think the executive side and Chair Bartels, and myself and others wanted a - you know, Tracey was very, very, very sure that it had in her mind, it had to be there had to be a matching aspect. And we didn't want to just throw money out there and have every municipality just go and say, if it's not matching, that every municipality is just going to go find a pipe somewhere to fix and throw something in. I think the executive side along with most of the legislators I talked to were much more comfortable with an overall parameter, and some criteria that we have, and not just have all these different legislators going to their town board and firing off all these different requests.

**Legislator Maloney**

Like I said, if it gets to the point where we're close on the matching, we can still have that conversation, vote on and approve it. I think you figure you could have eight to 10 municipalities, I think we already have five or six that have that have given us an idea on what they're looking for. And the criteria that we



came up with, in conjunction with the executive side was what you see before us, and it's going to be pretty close to fitting what most of these municipalities are looking for. So I actually think that most of us feel this was the best way to go about this the fairest way to go about this and it was going to achieve exactly what we wanted it to achieve, which is towns to come. We don't -we're not like Dutchess County, we don't have a water wastewater department. This is not what we necessarily do. But we did want to put some money and help towards and maybe even some motivations for these towns to take the bull by the horns and do a real project. And that's what the criteria here kind of guarantees that the town is - this is still a town thing. That's they're getting some assistance from the county on. So I'm very comfortable. I feel it's completely vote ready. And most everyone I've talked to felt that way too. I know Chris would agree or disagree with some of what I thought about it. But I know those are a lot of what I said came in conversations with him where him in the executive, but very helpful.

### **Chris Kelly**

Thank you, Legislator Maloney, Nolan and Chair Petit. So I just want to back up a little. So since we received the money, we've been getting unsolicited requests for said money. So since March of last year, when this was just a notion I've been receiving, I know legislators have been receiving requests for various projects in various states of readiness. All of those pieces have informed this \$5 million, so called bucket or program for infrastructure. We kind of designed it based on a community development project we did on Kings highway where the match would be 75% of the municipality, 25% of the county. We felt that with ARPA, we could increase that and have a bigger impact. So we went with half a million dollars or 33% of the project not to exceed that half a million dollars. I have probably I would suspect 10 to 12 of those types of projects where if you talk to the supervisor and say Marlboro, he's already got a funding stack and what he he's using his ARPA, he's got other funds from his sewer district or his water district, this is gap funding to make sure that this project comes to fruition. So that's part of the design.

### **Chris Kelly**

The one thing I do want to back up just a little here is we are making a- our intention is, once this allocation is made, we're going to do a formal and equitable call for projects. So I've already communicated to some of the supervisors, and I'll be on their next monthly meeting. So I can say, here's the pot, here's the rules, we'll do a mini pre-application to see where this project fits within the rules. We don't want somebody chasing money that they're not going to be able to spend within the legal timeline that we're kind of faced with here. We don't want to get in on a project that has no right of way work done. And it's going to require a significant DOT -other state agency approvals, because that can take years, I think, other water projects I know of if you're tapping DEP water, that's a decade long process. So I'm not, I'm not setting out a process to be bureaucratic or overly burdensome. But we do think a quick pre-application circulated to the 23 municipalities will surface those projects in quick order to see what comes back to us.

### **Chris Kelly**

In terms of setting the budget at 5 million. We are not running out of our funds, but we are certainly spending on larger priorities. So when we look at what the legislature did in terms of their survey, what the executive did last year, in terms of setting forth the buckets and the plan, we're getting to this point where we have to make decisions about what those long-lasting investments are going to be. Water and sewer is certainly not an area we typically get involved in. It doesn't mean that we shouldn't. We think that since it's one of the four main called for uses of this funding, it is an opportunity. The county wants



to see more infill economic development as a policy, or they want to see more affordable housing, or they want to make sure that lead pipes are going into a school like those are the things that as a legislative body as an executive, when we're approving projects we should be considering. So short process Nate's already got. He's nodding because he knows, short timeline we're gonna do a quick pre-app, we'll clear the weeds out very quickly communicate back to everybody. And then we'll have that full application process and see what surfaces. But we do think 5 million is a right size program where we can really assist in probably 10 to 12 or so projects that will have an impact. Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you, Legislator Nolan. And then Legislator Stewart.

**Legislator Nolan**

I could yield to Legislator Stewart. He hasn't spoken on this and then come back in. Thank you.

**Legislator Stewart**

Oh, well, thank you Legislator Nolan. Um, I just had a quick question. Um, and maybe I've misunderstood this. So is there a limit of \$500,000 per project per municipality?

**Deputy Executive Marc Rider**

Yes.

**Legislator Stewart**

So like, for example, I'm putting forth two resolutions here. One is for \$1.5 million for sewer, excuse me for water, and the other \$1 million for a park and trail network. And so I would only be able to ask for a total of \$1 million for those two combined projects.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Maloney would you like to respond?

**Legislator Maloney**

Well, the ones not - doesn't sound like it's sewer water. So that would be something different. You could put that up straight into ARPA next ARPA meeting. And I would probably suggest you do that to get a feel for where you're at. This is strictly water sewer.

**Legislator Stewart**

Okay.

**Legislator Maloney**

If you have multiple water, sewer projects, different projects, I would suspect if we have leftover money after every municipality that has had a request comes through, that at that point, we could discuss a second project, but for just to ensure like, you know, like, Chris just said the funds are evaporating. So we don't have 50 million, we have 5 million, which was the largest number that we could put together. And it is I think, going to ensure that every town that has a decent project is going to get it done. But you only get one and for that purpose, you do for fair reasons. If we if we didn't set you know that limit, then

there would be no way to ensure that every municipality gets at least one project. But that's something we could all discuss. After we find out how much we have leftover if any at all. You can then come for a second project. And at that point, we'd probably have two or three municipalities that would have to present the best project, I would assume. And then we it would be a vote of the legislature. But there may not even be that money there.

### **Legislator Stewart**

I see. Okay. Thank you, Legislator Maloney.

### **Legislator Nolan**

Chair Petit with your permission. So um, I think the Legislator Maloney just described the process that I think we would likely get into that will be cumbersome and delay. I support the notion of setting aside and 5 million, maybe the number and doing a call for projects. But I think the projects that we already have submitted based on last year's process, and the early process this year should be judged on their own merits aside from that. And I think there are likely to be projects like that that Legislator Stewart is bringing forward that are more than the \$500,000 but that serve a large number of people. And that are projects that have I mean, his particular project is one that's we've been trying to accomplish in Ulster County for decades, I would say.

### **Legislator Nolan**

So another criteria that I will hope that whatever money is set aside, if indeed, a majority of the legislature wants to vote for this, which is what I would consider evidence that a majority of the legislature wants this, we we haven't voted yet. So I don't think we have that evidence. But if the majority of the legislature does want this set aside for a call for projects, um, I think that could work well. But not every community will likely have a project ready to go in the next year or two years or three years. And so I am worried that we'll have money set aside under criteria that keep us from spending money that was intended as stimulus funding. And stimulus funding works best when you hire people, ideally, people in the community and build ready to go projects that serve people. So I do see a conflict with this proposal, and at least one of the infrastructure proposals we have in front of us. So I, you know, a potential way of addressing that conflict is to say that this \$5 million set aside would be for a new call for projects, and that we take projects that are already submitted and that are ready to be brought forward for review on their own merits.

### **Chair Petit**

I mean, is one of the sponsors I don't disagree with you? You know, I am I'm co-sponsor on to the marble Town projects that are there. I think they're great ideas, especially since one is moving for an expansion of the water and sewer system so they can create more housing. But I will defer to our County Deputy Kelly and then to Legislator Maloney.

### **Chris Kelly**

Thank you. So I just want to be clear, there has been no call for projects. There has been no solicitation of a single water and sewer project. These have come on their own. So there has been no equitable and open process to allow every municipality that has a project to put theirs forward. And that's what we recognized in terms of they - we've got one project that's put forward at a Marbletown. We don't have

anything from Marlboro, who I know has a shovel ready project. Town of Lloyd has shovel ready. I know Shawangunk has shovel ready. Saugerties has shovel ready. So we have a group of projects where they haven't had the same opportunity to say, I'm also ready. I've also got a capital stack here ready to go. I want to apply for gap funding so I can get moving on this project. I think it would behoove us to make sure that we make that call to all the supervisors to the mayors to make sure that they also have that same opportunity. Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Maloney.

**Legislator Maloney**

I'll let Legislator Nolan go first in case there's another question.

**Legislator Nolan**

Or questions I'll wait.

**Legislator Maloney**

Okay, I think Chris just described it pretty well. What we're dealing with here. We do have a time restraint to, these funds go away. This has been collectively worked on for exactly what Chris just described. I think the majority of the legislature is going to be a yes on this as it gets to the floor. And because it creates an equal opportunity for all towns to take some initiative and do some real water and sewer infrastructure have our assistance with ARPA. I'm ready for a vote. I've heard nothing that would hold this up. And I think the support and the votes are there from both branches of government.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Nolan, did you want to hear from Nate before your question or comment or? He did have his hand up.

**Legislator Nolan**

Do you want to speak Nate? Go ahead.

**Director Litwin Dir. Recovery & Resilience**

Sure. It's a quick mention here. And it's on the final rule. So if there are municipalities, and it sounds like there are projects out there, so if an RFA is released, I'm sure we'll get a quick return. But the final rule, US Treasury final rule for ARPA does have criteria. So I just want to make sure that doesn't get missed. It should be looked at. It is broad. Nobody's missed that point. And I think that's wonderful. But there are some specifics. And so I do encourage those legislators who have municipalities in their districts, who probably will be putting things forward to take a look. Most clearly, you can look at the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, and the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, CWS RF and DWSRF. For municipalities with their own sewer and water systems, they'll likely be familiar with those two programs, which are from the EPA. There needs to be no qualification for those programs. But basically, what the final rule did was, they just decided that the criteria under those programs are eligible for use of funds for ARPA money. So that's the cleanest, easiest way to, you know, as an initial thing to look and check and make sure that the projects work. And I just want to mention that.

**Chair Petit**

Legislature Nolan.

**Legislator Nolan**

Thank you. Um, yeah, that's a helpful point. I take the correction or take the or acknowledge that there has been no call for proposals under the ARPA funding. But the discussion of what ARPA funds would be used for has been going on since last year. And clearly people have contacted their legislators, with projects, for their municipalities and ask those legislators to bring them forward. So there's a certain kind of initiative there, that is, um, I think rational, and worthy of responding to as well as if there are concerns that, you know, some municipalities were not able to muster that or manage the system quite as well, that we make a pathway for equal access. So I'm supportive of the RFP, I'm supportive of the \$5 million figure. I'm a little concerned about the 1/3 match. I think there are going to be projects where a 50% match is going to be necessary. And then we get into a process of having to amend a process that we put into place by resolution, when we could just do the RFP and kind of set aside, you know, some monies that we're not going into. So it seems like a little bit more authoritarian in its approach than I think is necessary. I think that's likely to cause us some problems.

**Legislator Nolan**

So I'm also concerned about the project that would support housing that doesn't fit these criteria. So maybe the Legislator Steward has to bring that forward under housing rather than infrastructure. If the only way we're letting out ARPA money for infrastructure is under this resolution, his wonderful project doesn't qualify. So I'm greatly troubled by that. And I think that we have to make a decision, whether we're going to allow some bigger projects, and then, um, you know, have the RFP fill in with some of these other projects for other communities. I'm still not persuaded that this resolution helps us - that it does anything that we can't do without it. We can fund these projects without it. We can issue the RFP without it, we can decide what match we want based on what the you know, the applicants bring to us without it. So in terms of avoiding unnecessary and potentially restrictive legislation, I think we just put it aside and go forward until we see what the RFP generates. And I am, you know, in the context that we do have a surplus in county funding, so that if we do spend ARPA funding on some big project, and have not less money available through this mechanism for some of these good projects, that we might open up that surplus that we have generated through taxation, through taxes, use it for these projects. Um, so that's my approach. You know, I think we vote on it once we've heard all the arguments.

**Chair Petit**

And I would just before I call on Executive Director Kelly. You know, the intent behind this resolution was to get the infrastructure and you need infrastructure before you can get in housing, we need that infrastructure and housing and transportation before we can put a call into businesses and have, you know, true economic development. I am hearing what you're saying Legislator Nolan. I would still like to see this resolution passed, because it does put out a call for RFPs. We've seen that that did work with calls for proposals to help with economic development and not for profits. I'm also really attached to the Marletown resolutions as well. I don't know how you would all feel about an amendment that it would be moving forward. So we could take the resolution 161 and 162 on the merit as presented now, rather than pull back. I'm also finding this has been a really difficult couple of days, because there's resolutions with

significant amendments. The buckets have been convoluted and basically broken down. And so I don't even know for paying attention to them anymore, you know, that would go for the Silver Garden project as well. So it's, I don't know if we need to step back and all go to this ARPA meeting and just really re-discuss it. But okay, so I will hear from Executive Director Kelly, and then we should decide how we want to move forward on this resolution, whether it be amended or as presented.

**Chris Kelly**

So just the last point, and this goes to the rules into the funding. The projects that we put forward that the legislature has approved, we know that the money will be spent in a timely manner, because we have to follow those rules. We've vetted the projects, we're doing the same with the non-for profit grants, we'll do the same on the small business side. My concern is that if we have individuals bring projects forward that have no vetting to them, or no view into shovel readiness. Again, significant water projects require significant work. They require right of ways. They may require easement, they require approvals. If you're working in Marbletown, and you're tapping into that water pipe, you're working with the DEP. So I really want to caution that if we start passing things, without putting them through really any process, but the appropriation process, we may end up in a bad situation where we fund something not knowing that it was truly ready now. Not on the merits of the project or the good that'll bring in the end. But is it actually ready? And that can go for any of these applications. That's why working with Dennis and Nate, we've decided that this pre-application process - quick one page or two pages, we get to vet these quick, and then everybody gets to see, is this really ready for this specific program? It doesn't mean that we shouldn't chase other funds, though. Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you, Legislator Maloney.

**Legislator Maloney**

Yes. Just to reiterate what Chris was just saying, this is how this works. We're the policy fund appropriators. They're day to day operations. We decide to set this money aside. We worked with them on what the criteria would be, and then they have to go and dish out the funds and ensure that it's being done fairly properly, and just all these other things that Chris just mentioned. This is if we are going to do what we want to do here and do some shared services projects, meet some of these towns, help them do some water and sewer infrastructure that they may not be able to do without our help. This is the way to do it. The executives team is telling us if you guys want to do this, this is the way that we feel is the fairest and the most proper, the cleanest and probably the most efficient as far as ensuring that these projects are going to actually be done. Having legislators just bring forth un-vetted wishes, and then us approving it and then throwing it at Chris's that point is not the way to do this. And this has been discussed for like two months now by most of the legislature and the executive branch. And this is what we came up with. I'm like, if I had any more hair, I'd already have pulled it out. This is just the way to do this.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Stewart.

**Legislator Stewart**

I just want to say as someone who is still rather new at this, and not super familiar with all the procedures, that I just wanted to be sure that you know, I came prepared to vote in the affirmative for this particular resolution, as well as for my own personal resolutions that I'm putting forward. So I agree with Legislator Nolan one that it seems like I'm kind of working at odds against myself. But I've spoken to multiple people, some of whom are in this meeting others who are not, who have suggested that this is the correct way to proceed. And so I'm just kind of taking a leap of faith here. So I obviously want to see my own resolutions pass. And I want to see, you know, the town of Marble town not be limited to \$500,000 on these two projects. So

**Chair Petit**

And just as a reminder, we did pass a resolution, you know, for Town of Ulster, and they were provided with \$2 million and infrastructure to expand their water and sewer. So it's not unprecedented. Okay, if there's no further discussion, we'll call the vote on Resolution No. 96. All in favor?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Opposed?

**Legislator Nolan**

Opposed?

**Chair Petit**

Any abstentions? Okay, the resolution passes three to one. Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Now, again, there were so many revisions, everything's become very convoluted. And these and some of them I'm more comfortable with than others. And these resolutions 161, I believe through 166, 67 were held up in the ARPA committee. I certainly don't mind if it's the will of the committee to take action on them, or at least open them up for discussion individually.

**Chair Petit**

So we have Resolution No. 161. Amending the 2022-2027 Capital Improvement Budget, Establishing and Funding Capital Project No. 633, Marbletown water infrastructure expansion. Do I hear a motion? Legislator Fabiano. I will turn this over to you Legislator Stewart.

**Legislator Stewart**

Thank you so much Chair Petit. Sorry. I'm this. This particular project was kind of based on work that was begun in 2018. In 2018 the waterline was extended from the High Falls Water District on Burm Rd. on 213 to SUNY Ulster. And at the time, I was serving as a town councilman, and when we were discussing this water line at that point, initially, I wasn't quite sure what to think because ideally I thought it should have been like a municipal water line that would actually it is, you know, goes to the college and there

were there's language in the bill that said that the college was to be the beneficiary and this needed to have, you know, be related to education.

**Legislator Stewart**

There was also language in that law that stated that you know, the waterline could be tapped into an extended. And so the town this is something that town has been kind of toying with for quite a while. The idea is to bring the water line, the continuation of the water line down Leggett Road to 209 and Main Street in Stone Ridge. People who are familiar with that area will know that prior to extending the waterline to the college, that a lot of the surrounding homes their wells were running dry in dry periods of the summer. In addition, it caused all sorts of problems with the college itself, because there was during a drought, there was several days, the college could not function, because it did not have the water, you know, required for it to do so. So at that point, you know, the waterline got the go ahead, and you know, these and that solved the problems for the college. But it's has not really solved the problems of the surrounding area. Folks who live in Stone Ridge they are subject to their wells running dry. There's also a really strong sulfur smell in the water there that requires people to install expensive filtration systems. And one of the so that's a problem.

**Legislator Stewart**

Another issue that the Town of Marbletown is dealing with is, you know, the Town of Marbletown is very much wanting to create and build affordable workforce and senior housing. And as we all know, one of the biggest inhibiting factors to building high density housing is a lack of a public water system. And so, you know, we felt that allowing the water pipeline to extend to 209 and Main Street in Stone Ridge, that there's several sites, that the town either owns outright or is considering purchasing. That could be used for workforce in senior housing. In addition to that, you know, having a municipal water supply is just a good idea to promote growth of businesses, and, you know, future development. And so for those reasons, you know, the town is hoping to, like I said, bring the water down to 209. This has been something that they've been kicking around for a while, about a year ago, six months ago, the town put out a questionnaire to local citizens who live along the proposed water route, as to, you know, how they felt about extending the water line, and the response to the questionnaire was overwhelmingly positive. And, you know, again, we received lots of complaints about smell about wells running dry, and that sort of thing. It should be noted that this resolution asks for \$1.5 million. It would be that figure from ARPA funds would be matched \$1.5 million by the Town of Marbletown. And this would be for phase one of this project. The ultimate cost of the project as a whole has sort of yet to be determined, but they're guessing it's between like seven and \$8 million.

**Chair Petit**

Legislators Stewart, Legislator, Nolan has a question.

**Legislator Stewart**

Sure.

**Legislator Nolan**

Thank you Chair Petit. Um, yeah. So this is a project that in various forms, I think has been percolating for a very long time. But in light of the discussion on the prior resolution, I would basically ask that we



maybe have the executives team work with Legislator Stewart, to maybe do a little pilot testing of their criteria on readiness, because this is a complicated project. And I know, deputy executive, or Dennis Doyle could speak to the complications here and the potential for this not to be ready to go forward. But I think it's important to bring it forward and discuss it because of the price tag and the amount of the match required, which seem potentially reasonable to me, if the project can be made ready in other ways. So I, you know, in anticipation that there would be a way for the executive's office to work with you on this might be a good resolution to pull for now and evaluate and get ready if it's not, which it sounds like it, likely is not.

**Legislator Stewart**

Legislator Nolan, thank you for that. And I would say that I would certainly welcome that sort of approach from Deputy Rider, Deputy Kelly, and we could certainly work with Supervisor Parete in that regard. And also the firm that we that the Town of Marble town is dealing with is Briner and Larios and yeah, and we'd certainly be happy to work with for Dennis Doyle, whoever we want to be in on that. I think I can speak for the Town of Marblertown in saying that we would be more than happy and willing to do so.

**Chair Petit**

Deputy Director Kelly, I

**Chris Kelly**

Thank you, Legislator Nolan and Stuart, that sounds great to me. So everybody that you mentioned, I'll make sure that they're all in the room, including Nate and the ARPA team. So I'm 100% on board with that. And I did I do mean it like, we're surfacing projects. And we've said this and other ARPA meetings, and I'll say it in here today, what we're doing is surfacing need, and we're surfacing good ideas that whether or not it becomes the unicorn money of ARPA, or we shake 50 other trees, and we're looking to get these projects on the state's IUP or go to Environmental Facilities Corporation for clean drinking water, low interest loans, like, let's do that. So I'm 100% on board. And I say even Dennis is not in tonight. So I'll set that up in short order. Absolutely. Thank you.

**Legislator Stewart**

That would be great. Thank you, Deputy Kelly.

**Chair Petit**

So as a sponsor, would you want us to take no action on this tonight until you have time to discuss the project further with the executive's team? How would you like to proceed with this Legislator Stuart?

**Legislator Stewart**

I think that sounds like a reasonable approach. So if Deputy Kelly and Mr. Doyle are in agreement on that, I'd certainly be happy to do that. Okay.

**Chair Petit**

And it's just that we'll take no action. It'll be on next month's agenda -it's not disappearing by any means. Okay.



**Legislator Stewart**

Okay thank you.

**Chair Petit**

No action on Resolution No. 161.

**Chair Petit**

Resolution No. 162. Amending the 2020 to 27 Capital Improvement Program, Establishing and Funding Capital Project 634. Grady Park Construction Town of Marble town. Motion to

**Legislator Nolan**

I'll move it.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Nolan, second.

**Legislator Fabiano**

I'll second it.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you, Legislator Fabiano. Okay, you have the floor again, Legislator Stewart.

**Legislator Stewart**

Great. Thank you all once again. Grady Park is a project that I've been working on for about four years. It is for those of you familiar with High Falls, it is a 1.5 acre strip of land between 213 and old Rt. 213. It's the middle of High Falls historic district. If you drive through there on a Saturday afternoon, that is where the D&H Canal Society conducts their flea market. So the park itself, like I say, is only about one and a half acres. It is at this point, sort of a vacant lot. The town has done quite a bit of cleanup there. And this is just removing like invasive species and cutting down dead trees and that sort of thing. The town also did put up one guardrail that was a safety issue, because there's a very steep slope in one section of that park.

**Legislator Stewart**

Basically, in that 1.5 acre lot, there are ruins of the D&H of abandoned locks of the D&H canal. In addition to that, there's a lot of interesting changes in typography. You know, it's like say it's right in the center of town. And so we envision this as being kind of a needed green space and meeting place in the community. We've worked very closely with the D&H Canal Society. They are right now building and about to open their new visitor center, which is in the site of the former Canal House Museum, excuse me Canal House Restaurant. And that is going to be their new visitor center. And so this is kind of designed to work in conjunction with the projects of the D&H Canal Society, and also a local community group, the High Falls Conservancy, has been involved in this project for many years. In fact, they're the ones who kind of got the ball rolling on this whole project several years ago, in working with grants and so a lot of this is kind of taking up from where they left off, and they're still very much involved in the process.

**Legislator Stewart**

The town spent a lot of time working with the community in doing like public forums and getting feedback and setting up meetings of which I was intimately involved in all of it, to get community input on how they felt this park should function. The park is going to serve a variety of functions, if they're, like I said, there's historic preservation aspects to it, there are educational aspects to it. We envision the park as having a bunch of signage that would explain the impact of the canal on the history of the community. Also you know, the history of all of Ulster County. In addition to that there are public access and safety issues that are addressed. The park, in addition to like providing a green space and meeting space would also have an ADA compliant walkway that would run through the length of the park. It would also involve a bunch of you know, adding sidewalks in adding crosswalks, some of which the crosswalks have already been put in. So it's really, you know, to allow better access to the whole Historic District.

**Legislator Stewart**

In addition to the park also adds additional parking, which is a big problem in High Falls, especially during the summer months. So we see this as kind of serving a great many purposes at once. In addition to all of those aspects of it, the park will also serve as a nexus in our trail network. It will link High Falls to the O&W rail trail. And it will link the O&W rail trail to the five locks walk, which is a project that is done by the DNH Canal Society. But the Canal Society is also planning on creating a loop over to Berm road. So again, like I say it's sort of a nexus of these many trails. And in addition to that, there is the High Falls Creek walk, which is an existing trail that runs along the banks of the Rondout creek just below the falls. And that is now an official connector of the O&W rail trail so that so the O&W will be linked not only by sidewalks and crosswalks, but also by the creek walk. So like I said we envisioned this. This park is being able to serve a great many different purposes. For this project,

**Chair Petit**

This project is ready to go.

**Legislator Stewart**

This project is ready to go. We have extensive architectural planning that has been done by Green Man Peterson, which is a planning and engineering firm based in in Albany. And we've had these drawings out now for about a year. They are currently working on one issue with DOT right of ways. And this is something like that we've been working on for several years at this point. So they're working with the DOT right now. In addition, they are preparing the manuals that will be distributed to contractors who answered the request for proposals. And initially, we were hoping to have the request for proposals out last fall. But due to COVID and little things like elections, that just didn't happen. But this project is very much shovel ready. And I hope you guys will give it your support.

**Chair Petit**

Okay, we have a question by Legislator Nolan.

**Legislator Nolan**

Thank you Chair Petit. It's really an expression of support. For us to pass this out of committee. I think it is shovel ready. I think it is exactly what we need to help translate trail networks into community building

in the hamlets and provide access not only to visitors but also to residents. So I think it's a really good project. I would support voting it out of committee with our approval for it as a project and let the ARPA committee review it for its merits as a project for ARPA funding. I haven't seen the score sheets. I don't know how it does on all the criteria, but I think that the way I see the ARPA committee best complementing the work of the standing committees is for us to look at the project and whether it's worth funding. And if ARPA doesn't provide funding for it, then we have to work with the sponsors and find that funding.

**Chair Petit**

I absolutely agree with you. I'm sorry Legislator Stewart.

**Legislator Stewart**

Legislator Nolan thank you for that comment. I appreciate it. Also, one thing I failed to mention earlier, is that there are - in the background formation there, I only saw one map, there's actually three maps that show like the ADA compliant walkway and how it links up to the various other projects. In addition, I failed to mention that we have letters of support from a great many individuals and organizations, including Ulster County Development Agency, the D&H Canal Society, the Ulster County Historical Society, the Rondout Valley Business Association. So this project has great support within the local community. And as noted, the Town of Marbletown will be matching these funds 50/50.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you. Okay, so if there's no further discussion, I'd like to call the vote on resolution 162. All in favor?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. Thank you. That was a great discussion. Okay. Next is Resolution 163. Establishing and Funding Capital Projects No. 631. A Geothermal System for Silver Garden Senior Housing Development. Do I hear motion for discussion?

**Legislator Fabiano**

I'll move it for discussion.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Fabiano, thank you seconded by Legislator Nolan. We have both Richard Gerentine and from who's part of the project and Emily Hamilton from REPCO. Nettie, did you share or co-host with Emily so she can share her screen and do a brief presentation. For those who did not make the ARPA meeting. There was a nice PowerPoint presentation, which is also part of the 1000 pages that was sent to us in our one drive as backup but

**Nettie Tomshaw**

Ok Emily.

**Chair Petit**

There we go. Perfect. Okay, Emily, you have the floor.

**Legislator Nolan**

But you're muted.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

Technology.

**Chair Petit**

It was a great presentation, though.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

It muted and unmuted itself. Um, so good evening, everyone. My name is Emily Hamilton. I'm a Senior Project Manager for real estate at REPCO. And I'm here to and I'm here with Richard Gerentine who is co-developing this project with REPCO. I am here to talk to you tonight about Silver Gardens, hopefully 57 apartment project, in Highland, New York. So for those of you who don't know REPCO well, our mission is to create homes, support people and improve communities. And our vision is for strong, vibrant and inclusive communities for the home and opportunity for everyone. So I'll quickly run through some examples of our projects. That I think perhaps many of you already now, there's the lease known in Kingston - Energy Square, which was completed beginning of the pandemic in 2020, with 57 apartments and that has a geothermal system as well as solar. Landmark Place which is now in construction, but when the building is complete, and that building that's completes, has 34 units and 28 of those are supportive housing. So those housing for those who were formerly homeless 55 and older. Newburgh East End II so we completed East End I in 2018. And that's 45 total apartments in 15 properties, so it's a scattered site project. This is also a scattered site project, he's done two, with a total of 24 properties. 22 of them are residential. And one of the non-residential properties is this church in this presentation, and that will be a center for job training, including youth build program. So, as I said before, we are partnering on this project with Richard and his sons. Their entity is Girondini and they have four affordable housing projects. Jenny's Garden 1 and 2, Milton Harvest and Golden View.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

An overview of Silver Gardens. As I said before, it will be 57 apartments 57, one bedrooms for 55 and older. A three-story wood frame building with a total of 52,600 square feet in Highlands. And 29 of the total of 57 apartments will be for those who are currently homeless, 19 will be for those who are considered frail elderly, 8 are for chronically homeless people, and 2 for those with HIV AIDS. So this funding from the ARPA funds will be used for the geothermal system that will not only heat hot water, but it will also which normally, we don't do that. We normally install systems that will provide heating and cooling but this time we're doing heating and cooling and heating hot water. And it will be a very energy efficient building. And it will get some green building certifications.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

So why do we need housing, like the Silver Gardens Project. Well, as we all know, many people in Ulster County need affordable housing including those who are 55 and older. So the project's high quality, new construction, naturalists setting and convenient access to major amenities will attract seniors. And this

shows you the location of the project across from Poughkeepsie and next to (inaudible) park. As I said before, there will be 29 apartments for those who are currently homeless. And at the property REPCO will provide mental health counseling and case management.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

So each of these apartments will be 682 square feet. Again, there's a map with the site location closer up map.

**Chair Petit**

So Emily, what's the total there's about 78 units is that the total?

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

57.

**Chair Petit**

Fifty-seven altogether that includes a 29 REPCO and okay.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

Right. Yeah, so 29 units reserved for those who are currently homeless and 55 and older, and then an additional 28 for those who are 55 and older and who income qualify. There's a site plan with 57 parking spaces. So there's been some questions about the developer fee that REPCO and the Gerentine's are on for this project. We've reduced it to 10% normally it's 15% of the total development cost, and that amount is \$1.638 million. And there were also some questions about the land sale. The land sale is supported by an appraisal, and the total is \$590,000. So the rent, tenants in any affordable housing development, pay no more than 30% of their income and rent. And this gives me an example of what that is like in Ulster County in terms of the incomes that in Ulster County for 100%, AMI is 87,800. And so that's for a family of four. And so that family could afford to pay up to approximately \$2,195 in rents of the 57 one bedroom units at Silver gardens, and this is the breakdown for each of those. Each rental type in the development, so 10 units for seniors with an income of 50%, AMI, and monthly rent of which is a monthly rent of \$782, 18 units at 60%, AMI with a monthly rent of \$939. And the remaining units 29 units, has a total rent of 8\$23. But those will be subsidized by this program called Empire State's Supportive Housing Initiative.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

The idea is if we get funded by New York State Homes and Community Renewal, we just submitted another application last week, construction will start in the winter of 2022. The construction will be completed in the summer of 2024. And the building will be occupied completely by fall of 2024. Those are all goals.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

So who do we just submit an application to. We submitted an application to New York State Homes (inaudible) annual in their what they call their 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credit Multifamily Funding round. It's very competitive rounds. For an example of the 21 projects awarded tax credits in the summer of 2021, only three projects were awarded from the Mid-Hudson region. And typically two projects are

awarded from our region. And we expect 10 or more applicants from the Mid-Hudson region to apply for the rounds that we just applied for.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

And this is a draft of the capital stack of all the sources that are needed to complete this project. There's a loan from Webster bank from loan on the property. There's low income housing tax credit equity that comes from an investor. In our case, it's bank. There is New York State supportive housing opportunity program is a particular program for those who are formerly homeless. And there's the Federal Housing Trust Fund, which are federal funds, but they're administered by New York State Homes and Community Renewal. And then we included the Ulster County ARPA funds of 600,000. There's also funding that we expect from NYSEDA for the energy efficiency measures we are getting in the building and a deferred developer fee, which comes from the rents over a period of 15 years. So why is ARPA funding needed for this project? A 600,000. ARPA funding commitment demonstrates local and county support for silver gardens in the last round of the 9% multifamily. I'm going to just say HDR from now on HDR funding rounds. There were two projects from Westchester and they received a lot of advocacy from local legislators. And on top of that, they receive funding from Westchester County and that that helps those projects get awarded. As I said, it's very competitive. There's a lot of need throughout the state for affordable housing. And having the local support is very important. So regarding supports our permissions and goals, households impacted by the pandemic, permanent supportive housing and social services and case management remedies systemic

**Committee Members**

public health challenge had challenges.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

Seniors homeless, frail, elderly, and those with HIV age as well as chronically homeless residents all represent underserved and vulnerable populations. And that is what our performance So, one of the reasons why we need these harbor funds. So the also the funds will contribute towards the beginning the building of a geothermal heating and cooling system. And as I said before, it's not just cooling. It's also for hot water. And

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

that's our presentation. Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you very much. Mr. Gerentine, did you have anything else to add? Or you're getting applause from Legislator Stewart?

**Chair Petit**

No, I don't see.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

You got to hear it again.

**Chair Petit**

Yeah. As a veteran. I think the only question I have is actually to the deputy executives. are we pulling the ARPA funding? Because again, it's convoluted. And I heard there was another ARPA funding source now. And I discussed with Mark Ryder about perhaps using the clean energy and workforce line, but he thought legislator green may hunt me down. And then there's also housing. I think that would be the only question I would have. are we pulling this money out of the right ARPA allocation? Deputy Director, Kelly?

**Chris Kelly**

Sure. Thank you, Chairman. Fatigue. So we had the buckets that was established in the last legislative session, I would say, with certain projects, we have stuck with a large part of that plan. But I would say it's not 100% anymore. And we said this at the time when we presented that plan in June, and subsequently put projects forward in the budget. Both we did and members of the legislature did for approval as well, that not every good idea was surfaced at that time. So we're not we're no longer I wouldn't say completely wed to those specific buckets, those targets they were they were target spending. But from our perspective, we still have largely operated within them that this 600,000 coming from the housing fund is certainly within that realm of what we originally envisioned. We've talked about some other projects, in affordable housing or in emergency shelter, housing, and it's still coming from within that same, I guess, intended allocation. But you're right, like, what you're seeing now is part of a learning process. And I think some of the confusion with the changing of how the resolutions have been presented and now amended, that's part of a collaboration between our budget team and the clerk's office, trying to make sure that we can have proper accounting. So 10 Jurors worked with Amber just to kind of clean those up. You know, I know, I know, it's a little confusing, but we are definitely trying to make sure that that's more clear for everybody.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you, Legislator Nolan.

**Legislator Nolan**

Thank you, Chair Petit. I want to voice my support for this project. My only concern would be that it's still putting it together its funding package. And I don't like to have these funds set aside and not used. But this is clearly a project making great headway. And to me, it's perfect for the ARPA funding for the populations it serves, for the fact that we need the housing, and to have this go for geothermal is just so exciting. This facility may be one that if fuel prices shoot through the roof everywhere else, we may have to put multiple people in all the rooms down there because they have geothermal and they're warm. And we may have to turn the lobby into a warming center. And I say that it was some levity. But I'm also concerned that with the volatility of fuel prices, that is now not just hypothetical, that a project like this ensures that we have housing that can really work in the next decade in the 21st century. So I'm really excited about it for that reason and to have local people bringing it forward is particularly nice.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Stewart.



**Legislator Stewart**

Thank you, Chair Petit. I just wanted to echo a lot of things that Legislator Nolan just stated. I mean, I serve on the Energy and Environment Committee, and I think that this, I mean, I'm a huge fan of RUPCO and I think they just do wonderful things for the entire County. And I think that this project could really serve as a green energy model not only for Ulster County and New York State but for the whole country and I just applaud it. So thank you all so much.

**Chair Petit**

Sorry, it was getting dark in here. Do we have any other questions or discussions? Legislator Fabiano.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Yes first of all, how you doing Richie? It's great to see you. And I think this is an awesome project that couldn't come at a better time. God knows that we need affordable housing more and more every day. And I don't foresee it getting any better anytime soon. Um, my only question is, if I wanted to get it like, do you have like a brochure that you have out there for this project that I would like to look through if there was a place I could get one.

**Chair Petit**

There's a whole application process. You're on mute.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Am I?

**Legislator Nolan**

If you put in an application Legislator Fabiano, you'll have a conflict of interest.

**Legislator Fabiano**

I just wanted to thumb through it, you know?

**Chair Petit**

Yeah.

**Richard Gerentine**

Can you hear me know?

**Chair Petit**

Yes, we can.

**Legislator Fabiano**

I can hear you Richie yes.

**Richard Gerentine**

Dean yes, we don't have a brochure at this moment for this particular project. But I will make an offer to any legislator that would like to come on a site visit which is right - we have a project right next to it called



Golden View Senior Housing. You're more than welcome to come down. We'll take you through a tour. We'll show you what we're doing, how we're doing it through an existing building. But also, you have a bunch of paperwork that we gave the county.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Okay.

**Richard Gerentine**

Probably like Laura said 50 pages, it's probably about

**Legislator Fabiano**

Oh, boy okay.

**Richard Gerentine**

Anything you would like we have - any other questions you're more than welcome to ask.

**Emily Hamilton REPCO**

The closest we had her brochure is the presentation I think that I just gave the PowerPoint.

**Nettie Tomshaw**

Emily, could you please email that to me tomorrow?

**Chair Petit**

It's included in the backup documentation? Yes. Presentation.

**Chair Petit**

Yeah. Yeah, I thought I saw all of the PowerPoint.

**Legislator Nolan**

I think we have it already.

**Chair Petit**

Yeah, but you got to go through. I think it starts on page 40 maybe. And then it goes to page 300. I don't know but yeah.

**Legislator Nolan**

Maybe it's worth mailing that separately to the members of the committee, just this presentation to make it easier for us to use it.

**Legislator Fabiano**

That is a good idea.

**Richard Gerentine**

Get with Nettie tomorrow and she'll get it out to them. Right Nettie?

**Nettie Tomshaw**

Yes.

**Chair Petit**

Yes, she will.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you. Okay, if we don't have any further discussion, I'll call the vote on resolution number. Oh, goodness, what 163? All in favor?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Any opposed? No abstentions? Okay. So that's 4 with one absent. I just got a text from Legislator Litts he safely landed at JFK. But he won't be able to make the meeting so. He still might! Okay, thank you.

**Chair Petit**

The next resolution is just a follow up. Resolution No. 164. Approving the Execution of a Contract for 600,000 Entered into by the County with REPCO Inc. You're okay. Legislator Nolan moves it. And a second.

**Legislator Fabiano**

I'll second it.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Fabiano. Do we have any discussion on this? Okay, hearing none, I'll take a vote. All in favor Resolution 164.

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Four in favor? Any opposed? No abstentions. Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. You're welcome to stay with us. Mr. Gerentine and Emily.

**Richard Gerentine**

Laura, I would love to but I missed those days of staying all those late nights. Thank you very much for everybody. Nice seeing everybody.

**Chair Petit**

We miss your meatballs and lasagna. Okay next up.

**Chair Petit**

Bye bye. Next up, we have Resolution No. 165. Establishing and Funding Capital Project No. 629, ARPA Brownfields Redevelopment. Motion to discuss.

**Richard Gerentine**

Bye bye.

**Legislator Nolan**

So moved.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Nolan, and a second?

**Legislator Fabiano**

Second.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Fabiano. Who discussed this the other day was that you Deputy Director Rider.

**Deputy Executive Rider**

Yeah, Amanda LaValle here from planning.

**Chair Petit**

Oh, thank you.

**Deputy Executive Rider**

Chris Kelly can also speak to it, but Amanda

**Chair Petit**

All right, Amanda, are you still with us or did you give up on us? I don't know if she's still here.

**Nettie Tomshaw**

She's here.

**Chair Petit**

Okay, I'm calling okay there you are. Thank you. You're right under Marc.

**Amanda LaValle**

Would you like? Thank you. Would you like the presentation or a brief version of it?

**Chair Petit**

Yes.

**Amanda LaValle**

Or just a summary.

**Chair Petit**

Because you think brownfields right away, I'm thinking, you know, Dyno Nobel or, you know, Enterprise Drive. And I don't know if anybody was on the same mindset. But yes, just an explanation of what the projects are.

**Amanda LaValle**

Sure. So I will do the briefer version, happy to take more questions if anybody has them. But all the legislators are aware that you have a foreclosure eligible list and a foreclosure process, which is a multi-year process. And during that process before the judgment is made, which means that the deed is signed over to Ulster County, there are in any given year, a handful or more properties, which are not allowed to proceed through the foreclosure process because of real or perceived environmental concerns. And the real or perceived is actually part of the definition of brownfields in that there's enough of - there may be, you know, maybe it was a gas station. And there might be an unknown condition as far as to whether there's contamination on that site.

**Amanda LaValle**

Those properties are removed from the proceeding. So the county never takes the deed takes title to them. There are several properties which have been on that list for many years of which the county continues to pay the taxes to the town and to the school district making them whole. And they also sit within the community. And they're often places that are unrealized or blighted, or, you know, at the very best, they're missed opportunities for the community, but at the worst they can be actually, you know, potential sources of contamination.

**Amanda LaValle**

We have through the last several years, I think developed what could be called a proof of concept, in which we're using some authority through environmental conservation law, to go in front of a judge to gain a temporary incidence of ownership for the purpose of going on these properties to conduct testing, but it does not put the county in the chain of title. So by going and getting this TIO as it's called, we're able to conduct testing, and then either describe the conditions that are on the site, or realize that perhaps it was just the kind of you know, the concern that there were conditions on the site. And that also gives us information really, most importantly, and from there, we can either decide to foreclose upon the property, or push that property into kind of programmatic channels in which the DEC or perhaps other Oil Spill Fund can do appropriate cleanup.

**Amanda LaValle**

The proof of concept properties that I was referring to when we went in and did some investigation, there wasn't really anything. So we went ahead and foreclosed on that, we had to do some legal work releasing some liens from DEC. Another property there, there was some contamination and then the Oil Spill Fund came on the site and did some additional investigation before DEC closed out the file. But with that additional investigation, then we were able to say okay, we're ready to foreclose on the property because it had been thoroughly investigated.

**Amanda LaValle**

So what this project would do is upscale this effort and a concerted effort to deal with the several dozen properties that are on this potential brownfield list. Properties that are foreclosure eligible that haven't been no judgment has been sought for them. And it would allow us these properties are in about 13 different municipalities across the county. And it would really allow us to really kind of, again, take the effort, make a concerted, make it a bigger, bigger project and get through some of these projects. have been sitting as blight or contamination in communities for a very long time.

**Chair Petit**

It's my understanding there's over 40 of these properties and are some of them still occupied?

**Legislator Nolan**

I would say there is about 30, maybe 25? And yes, there are quite a few of them that are still occupied at this point in time, because the county has never taken title to the property.

**Chair Petit**

Okay, any other questions? I'm sorry, I'm sorry to interrupt you. Sorry

**Amanda LaValle**

I'm just going to elaborate about the budget. The budget would go towards initial work of the records review on the sites. A certain number of those sites, we believe we would need to do some type of onsite sampling, and also toward legal services. Sometimes there are issues that require kind of specialized outside environmental counsel around release of liens and some other issues that are kind of particular to environmental law.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you. Legislator Nolan has a question.

**Legislator Nolan**

I just want to commend this - such a smart use of the county's money to do this. And thank Amanda LaValle for her work, and the Department of the Environment and others Department of Planning, I'm sure involved in this just, this is really smart. And we should do it as soon as we can get it going. I appreciate the proof of concept. You've already been doing it. And it works and the early results suggest that we should do it in a much bigger way really take care of identifying all these properties, getting this information for all the properties and moving them out of limbo into whatever actions need to be taken with them.

**Legislator Stewart**

Legislator Stewart. Thank you.

**Legislator Stewart**

Sorry about that.

**Chair Petit**

It was very profound whatever it was you said earlier.

**Legislator Stewart**

I was just saying, hey Amanda it's nice to see you again. And I hope you're enjoying your new position. I was just curious, like, what happens to these? What's the long-term plan for properties?

**Amanda LaValle**

So the key there being that we need to get to judgment, so we need to get to the point where the county can actually sign over the deed. And from there, depending on what the property is, it could be auctioned. But it could be used for county use any other kind of discussion there as well. But it gets us to that point of having the judgment and the deed.

**Legislator Stewart**

So it could almost be like, like a County Land Bank sort of thing or, or like you said it could just be sold.

**Amanda LaValle**

We're currently reviewing a property right now, that was actually one of the proof of concept properties that you know, does, you know, have some potential for other uses- for county uses. So yes.

**Legislator Stewart**

Great. Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Okay, any other discussion? Legislator Cahill.

**Chair Petit**

Hi, can we merge our meetings?

**Legislator Cahill**

Well, I wish we could at some point, we got a lot of people waiting at the next meeting. So I just wanted to ask a quick question. We discussed this amongst a few legislators about the possibility of setting up a policy for how we go about doing this because right now, you know, we're being presented a list of properties that are designated brownfield. We don't know how they're designated as Brownfield. We don't know if there's other properties designated as brownfield. And we really don't know what the outcome of these properties are going to be. And so my question is, is there a thought to working with the legislature to create a policy on how we want to deal with these brownfield sites if this is going to be something that we're going to tackle. Some of these properties have been on there going on 30 years, right. And so now, after 30 years, we're going to, you know, address the issue, potentially, without a policy. So I just think that's something that we should maybe take a step back, think about it a little bit and decide if this is how we want to go about it just by funding these particular projects without really knowing exactly what we're going to do there and how we're going to approach it and you know, the end of the call and everything else. I mean, I just think that we should have a defined repeatable process, if we're going to designate these properties as brownfields and then use taxpayer funds to clean them up. You know, no matter

where the money comes from, it's taxpayer money. So just my two cents on this. And I'm going to bring that up again in Ways and Means to see if we can maybe get the ball rolling on setting some sort of policy on this.

**Chair Petit**

And just to clarify Legislator Cahill, this would be in addition to a policy on how we're going to handle the properties after such as transfer, either to an LDC or to a land bank, or will this all be one?

**Legislator Cahill**

Well, you know, I think they're two completely distinctly different issues, right? You know, how we how we actually even identify properties for an LDC or a land bank is one thing. This is completely different. This is remediating brownfields, and then what do we do with them then? How are they designated? You know, all that other stuff? So thank you. Okay.

**Amanda LaValle**

Chair Petit, if I may.

**Chair Petit**

Sure. And then we have Legislator Maloney.

**Amanda LaValle**

There is certainly a procedure internally as far as how these are reviewed, starting with the town and the assessors in the code enforcement officers continuing with DPW and site, roadside site inspections, and then a record review that we do internally. Council that we've worked with, you know, outside environmental council, has, frankly, been impressed at the level of records review that we do on these properties. I think that, you know, if there is contamination of significance that is discovered on these properties, and it's not just that we're kind of just doing the investigation, and they are kind of pushed out to DEC or EPA or Oil Spill Fund, those agencies have mechanisms for going after the parties responsible for the contamination. So they much more so you know, the county doesn't have anything like that. But they do very much pursue that. Looking for the responsible parties. That doesn't answer all of your questions, but just to add that to for context.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you, Legislator Maloney.

**Legislator Maloney**

Before I make my comments. So there is a procedure, could we could we get that sent to us, we and then we could end up codifying that into our policy, but you have a written procedure, a process?

**Chair Petit**

Or bullet points or

**Amanda LaValle**

It's very much a standard process, so

**Legislator Maloney**

Could you send it in writing what the procedure is?

**Amanda LaValle**

We could outline that.

**Legislator Maloney**

Thank you. And then maybe we could work off that. I happen to think that we do need a policy. I agree. And but I agree with the reasons that Brian put forth. But I also think, to protect ourselves from corruption. And, you know, inside play, when you look at Tech City, I think there's a lot of people around the county wondering whether we were just following procedure, or whether it was more than that. There was a big donor, a big involved person, some perhaps some lobbying being done by certain people involved with the executive at that time and Mr. Ginsburg, and you wonder if that if that entire process and decision making was on the up and up and I will remind everyone that the first thing Adele Ryder did when she became executive was to immediately start to act on something. And I am not the only one that thinks that it was quite peculiar how that all went down, and how suddenly we were all over it after there were many people from elected officials in the Town of Ulster crying foul, why are we allowing this, this land to sit there and Ginsburg to continue to make money. I happen to feel that our policy should basically just stay to 36 months, whether it's contaminated, whether we feel it's I don't care if there's plutonium there, we should take it. Because if we're not going to and go and address the issues there who is. So at 36 months, everybody gets treated equally in my mind, and we go and get the property and we deal with it. Let allowing something to sit there and be toxic is no solution at all. And it's and it's a failure of government.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Cahill.

**Legislator Cahill**

Yeah, thank you. You know, and that actually brings up another point as I look through that list, and the description of what is considered a brownfield. Actually, some of them aren't actually brownfields, as I understand it, some of them are listed as blighted. Right, which is not a brownfield, but just an eyesore and rundown. And so, you know, that's another thing that I think we should be looking at is, you know, having app descriptions for what the properties actually are. I mean, there's A property on there in my district that's hasn't had been addressed in over 10 years has \$10 million in owed back taxes. And as far as I know, there is no contamination on that site. It's an active, productive site, there are people working on it every single day. Right. And so that's my concern is, you know, what was the reason for not. And I know that there's government agencies in there other there was social security in that building at one time. And I know that there are other businesses thriving there. But, you know, \$10 million in back taxes. And then, you know, now we're going to pay to fix a blighted property there. I'm just a little concerned about how, what, you know, how that happened. And where we are there. I'm specifically talking about the one on Grant Avenue, as you would know, with the \$10 million. So we absolutely need a policy here. And, you know, it's going to take a little bit longer I think, then we have tonight here. Thank you,



**Chair Petit**

Legislator Nolan.

**Legislator Nolan**

Yes, I think that working on a policy makes sense. I also think that working on these properties that have been on this list, as is pointed out, for some of them more than a decade, is a good first step and a great investment of this money. And we should pursue those in parallel. The \$10 million tax bill would have been less if we had had a process to go through and address the legal issues that we're preventing the foreclosure and are taking those properties over earlier. So this kind of procedure was developed to deal with the fact that we had a problem that needed to be addressed. And I think we should move it forward as it's been developed, and then codify it.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you. That was my next question. If there's no other questions, how would the committee like to proceed? Are you ready to take a vote?

**Committee Members**

Yes, yes.

**Chair Petit**

Yes. Okay. All right. So on Resolution No. 165. All in favor?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Hesitating, but I. Okay. Any opposed? And no abstentions? Okay, the resolution passes four to zero. We will get more information and we have an opportunity to, you know, discuss on the floor, change our minds, you know, but it's, I mean, I'm glad it's \$12 million in lost tax revenue. So.

**Chair Petit**

Okay, Resolution No. 166. Establishing and Funding Capital Project No. 632. Crisis Stabilization Center Purchase of 368 Broadway. A motion to discuss.

**Nettie Tomshaw**

Laura. No, it's not amending. It's just funding a capital project. That's one of the ones that was changed, modified -amended. Okay. So it's just funding capital project number 598.

**Chair Petit**

It's not establishing it's just funding capital project number.

**Nettie Tomshaw**

Yes 598.

**Chair Petit**

Okay. What Nettie said. Do I have a motion to move to the floor for discussion? Legislator anybody - Legislator Stewart. Second.

**Legislator Fabiano**

I'll second it.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you, Legislator Fabiano. Do we have questions discussion on this one. I do. This is a bargain at \$2 million. And it is an outright purchase. Because it did say reuse and in kind which I was a little confused about but if this is an outright purchase, and I understand have one tenant.

**Deputy Executive Rider**

So there's currently multiple, there's a few tenants in there Access Supports for Living is there and Samadhi has a lease on there as well.

**Chair Petit**

Okay. But it is an outright purchase of the entire building.

**Deputy Executive Rider**

Okay. All right, very good. I'm excited about this one then.

**Deputy Executive Rider**

Correct. It's currently a condo association with I think 16 to 17 owners that are separate, but they have all agreed to sell and this price includes all suites. And they will all be out shortly by either by closing or I think there's one doctor who's retiring in the next short term and would lease some of the space that - you know it's going to take us a little while to get this facility filled. Anyway, so if he's winding down his practice, we could lease some of the space back but everybody else will be out.

**Deputy Executive Rider**

Chair can I intercede. I apologize 165, 166 and 167. These three resolutions, have if you're going to approve them, it's motion to adopt as presented. Because they

**Chair Petit**

Okay, because we - and are there any other ones? Or is this just the one these three.

**Nettie Tomshaw**

Just those three? If you can amend your vote to just

**Chair Petit**

Yeah, yeah. Because this was several emails that come through, including, I think one about 15 minutes before the meeting from Amber. So I will take another vote on Resolution No. 165 as presented.

**Legislator Nolan**

I amend the motion and we should get whoever seconded to amend the seconds as well.

**Chair Petit**

Dean Fabiano.

**Nettie Tomshaw**

Right. Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Do we have to take another vote on it. Are we okay, should we do just to be safe? Okay. All right. So on the resolution is presented?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Any noes? Okay, no abstentions? So going back to Resolution 166, as presented with you know, amendments that we got a little bit earlier revisions. A motion to move that for discussion. I think that was Legislator Fabiano and then it was seconded by

**Nettie Tomshaw**

Stewart and Fabiano.

**Chair Petit**

Okay, thank you. It was discussed. Is there any further discussion? Okay, hearing none, Resolution 166 as presented.

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

All in favor?

**Chair Petit**

Any opposed? No abstentions? Okay. Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Next, as presented Resolution No. 167. Adopting a Negative Declaration for the Demolition of the Former Ulster County Jail located on Golden Hill and Establishing and Funding Capital Project No. 630. Motion for discussion.

**Legislator Fabiano**

I'll move it.

**Chair Petit**

Fabiano.

**Legislator Nolan**

Second.

**Chair Petit**

Second by Legislator Nolan. Questions on this one. I did receive an email earlier from Phil Erner who is unable to be here. But he did have some concerns and had asked that we take no action. I just wanted to put that out of there out of respect for him. And also this is this property is currently held by an LDC.

**Deputy Executive Rider**

Yeah. So do you mind if I just give a um,

**Chair Petit**

Absolutely.

**Deputy Executive Rider**

So there was a resolution to surplus this property. But that requires a subdivision that has not happened yet. So this property is still owned by the county. There is an overall seeker determination being done currently by the Kingston Planning Board. They are aware and that's for the overall project. With Pen Rose doing the housing development, they're aware that we're doing this. They are comfortable with us seeking a SEQRA determination a negative declaration here on just the demolition of the jail. We've done the environmental studies. And it is appropriate for a neg dec. We are trying to move forward so we can demo this facility this summer. And so this is part of that process that will help us meet our timeline. I'm not sure that there's anything that a month would do to change the outcome of this resolution being the neg. dec. and establishing the fund of the 1.5 million in demolition.

**Chair Petit**

Ah, county executive Deputy Executive Kelly, you've gotten the promotion -you want to run right now.

**Chris Kelly**

So I just wanted to add that in a discussion with the Chair Bartels earlier on this project as well as the Silver Garden's one is we are looking to attach either a seller's note or a recapture rider. This would ensure that our investment in these projects will stay with for the intended purpose. So we're investing in these projects have because of what they're going to create, which is affordable housing. So common within these projects. And I think Kevin O'Connor said it during the ARP meeting that with the (inaudible), the Low Income Housing Tax Credits, there's a 50-year recapture clause within any of those funding streams. So the chairs asked that we also include it in these projects. It's not in front of you tonight. But full confession, I'm texting Nate, and he will be working on this as he nods, and we'll have these ready before, hopefully it hits the floor and everybody can view that language. It's, really just to make sure that if the project sold, that if it doesn't stay with the intended use of being affordable or for what we're investing in, then we would get those funds back. That's all. Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

That actually that that's a great move. Okay. And we should - so it won't be as presented for say Ways and Means, but it'll be in our legislative session packet.

**Chris Kelly**

I'm hoping that we get this locked in tomorrow. So that whatever is voted on the Tuesday Ways and Means that then we'll be okay.

**Chair Petit**

Okay. Well, so, with that information, how would the committee like to proceed then?

**Legislator Fabiano**

I think we should call for a vote to move forward. Okay. Once again, we have a good opportunity here to try to get some more affordable housing and Ulster County which is desperately needed, and the hold it up another month is foolish. Sometimes just got to move forward.

**Chair Petit**

Okay. All right. I'll give I'll shoot Legislator Erner a text later. Okay, so I'm calling the vote on 167 as presented. All in favor?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Any opposed? Okay, so moved. Thank you. Legislator - boy, it's getting awfully late. We're gonna have to talk about our meetings.

**Chair Petit**

Resolution No 175. Re-establishing the Ulster County Trails Advisory Committee. Motion to move for discussion.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Move it.

**Chair Petit**

Fabiano. Second.

**Legislator Nolan**

Second.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Nolan. And everybody has the backup information and who the appointee's names. Was there any further discussion? Okay, hearing none, I'll take the vote on Resolution No. 175. All in favor?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Any opposed? No abstentions? Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Resolution number 176. Approving the Execution of a Contract for \$121,600 120 1000s. My saying that right \$600 entered into by the county with Creighton Manning engineering LLP. Motion to move for discussion.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Move it.

**Legislator Nolan**

Second.

**Chair Petit**

Fabiano, seconded by Legislator Nolan. Any discussion on this one? And which specific project is this for? Is one of the bridges.

**Director Dennis Doyle**

If I may Chair Petit.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you.

**Director Dennis Doyle**

It is a study of the Route 9W corridor between essentially the Shop Rite area all the way up through and including the new facility that's being built by Central Hudson. This is 100% federal funding. It's coming from the Ulster County Transportation Council.

**Chair Petit**

Okay, can they just close down that whole strip and only let buses run through?

**Legislator Nolan**

Pedestrians.

**Chair Petit**

Pedestrians, yeah, not when there's cars boy it's crazy. Okay, if there's no further discussion, I'll take the vote. All in favor of Resolution No. 177.

**Legislator Nolan**

176.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you. You're keeping me straight. All in favor?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Any opposed? No abstentions? Okay, thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Okay, after 176 we have No. 177 and 78 which we have already voted on.

**Chair Petit**

Resolution No. 179. Establishing Capital Projects 628 Galeville, Bridge Replacement, Town of Shawangunk. Motion for discussion.

**Legislator Nolan**

Can we block that one with the next one.

**Chair Petit**

Yeah with the others? So we would have 179 with 181.

**Legislator Nolan**

Correct.

**Chair Petit**

Do we have 182?

**Legislator Nolan**

182 is a different project, isn't it?

**Chair Petit**

Different project - so we'll block 179 and 181. A motion to block.

**Legislator Nolan**

Motion to block.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Second.

**Chair Petit**

Motion by Nolan, second Legislator Fabiano. All in favor.

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Okay a motion to open up these resolutions for discussion.

**Legislator Nolan**

Motion on the block.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Nolan.

**Chair Petit**

Second.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Second.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you, Legislator Fabiano. Any discussion on this. I don't think anything jumped out for me. No.

**Legislator Nolan**

Call the questions please.

**Chair Petit**

Call the vote. All in favor of resolution as blocked 170 - good lord 79 and 81. All in favor? Don't laugh at me.

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Four in favor. Any opposed? No abstentions. Thank you. Can we make the print on the screen bigger? How do you do that? Whoa, okay, there we go. Okay, a resolution 182

**Chair Petit**

Yeah 182.



**Chair Petit**

And okay, then there's nothing else associated with that. I think I remember the CNS. Okay Approving the Execution of a Contract for 150,000 Entered into By The County with Town and Country bridge and Rail Inc.

**Chair Petit**

Motion to

**Legislator Nolan**

Motion.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you, Legislator Nolan. Second. Legislator Fabiano. Any questions on this resolution? No. Okay, hearing none, I will call the vote All in favor.

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Four in favor. Any opposed? No abstentions.

**Chair Petit**

Resolution No. 183. Approving the Execution of a Contract for 80,700 Entered into by the County with CNS Engineers Inc. Motion to discuss.

**Legislator Nolan**

I'll move it.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Nolan.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Second it.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Fabiano. Was this the one for the concrete work? Yes. Is this part of the ones that were flagged? So that we're just doing repairs? Because it's

**Nettie Tomshaw**

183 is for design purposes for the radio tower.

**Deputy Executive Rider**

Right. Sorry. This Tonche Mountain.

**Chair Petit**

Oh okay you were going to find out where Tonche Mountain was. I bet Legislator Nolan knows that. Is that

**Deputy Executive Rider**

It's in Legislator Nolan's district - Olive.

**Legislator Nolan**

It's in the town of Olive in the hamlet of Boiceville.

**Chair Petit**

Okay. All right. Very good. They needed up there. Apparently when the city people go up in their flip flops and shorts and get lost up in Frost Valley. They don't have very good coverage up that way. So.

**Legislator Nolan**

Okay, just for the record, there is a pre-existing tower up there, but this is a replacement.

**Chair Petit**

Okay. Alright. So should meet with little public opposition. Oh okay. Good, because I heard Mt. Marion was not you know, they're not real happy but. Okay. Any other discussion? Hearing none, I'll call the vote. All in favor?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Chair Petit**

Any opposed?

**Chair Petit**

No abstentions? Thank you.

**Chair Petit**

Resolution No. 184. Authorizing Track Removal Within the Ulster and Delaware Railroad Corridor to Allow for the Connection of the Ulster County Shokan Rail Trail at Boiceville to Route 28A as Proposed by the New York City Department of Environmental Protection for Replacement of the Boiceville Bridge over the Esopus Creek. Motion to discuss.

**Legislator Nolan**

I'll move it.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Nolan.

**Legislator Fabiano**

Second.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Fabiano. A Legislator Nolan.

**Legislator Nolan**

So I just like to say that this is a resolution that deals with the trailhead in Boiceville. Again the town of Olive. It's the eastern end of the Ashokan Rail Trail. It's an area that already has a trailhead, but the trailhead was built before we had full specs from the Department of Environmental Protection of New York City of what the new bridge would involve, and the trailhead that was put in was envisioned as temporary. This is now planning towards the more permanent Trailhead at that site, and the track that was removed, left 60 feet that is now in the way. So this is a very minimal, inconsequential removal of tracking an area that already has track removed. And the construction of the new trail head will allow connection with the bike and pathway that the DEP is going to put on their bridge. And it will connect the trail into the hamlet of Boiceville and the high school. Thank you for the musical background on that.

**Chair Petit**

Yeah, there we go.

**Legislator Nolan**

Yeah. So I think that, you know, we should keep the discussion here focused on the fact that this is the Boiceville Trailhead. This is a section of the corridor that is assigned to trail only. There's no rail connection from this site further westward at this point. And t the area of the corridor that would connect to Mount Tremper, where I live and Phoenicia a little further east, it has one of the worst washouts in the entire corridor. So it's an unproblematic move to take up this 60 feet of track. If somebody doesn't want to ever take up track, then they can vote no on it. But I think we should not have a discussion on anything else other than the eastern end of the trail head. And the 60 feet. We should keep this simple. It is.

**Chair Petit**

Now I do have a question for you because you're intimately involved and have knowledge of of the trail and I honestly haven't walked it, I would like to get out there. Because you know, picture speaks a thousand words, and I'm more visual anyway. Is there anything anywhere near any trail within miles of the 60 feet? You know, if you were talking about connecting, Rail Explorers or is this just like 60 feet just sitting in the middle of nothing else?

**Legislator Nolan**

It doesn't connect. Go ahead, Marc.

**Deputy Executive Rider**

If I could just speak to that. It connects to our rail trail currently. It is near the parking trailhead, and that goes from there to Route 28A, where they're building a brand new pedestrian bridge, that's what it connects to. It doesn't connect to any workable rail. There's something called the spaghetti track. That is along the Esopus that is literally impossible to fix. It's laid up on the side. Rail Explores ends there. At

one point they wanted to try to get to the Colebrook station, which this still wouldn't impede even by tearing up this track. And so there really isn't any rail that this touches that is usable.

### **Legislator Nolan**

Just just east of this area, that Colebrook bridge is washed out. So that's another interruption in the corridor. So it's the worst section to try to do either trail or track that I can imagine in the entire corridor from Kingston to High Mount. The, so this 60 feet is really not serving a purpose of connection of any kind. And I can't figure out a way that we could in the next decade, make it connect. So we can argue about sections where it's more problematic. But here we're allowing the already constructed Ashokan rail trail to be supplemented by improvements from New York City and connected into the hamlet of Boiceville, where, again, that's that connection to allow people to have non-motorized access to the trailhead from the high school from the hamlet from the business center there. So, um, a good project to move forward, I think.

### **Chair Petit**

Okay. Do we have any other questions? All right. So, um, I just, you know, I'm protective of the rails. I don't want to muddy anything, I believe that it will get through committee. So I will take the vote with that explanation. Okay. All right. So all in favor of resolution No. 184.

### **Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

### **Chair Petit**

Okay. All opposed. Any abstentions? Thank you. We, have economic development that is waiting for us to finish our meeting. And I don't, I mean, we had a couple of other things to discuss. But I think given that we've gotten two and a half hours, and they're waiting, we need to be respectful and step away. With that, though, under I don't know if it'd be old or new business. I would like to because I feel that there's a lot as far as contractual dive into, and especially if there are then changes, and it's as presented or amended. And also, if I have questions, I would have gotten in touch with somebody. I would have gone up and hiked the trail or going to do a site visit with Mr. Gerentine. So is it possible are you willing that we could push this meeting often to the second week of the month? Or would that be something we can consider? I mean, I can have - I'll talk to the chair, and I already mentioned it to her. I mean, I guess we could flip flop this around, but I still don't feel that getting the information on a Friday afternoon and just having a couple of days is really enough time, at least not for me and I'm retired. So I have time, but it's still not enough. So with that I will have Nettie reach out. We'll speak with Chair Bartels to see if there's other opportunities for meetings. So again, with that, we do have another resolution that we were going to discuss, but we can discuss that further in our next meeting.

### **Chair Petit**

So with that, I would like a motion to adjourn.

### **Legislator Stewart**

So moved.

**Chair Petit**

Legislator Stewart.

**Legislator Nolan**

Second.

**Chair Petit**

Thank you, Legislator Nolan. All in favor. Got a vote on it. Two hands. We have the five votes. Thank you. Alright.

**Legislator Stewart**

Laura, thank you so much. I hope you're feeling better.