

**Ways & Means Committee
Regular Meeting Minutes**

DATE & TIME: March 08, 2022 – 5:00 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meetings, Meeting ID: 876 3970 0579
By Phone (646) 558-8656
PRESIDING OFFICER: Chairman Gavaris
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Natalie Kelder, Legislative Financial Analyst
PRESENT: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Ronk, & Walter
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes

OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Erner, Heppner, Levine, Litts, Maloney, Nolan, Greene, Petit, Sperry, Stewart, & Uchitelle, Clerk of the Legislature Fabella, Deputy Clerk of the Legislature Feaster, Legislative Counsel Ragucci, Minority Counsel Pascale, Deputy County Executives Contreras, Kelly, & Rider, Sheriff Figueroa – UC Sheriff, District Attorney Clegg – UC District Attorney, Comptroller Gallagher, Alicia DeMarco, & Samuel Sonenberg – UC Comptroller’s Office, Commissioner Gulnick – UC Finance, Director Weidemann – UC Department of Economic Development, Director Doyle – UC Planning, Director Litwin, Molly Scott, & Ashlee Long, – UC Recovery & Resilience, J. Bleau – UC Jail, Peter Karis & Bob Anderberg – Open Space Institute, Tamara Murray – Emerson Resort & Spa, Thomas Smiley, Eric Gullickson, & Barbara Stirewalt – Mohonk Mountain House, Steve Turk & Andrew Chafatelli – Rocking Horse Ranch, Airbnb Representative, Kevin Smith – Ulster County Trails Advisory Committee, Patricia Doxsey – Daily Freeman, Colin Driscoll, Andrew Jacobs, Loren Michael, Patti Scribner

Chairman Gavaris called the meeting to order at 5:03 PM

Motion No. 1: Moved to APPROVE Minutes of the February 8th & February 15th Regular Meetings

Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, Ronk & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 6
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Minutes APPROVED

Resolutions for the March 16, 2022 Session of the Legislature

Resolution No. 11: Requesting Enactment Of A Senate Bill And Assembly Bill In The New York State Legislature For A Special Law In Relation To The Hotel And Motel Room Occupancy Tax Rates In Ulster County

Resolution Summary: This Resolution requests the enactment of a Senate and Assembly Bill in the New York State Legislature to increase the Hotel & Motel Occupancy Tax to 4% and the Short-Term Rental Tax to 8%.

Motion No. 2: MOTION TO DISCUSS Resolution No. 11
Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Motion No. 3: MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution No. 11
Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, Ronk, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 6
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution POSTPONED

Resolution No. 17: Setting A Public Hearing On Proposed Local Law No. 3 Of 2022, A Local Law Amending Local Law No. 6 Of 2021, A Local Law Requiring The Payment Of A Living Wage To Employees Of Contractors And Subcontractors That Provide Services To Ulster County, In Relation To Living Wage For Social And Human Services, To Be Held On Tuesday, April 19, 2022 At 7:20 PM

Resolution Summary: This Resolution sets a Public Hearing on Proposed Local Law No. 3 of 2022, requiring the payment of a living wage to employees of contractors and subcontractors, to be held on Tuesday, April 19, 2022 at 7:20 PM.

Motion No. 4: MOTION TO DISCUSS Resolution No. 17
Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: See attached transcript

Motion No. 5: MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution No. 17
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: Legislator Ronk
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 1
Disposition: Resolution Postponed

Resolution No. 18: Appointing An Independent Administrative Hearing Officer Pursuant To §304-25 Of The Code Of The County Of Ulster

Resolution Summary: This Resolution appoints an Independent Administrative Hearing Officer to issue orders assessing civil penalties for violations of Local Law No. 8 of 1991.

Motion No. 6: MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution No. 18

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, Ronk, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 6

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Resolution POSTPONED

Resolution No. 29: Funding Capital Project No. 601 – ARP Small Business And Economic Recovery – Department Of Finance

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Capital Fund in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 to fund Round 2 of the “Ulster County Small Business Assistance Program”. Funds are designated for use as follows: \$850,000.00 for Direct Assistance to Businesses; \$100,000.00 for Program Delivery; \$50,000.00 for Program Administration.

Motion No. 7: MOTION TO AMEND Resolution No. 29

Motion By: Legislator Ronk

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, Ronk, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 6

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Resolution AMENDED

Motion No. 8: MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution No. 29

Motion By: Legislator Ronk

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, Ronk, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 6

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Resolution POSTPONED AS AMENDED

Resolution No. 32: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$1,000,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Ulster County Economic Development Alliance, Inc. – Department Of Finance

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with Ulster County Economic Development Alliance, Inc. from March 1, 2022 through February 28, 2023 as a subaward of American Rescue Plan Act (“ARPA”) funding in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 to fund Round 2 of the “Ulster County Small Business Assistance Program”. Funds are designated for use as follows: \$850,000.00 for Direct Assistance to Businesses; \$100,000.00 for Program Delivery; \$50,000.00 for Program Administration.

Motion No. 9: MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution No. 32
Motion By: Legislator Bartels
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Cahill

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, Ronk, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 6
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution POSTPONED

Resolution No. 69: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$150,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Family Of Woodstock Inc. – Department Of Social Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$150,000 with Family of Woodstock for Emergency Assistance Walk-in Centers and hotline.

Motion No. 10: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 69
Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 97: Funding Capital Project No. 602 – ARP Infrastructure And Trails – Open Space Institute Land Trust, Inc. As Subrecipient - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution funds Capital Project No. 602 in the amount of \$2,100,000.00 for expansion of Ulster County’s trail networks to serve Ellenville, provide access to scenic views along the

Rondout Creek, further complete a 29-mile rail trail from the City of Kingston to the Village of Ellenville, and to provide a direct feeder trail to the statewide Empire State Trail in the Village of New Paltz.

Resolution No. 98: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$2,100,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Open Space Institute Land Trust, Inc. – Department Of Finance

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approve the execution of a contract with Open Space Institute Land Trust, Inc. from March 15, 2022 through June 30, 2024 for subaward of American Rescue Plan Act (“ARPA”) funding for the purpose of improving or developing three sections of public outdoor, rail trail corridors for the mental health and outdoor recreation benefit of trail users and the economic benefit of Ulster County and local communities in the County in the amount of \$2,100,000.00.

Resolution No. 99: Amending Capital Project No. 597 ARP Housing - For The Purchase & Renovation Of 21 Elizabeth Street Group Home, City Of Kingston – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Public Works (Buildings & Grounds)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends Capital Project No. 597 for the purchase of 21 Elizabeth Street for improvement and continuance of operation as a facility to provide supportive housing as an “Unlisted Action” in the amount of \$700,000.00.

Resolution No. 101: Authorizing The Acquisition Of Real Property Located At 21 Elizabeth Street In The City Of Kingston, County Of Ulster, In Order To Renovate A Group Home Facility, And Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Execute, On Behalf Of Ulster County, Any And All Documents Required For Said Acquisition – Department Of Public Works (Buildings And Grounds)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the acquisition of 21 Elizabeth Street for the purpose of improving and continuing its operation as a facility to provide supportive housing as an “Unlisted Action”, and authorizes the Chair of the Legislature to execute an agreement, and any amendments thereto, and such other documents as may be necessary to establish the terms and conditions pursuant to which the County of Ulster shall purchase and take title to the property.

Motion No. 11: MOTION TO BLOCK Resolution Nos. 97, 98, 99, 101
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolutions Blocked

Motion No. 12: MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution Nos. 97, 98, 99, 101
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolutions Postponed**

Resolution No. 105: Confirming Appointment Of Loren Johnson As The Director Of The Department Of Transportation For The County Of Ulster

Resolution Summary: This Resolution confirms the appointment of Loren Johnson as the Director of the Department of Transportation for the County of Ulster, effective March 21st, 2022.

Motion No. 13: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 105**
Motion By: Legislator Bartels
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 110: Amending Capital Project No. 577 McKinstry Bridge, Town Of Gardiner – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Public Works (Buildings & Grounds)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends Capital Project No. 577, McKinstry Bridge replacement, in the amount of \$206,885 for construction and construction inspection services.

Motion No. 14: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 110**
Motion By: Legislator Bartels
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 4
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 112: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$2,641,285.00 Entered Into By The County – A. Colarusso And Son, Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with Colarusso and Son, Inc. in the amount of \$2,641,285 for construction services for Capital Project No. 577, the McKinstry Bridge replacement.

Motion No. 15: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 112
Motion By: Legislator Bartels
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 4
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 113: Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program - Amending Capital Project No. 390 Sundown Bridge, Town Of Denning – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Public Works (Highways & Bridges)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 – 2027 Capital Improvement Program and Capital Project No. 390, Sundown Bridge, in the amount of \$631,600 while approving \$2,291,600 for bridge materials and professional services.

Motion No. 16: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 113
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 115: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$250,800.00 Entered Into By The County – Barton & Loguidice, D.P.C. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment with Barton & Loguidice D.P.C., in the amount of \$250,800, to expand the scope of services for design services, preparation of an asbestos survey report, analysis and assessment of detour structure placement, design of a wingwall repair, construction administration, and construction inspection services.

Resolution No. 116: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$2,646,000.00 Entered Into By The County – HVB Construction, Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with HVB Construction, in the amount of \$2,646,000, for construction services for the replacement of the Sundown Bridge.

Resolution No. 117: Authorizing Right-Of-Way Acquisition Of Certain Real Property For The Purpose Of Replacing The Sundown Bridge, Town Of Denning – Department Of Public Works (Highways & Bridges)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the right-of-way acquisition of certain real property for the purpose of replacing the Sundown Bridge in the Town of Denning.

Resolution No. 118: Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program - Amending Capital Project No. 595 Courthouse Fascia, Exterior Repairs & Roof Replacement – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget - Department Of Public Works (Buildings & Grounds)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 – 2027 Capital Improvement Program and amends Capital Project No. 595, Courthouse fascia - exterior repairs and roof replacement, by \$65,000 for a total project cost of \$265,000.

Resolution No. 120: Establishing Capital Project No. 622 – 2022 Pavement Preservation Of Various Roads — Department Of Public Works (Highways & Bridges)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 622, 2022 pavement preservation of various roads, in the amount of \$650,000.

Resolution No. 122: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For Rates Anticipated To Exceed \$50,000.000 Entered Into By The County – Gorman Bros., Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment with Gorman Bros. Inc, for paver placed surface treatment.

Resolution No. 123: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For Rates Anticipated To Exceed \$50,000.000 Entered Into By The County – Gorman Bros., Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with Gorman Bros., Inc for cold in-place asphalt recycling.

Resolution No. 124: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For Rates Anticipated To Exceed \$50,000.000 Entered Into By The County – Gorman Bros., Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment with the Gorman Bros., Inc for fiber-reinforced bituminous-membrane surface treatment.

Resolution No. 125: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For Rates Anticipated To Exceed \$50,000.000 Entered Into By The County – Gorman Bros., Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment with Gorman Bros. Inc., for fiber-reinforced microsurfacing.

Motion No. 17: MOTION TO BLOCK Resolution Nos. 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 5

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolutions BLOCKED**

Motion No. 18: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution Nos. 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125**

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 5

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolutions APPROVED**

Resolution No. 126: Establishing Capital Project No. 623 – 2022 Bridge Flag Response — Department Of Public Works (Highways & Bridges)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 623, 2022 Bridge Flag Response, in the amount of \$110,250 in order to respond to flagged bridges in a timely manner and support public safety.

Motion No. 19: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 126**

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 5

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 128: Authorizing An Amendment To A Grant With The Catskill Watershed Corporation (CWC) For The Maltby Hollow Bridge Replacement Project In The Town Of Olive And Authorizing The Execution Of Any Associated Grant Funding Agreements With CWC – Department Of Public Works (Highways & Bridges)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes an amendment to a grant with the Catskill Watershed Corporation for the Maltby Hollow Bridge Replacement in the Town of Olive for the amount of \$750,000.

Motion No. 20: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 128

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 5

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 129: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$22,280.00, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Eastern Heating & Cooling, Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment with Eastern Heating & Cooling, Inc. in the amount of \$22,280 to expand the scope of services for preventative maintenance inspections and repair of the Automated Logic Web Control Equipment to include the removal of Delta Controls at UCAT including the extension of the existing facility-wide Automated Logic System.

Motion No. 21: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 129

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 5

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 130: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$437,000.00 Entered Into By The County – T. McElligott, Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with T. McElligott, Inc in the amount of \$437,000 for construction services in connection with the upgrade of the Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning system upgrade at the Trudy Resnick Farber Building.

Motion No. 22: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 130

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 131: Establishing Capital Project No. 624 SUNY Ulster – Children’s Center Renovations, And Amending The 2022-2027 Capital Fund Budget – SUNY Ulster

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 624, SUNY Ulster – Children’s Center Renovations, and amends the 2022 – 2027 Capital Fund Budget in the amount of \$40,000 for architectural and engineering services.

Motion No. 23: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 131**
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 133: Authorizing The Execution Of A Lease Agreement With The Ulster County Economic Development Alliance, Inc. For Space At The Enterprise West Facility Located In The Town Of Ulster– Department Of Public Works (Buildings & Grounds)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the execution of a lease agreement with the Ulster County Economic Development Alliance, Inc. in the amount of \$1.00

Motion No. 24: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 133**
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 137: Setting A Public Hearing On The Sale And/Or Transfer Of Three (3) Easements Across County Owned Property, Being A Portion Of The Former Ulster & Delaware Railroad Bed Property Located In The City Of Kingston, To The Ulster County Housing Development Corporation, A Local Development Corporation For the Purpose of Affordable Housing Development

Resolution Summary: This Resolution sets a Public Hearing on the sale and/or transfer of three easements across county owned property to the Ulster County Housing Development Corporation for the purpose of affordable housing development, to be held April 19, 2022 at 7:05 PM.

Motion No. 25: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 137
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: Legislator Fabiano
Votes in Favor: 4
Votes Against: 1
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 138: Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Enter Into Intermunicipal Agreements With Various Municipalities For The Operation Of The Summer Youth Employment Program, Gun Violence Prevention Initiative, And The Young Adult Employment Program

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the Chair of the Ulster County Legislature to enter into an intermunicipal agreement with various municipalities for the operation of the Summer Youth Employment Program, Gun Violence Prevention Initiative, and the Youth Adult Employment Program.

Motion No. 26: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 138
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 140: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget To Accept An Allocation Of Child Abuse Or Neglect Prevention And Treatment Act (CAPTA) Comprehensive Addiction And Recovery Act Of 2016 (CARA) Funds From The New York State Office Of Children And Family Services – Department Of Social Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County Budget to accept an allocation of funds from the New York State Office of Children and Family Services in the amount of \$70,000 to help improve the response to families and infants affected by substance use disorders for drugs and alcohol.

Motion No. 27: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 140
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Cahill

Discussion: See attached transcript
Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 141: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget – Department Of Social Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County Budget for the rollover of various State Aid, Federal Aid, and other revenues for a total of \$292,562.

Motion No. 28: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 141**
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 142: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$705,188.00 Entered Into By The County – Family Of Woodstock Inc. – Department Of Social Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract for \$705,188 in revenue with the Family of Woodstock where the County will provide street outreach, shelter, rapid re-housing, and eviction prevention activities to help communities prevent, prepare, and respond to Covid-19 among individuals and families who are homeless or receiving homeless assistance.

Motion No. 29: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 142**
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 143: Authorizing The Interim Commissioner Of The Ulster County Department Of Mental Health To Enter Into An Intermunicipal Agreement With NYS Office Mental Health To Accept Funding From COVID Emergency Relief Funding For The Community Mental Health Services (MHBG) Block Grant Program - Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the Interim Commissioner of the Ulster County Department of Mental Health to enter into an Intermunicipal agreement with the New York State Office of Mental Health to accept funding in the amount of \$25,000 from COVID Emergency Relief Funding for the Community Mental Health Services (MHBG) Block Grant Program to build a System of Care Infrastructure in Ulster County.

Motion No. 30: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 143

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 5

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 144: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$185,000.00 Entered Into By The County – The Hudson Valley National Center For Veteran Reintegration, Inc. – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment with The Hudson Valley National Center for Veteran Reintegration, Inc. for Veteran peer-to-peer services in the amount of \$185,000.

Motion No. 31: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 144

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Cahill

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 5

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 145: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget To Reflect Additional Funding From New York State Department Of Health For The Epidemiology And Laboratory Capacity (ELC) COVID-19 Enhanced Detection Grant – Department Of Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 202 Ulster County Budget to reflect additional funding from New York State Department of Health for the Epidemiology and Laboratory Capacity Covid-19 Enhanced Detection Grant in the amount of \$1,000,000 to support enhanced detection expansion of COVID-19 surveillance and prevention.

Motion No. 32: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 145
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 146: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$105,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Family Home Health Care, Inc. – Office For The Aging

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with Family Home Health Care, Inc for in-home personal care assistance in the amount of \$105,000 for a one-year term through March 31st, 2023.

Motion No. 33: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 146
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Cahill

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 148: Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Enter Into The Necessary Agreements With The New Paltz Rural Cemetery For The Purposes Of Providing A Veterans Cemetery To Be Located At 381 Plains Road In The Town And Village Of New Paltz – Veterans Service Agency

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the Chair of the Ulster County Legislature to enter into agreements with the New Paltz Rural Cemetery for the purposes of providing and expanding a Veterans Cemetery.

Motion No. 34: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 148
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Cahill

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 5

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 149: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$8,640.00, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Touch Legal, Inc. – Ulster County Sheriff

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment with Touch Legal, Inc. in the amount of \$8,640 to extend the term of the mobile law library kiosks, located in the Ulster County Jail, through March 31, 2023.

Motion No. 35: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 149**

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 5

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 150: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$97,246.60 Entered Into By The County – New York State Technology Enterprise Corporation – Emergency Management

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment with New York State Technology Enterprise Corporation to extend the term through June 30th, 2024 and expand the scope to include consulting services through design and build-out phases of the relocation of the Ulster County Emergency Management Department, in the amount of \$97,246.60.

Motion No. 36: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 150**

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Cahill

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 5

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 151: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget To Accept An Allocation Of Funds From The New York State Office Of Prevention Of Domestic Violence – Department Of Probation

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County Budget to accept an allocation of funds from the New York State Office of Prevention of Domestic Violence to provide eligible domestic violence survivors in Ulster County (and their children) with short term, non-recurrent expenses related to housing and essential needs, in the amount of \$94,700.

Motion No. 37: MOTION TO AMEND & APPROVE Resolution No. 151
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED AS AMENDED

Resolution No. 152: Amending The 2022 County Budget To Create Two Full-Time Assistant Public Defender Positions – Public Defender’s Office

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County Budget to create two full-time Assistant Public Defender positions which will be reimbursed by Hurrell-Harring in an effort to improve the quality of mandated indigent legal representation and to reduce excessive caseloads in indigent legal service provider programs.

Motion No. 38: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 152
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Cahill

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 153: Authorizing the Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Enter Into An Agreement With The New York State Office Of Indigent Legal Services For Distribution #12 – Public Defender’s Office

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the Chair of the Ulster County Legislature to enter into an agreement with the New York State Office of Indigent Legal Services for Distribution #12 for the period of 1/1/2022 through 12/31/2024 for a total of \$440,544.

Motion No. 39: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 153
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 155: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$252,477.12 Entered Into By The County – West Publishing Corporation, Thomson Reuters – Information Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with West Publishing Corporation, Thomson Reuters for West Proflex subscription for legal research materials in the amount of \$252,477.12 for a term of 4/1/2022 through 3/31/2025.

Motion No. 40: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 155
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 156: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$917,568.00 Entered Into By The County – Atlantic Tomorrow's Office – Information Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with Atlantic Tomorrow's Office for a county-wide copier lease agreement in the amount of \$917,568 for a five-year term from 7/1/2022 through 6/30/2027.

Motion No. 41: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 156
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5

Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 158: Supporting New York State Assembly Bill A9037 And New York State Senate Bill S8165, Providing For The Continuation Of The Excluded Worker’s Fund

Resolution Summary: This Resolution supports the New York State Assembly Bill A9037 and New York State Senate Bill S8165 to amend the labor and finance laws to establish the excluded worker unemployment program.

Motion No. 42: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 158
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Comptroller Gallagher provided a brief update. See attached transcript.

Chairman Gavaris moved on to the Forthcoming Local Laws portion of the agenda. See attached transcript.

Chairman Gavaris asked if there was any old or new business. See attached transcript.

Adjournment

Motion Made By: Legislator Fabiano
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Cahill

No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 0

TIME: 7:07 PM

Respectfully submitted: Natalie Kelder
Minutes Approved: April 12, 2022

Ways & Means Committee
Regular Meeting Transcript

DATE & TIME: March 08, 2022 – 5:00 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meetings, Meeting ID: 876 3970 0579
By Phone (646) 558-8656
PRESIDING OFFICER: Chairman Gavaris
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Natalie Kelder, Legislative Financial Analyst
PRESENT: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, Ronk, & Walter
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes

OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Erner, Heppner, Levine, Litts, Maloney, Nolan, Greene, Petit, Sperry, Stewart, & Uchitelle, Clerk of the Legislature Fabella, Deputy Clerk of the Legislature Feaster, Legislative Counsel Ragucci, Minority Counsel Pascale, Deputy County Executives Contreras, Kelly, & Rider, Sheriff Figueroa – UC Sheriff, District Attorney Clegg – UC District Attorney, Comptroller Gallagher, Alicia DeMarco, & Samuel Sonenberg – UC Comptroller’s Office, Commissioner Gulnick – UC Finance, Director Weidemann – UC Department of Economic Development, Director Doyle – UC Planning, Director Litwin, Molly Scott, & Ashlee Long, – UC Recovery & Resilience, J. Bleau – UC Jail, Peter Karis & Bob Anderberg – Open Space Institute, Tamara Murray – Emerson Resort & Spa, Thomas Smiley, Eric Gullickson, & Barbara Stirewalt – Mohonk Mountain House, Steve Turk & Andrew Chafatelli – Rocking Horse Ranch, Airbnb Representative, Kevin Smith – Ulster County Trails Advisory Committee, Patricia Doxsey – Daily Freeman, Colin Driscoll, Andrew Jacobs, Loren Michael, Patti Scribner

Chairman Gavaris: Ways & Means to order.

Can I have an approval of minutes from February 8th and 15th regular meetings? Legislator Ronk. Second? Second, Fabiano Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

Resolution 11: Requesting enactment a Senate Bill and Assembly Bill for a special law in relation to the hotel and motel room occupancy tax rate, as amended. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move for discussion.

Chairman Gavaris: Second?

Legislative Chair Bartels: I'll second for discussion.

Legislator Fabiano: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: Discussion? I think my computer's frozen here, so I can't see hands, I just hear voices.

Legislator Ronk: All right. Mr. Chairman, may I speak, Ken Ronk.

Chairman Gavaris: Go ahead, okay.

Legislator Ronk: I, I'd like to make a motion that we postpone this until next week's meeting. I know that my caucus would like to have some more discussion on it. I'm, I'm not supportive of this at this time. But I think that discussions need to have, to happen in our caucus before we move this forward.

Legislator Fabiano: I'll second, that motion.

Chairman Gavaris: Seconded. Any discussion? I can't see pictures, I'm sorry, I only hear voices right now.

Legislator Maloney: Chair Gavaris, this is Joe Maloney.

Chairman Gavaris: Go right ahead.

Legislator Maloney: I'm fine waiting a week, but I'm really I'd, I'll be pushing for a vote next week, this is, you know, this went through Economic Development, which I think we spent some time on it, there was a lot of discussion, it was open for anyone and everyone. And this really is just the initial part of the process. This does nothing. It gives us permission forevermore, to have this conversation. Chair Cahill of Economic Development pointed out that in an election year, we might not be getting this back till next year anyways. So this is something that I think is long overdue. I remind everyone, we waited four, five more years than we needed to, to enter into an Airbnb agreement, a collection agreement, probably cost the our constituents about \$10 million dollars, and the conversation feels very similar to that. And once again, this is just to get permission from the state to go ahead and have this conversation, which is a conversation, I think, I think there's more than 12 legislators that are ready to have that conversation. So we'll see, but I'm, I'm ready for a vote. If it's, if the vote is going to be next week, that's fine. I'll also remind everyone that Chair Bartels has made a point that she really, the way she created these different standing committees, she was hoping for conversations like this to happen in the primary committee, and that conversation did happen. I don't think Ways and Means is set up this year to be something that holds things up. You know if these conversations have already happened, like I said, I don't mind waiting. But I will be asking for a vote next week. If anyone wants to talk to me, I will even come to the Republican caucus. But this is a conversation that's long overdue. When you look honestly at the numbers. We're nowhere close to where other counties are. And one of the leading driving forces behind our housing crisis right now is short term rentals. We really need to have this conversation, which starts with just getting permission to have the conversation. That's all this is, is permission to have the conversation.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels then Nolan.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Legislator Nolan actually had her hand up first, since you couldn't see it, I'll defer to Legislator Nolan.

Legislator Nolan: Thank you, but both you, Chair Bartels, and Legislator Walter also had your hands up. So I'm not on the committee so I would yield if either of you would like to speak first.

Multiple Speakers: [inaudible].

Legislator Walter: raise my hand, so you can go first, Legislator.

Legislator Ronk: It's a yield-athon, it's awesome.

Legislator Nolan: Thank you, thank you. So I'm actually raised my hand because I understand, I understand that there were several members of the community that would be affected by this law that were present in Economic Development but didn't understand the process of when they would be, when was the appropriate time for them to bring forward their remarks, and I see several of those people here again tonight. So I would just ask if either in this committee or where would be the appropriate committee for people who had intended to make comments at the Economic Development Committee but didn't recognize their, you know the process in a way that let them that time. So I, I don't know with this being moved to be postponed, if that would be appropriate tonight, or if there's a better time, but if this committee would find a time for that, I think that that would that would be fair to the people who did come hoping to make comments and then just didn't find the right opportunity.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah, if, if it does get postponed tonight, it would be next week, at next week's meeting and they would speak then.

Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you so so I am, just speaking on the postponement. I'm supportive of the postponement. Um, it's, in order to allow the opportunity for the caucuses to have a discussion about this.

Legislator Ronk: Can I make a point of order, has this been seconded for postponement?

Legislative Chair Bartels: It was, yes [inaudible]

Legislator Fabiano: I postponed it Kenny.

Legislative Chair Bartels: by Legislator Fabiano. Yeah, so but, but that said, I also would be supportive of hearing if there are members of the public who came to speak on that, to hearing their comments, if the Chair of Ways and Means would be so inclined, I'd be supportive of hearing those comments today in anticipate, in anticipation of having further comments in caucus being able to consider those comments in caucus as well. So you know, being supportive of the, the move to hold a week doesn't necessarily mean that I didn't want there to be conversation here today, either by affected members of the public or by the leg, members of the legislature. But just that I didn't, I don't want to move on it until caucuses are able to have a deeper discussion about it.

Chairman Gavaris: And that's a good point, and it probably does make sense to do that tonight. This way, the caucuses do have some information. So if there's no objection from the Ways and Means Committee members, then if somebody from the Lodging Commission would like to speak.

Tamara Murray, Emerson Resort & Spa: This is Tamara Murray from the Emerson Resort and Spa, there were actually several of us that wanted to speak., if that's okay, I'd like to call upon Andrew Chafatelli to speak first.

Chairman Gavaris: Andrew.

Andrew Chafatelli, Rocking Horse Ranch: Can you guys hear me okay?

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah.

Andrew Chafatelli, Rocking Horse Ranch: All right. Thank you for having us tonight. I appreciate the sponsor of the bill, or resolution who actually came to our property and met with us, and we did speak a little bit about our issues with this, this one, the resolution. And we did want to speak last week at the Economic Committee, but again, as Legislator Nolan pointed out, we were kind of confused about when we were supposed to start. So so thank you for the time. Also, I'm sure you're gonna hear from many other members of our hotel and motel industry that are opposed to this resolution. You know, as the sponsor just indicated, there is a part of the reason why this was brought up was to, you know, target or to pursue the short-term rental market in hopes that it negatively impacted businesses, or, you know, to impose a tax on them that would, hopefully maybe help out with the housing crisis. And there's many other solutions to this problem. Unfortunately, this resolution couples, hotels and motels to the housing deficit. In effect, this resolution has our industry really kind of started to feel like the lawmakers in our county are seeking to delegitimize our businesses as well, because the same mode of method is increasing the tax on, on our industry. It may, it may sound a little bold to make such a statement. But this committee, Ways and Means, should be reminded that when we had this resolution out in early 2020, we were assured that we were going to have a say in how the resolution was crafted in the future. And although there's new members on this committee, [inaudible] should should be upheld. It has been requested by the lodging coalition that the resolution be withdrawn. And I appreciate you guys postponing it tonight. But at the same time, our coalition or lodging industry has not had time to give any input or work with the legislator. Soon as it came back out, the resolution was drafted. And you know, what we were told is not what what happened.

Last week, it was said in the Economic Committee that you know, we don't need to talk about the details. And we don't have to get into the weeds on this right now because it goes up to the state. And at that point, when it comes back, then we will come and talk to the lodging coalition. Well, we kind of find it hard to believe that that's going to be the case because this time the resolution came out, we weren't talking, nobody spoke to our anybody in our industry prior to the resolution being drafted and put together. Now, the sponsor did speak to us after that resolution was put up and made a couple of concessions, but it really didn't comprehensively look at some of the issues that we had. More importantly, I think this resolution is incomplete, more work is needed. We're willing to assist in doing this. I don't think one week does it, this resolution should be postponed until the time that there's a committee meeting with members of our industry to comprehensively address the resolution. Look, we

understand in the business world, sometimes we we have to be expedient. However, what is the current need for the legislator to act in one week? Several county legislators have already recently said that tax reductions should be in line. You know, they're talking about the surplus of the county, the county is in a strong financial position, there is no need for expedience, here. Look, in our industry, we're just coming out of pandemic, we have a big looming issue going on with what's going on in Europe and how that's gonna affect our businesses. We are, we are still in tactical mode, we're dealing with the here and now everyday problems that we have from staffing to supply chain demands. And as of right now we're spending this time to try and fight back on occupancy tax that you really shouldn't be dealing with at this point in time. So we would suggest or recommend or hope that the this legislator would kick this further down the line, let us come and, and speak with you guys and talk. We're not opposed, necessarily to ultimately figuring out when there's going to be an occupancy tax increase. We want to work with you guys. But we just need to do it the right way. And brainstorming and working together usually, it's the best way to do that. So we hope that you guys will not only kick this can down the road a little bit, but vote no on this resolution until we can sit down together and work together earnestly to make it right.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Anyone else from the coalition want to speak? All right, Legislator Maloney.

Tamara Murray, Emerson Resort & Spa: Tom did you want to speak? Tom or Eric?

Chairman Gavaris: Either one can go first.

Thomas Smiley, Mohonk Mountain House: Chairman Gavaris, if you don't mind,

Chairman Gavaris: Absolutely.

Thomas Smiley, Mohonk Mountain House: I'd like make a couple of statements. So in the bill, one of the, one of the things that references is underfunded programs. But I haven't heard yet what any of these underfunded programs, how, how much funding is needed to properly fund them. So you know, as somebody who's been asked to foot that bill, I would like to know how much and where it goes. And I know there's, there's a perception that this is money that comes from people outside of our community. And you know I'd, I like to suggest that's a pretty simplistic view of it. Yes, we do collect it from our guests. And yes, most of them come from outside the county. But really, what we do is, we quote, a rate, if you call Mohonk Mountain House and say I want to come and stay on these dates, with this many people etc, you know, we, we put together a rate and we quote that rate, and that rate is inclusive of the room, you know, occupancy tax, the sales, tax, etc. So at the very end of the call they're, not even the end of the call, towards the end they're quoted, this is what it's going to cost you to come to Mohonk. They're going to make that same phone call potentially to, you know, other resorts, not just in Ulster County, but outside of Ulster County. So by increasing the occupancy tax, it does, it basically reduces our ability to compete, and we're gonna have to eat that difference. You know, if we, if it didn't affect our industry, we wouldn't be here tonight. We would have no issue with this going through. But we know it's going to affect our ability to compete, it's going to affect our ability to maintain our razor thin margins. You know, so I really want that to be understood, because it's, it's significant. I'd like for this to be, you know, when when it does go forward, or if it goes forward, and not just [inaudible] this bill, but this subject matter. I'd love to know what the actual impact is. You know, tourism is a major industry in Ulster County. And I just, from everything I've seen and the conversations we've had, I don't get a sense

that there's a clear understanding of what our industry does, and how we drive economic value in this, in this county. And then, because we're talking about increasing taxes, I decided to look at our tax bill for the last 10 years. And in the last 10 years, our taxes, that're, they're local taxes. So it's school taxes, town taxes, sales tax, the portion that stays local, and the occupancy tax, our taxes have gone up 60% in 10 years, that's six zero. For that same 10 years, the US Bureau of Labor Statistics reports a 12% increase in inflation. So our, our payments to the county and taxes have gone to five times inflation for the last 10 years. And now we're talking about increasing them again. No, that, that's not sustainable. So I just, I just asked the committee members and the legislature as a whole, if it gets there, really understand this, these are major impacts to us as a business. And to us as an industry. And it's not just the hotels that people stay in, but it's all the tangential businesses that are supported by tourism. It's the restaurants, it's the, the little shops, it's people buying gas, it's, you know, you name it, it's across the board. It's a good chunk of our economy. So, you know, I guess what we're getting at is we would love to see it slowed down so it can be properly designed and studied. So that it, you know, we don't create unintended consequences. Thank you very much.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you, I believe Eric, you were

Eric Gullickson, Mohonk Mountain House: Thank you. Tom represented my points very well, thank you very much.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Maloney, and then Ronk.

Legislator Maloney: Yeah, just to hit on a couple things, when you're talking about looking at your taxes, you don't pay this tax, we could essentially generate millions, millions and millions of dollars from people outside of the county that do not pay attention to that occupancy tax, we could put that back on the tax rolls and actually lower your taxes. So to combine the occupancy tax, and the other taxes you were referring to, I think is incorrect. I believe I heard something about a whereas we could certainly be more specific, a whereas don't mean anything. They're just kind of an example of why we're doing it. I could put housing, roads, bridges, addiction, mental health services, all of which we need more funding for. Those are some of the things we'll be using the money for. I was general with the whereas. And when it comes to several of the people, individuals, I've heard talk tonight, I've talked to over 12 legislators, that's enough to get it done. But there is another resolution being worked on right now, I spoke to our Legislative Attorney just the other day, again about it, a few days ago, about making the all-inclusives be able to separate out that bed tax. So most of the individuals we heard from tonight, even if we chose to raise the hotel, motel occupancy tax to three or four percent, would actually be paying those bills that they're talking about when they're referring a quote to how much is it gonna be total will actually be lower, by the time we're done with this term. And we get done with this conversation. So a lot of the things I heard tonight, I'm not sure if any of them move me not to be completely comfortable. Moving on, like I said, there's 60, I think, individuals that are members of the lodging coalition, and I believe they're going to be affected differently, the all-inclusives which seem to be leading this conversation, in many ways will actually be better off. And everyone could be better off if we ended up putting some of that money back on the tax rolls. But once again, I don't believe, I also do not believe I'm comfortable, if we raised the occupancy tax on short term rentals, I'll be on the record saying I am comfortable. If that ended up affecting the short-term rental market, I don't believe it will. And I'm on the record saying that too. I have yet to talk to a single person, I have talked to probably over 1,000 people by this, many people involved, some people on this meeting right now, and I have yet to

hear one person ever be able to quote a bed tax that they paid when they travel, not one. I have yet to hear one story about somebody staying in Ulster County rather than Dutchess County, because they have doubled the occupancy tax we have, I have yet to hear one negative impact of a three-year study that this county did, when we upped our bed tax for three years, I believe, and then sunsetted it. So the data's there, the facts are there, the needs are there, this legislation does not do anything but give us permission. It's a two-year term. If any legislator here wants to have this conversation in this term, then now is the time to send this off to the state and get permission. And I will continue to talk to everyone that wants to talk, everybody from the lodging coalition, but I will remind all legislators on this meeting, that there's 200,000 people that we work for, and we have to try to, we have to try to answer to everyone, hear all voices. And I really believe that this is a conversation that we need to have. It's long overdue. And it starts with just getting permission to have that conversation. So I look forward to talking to everybody in caucus and I look forward to having this vote next week if we decide to postpone.

Legislator Maloney: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you. I'll start by saying Legislator Maloney, you're, you're obviously welcome to come to our caucus. Our caucus is open to everybody. You know, and, and Legislator Maloney's right. This is a question of a you know, having the authority. This is us requesting the authority to do it. I mean, I'll be open and honest, I don't want the authority to levy this tax currently, to raise the let the, the higher level of this tax. I, I respect the argument that we're lower than our surrounding counties, which we are. I like that, I think lower taxes is good. It's one of the things that, you know, I personally believe in my, in my ideological opinion. And I also don't think that because our tax is lower, that means that we should raise our tax. I think that it's good that we're able to operate the county with a lower tax level. I, with all due respect to Mr. Smiley's comments, I, you know, and I'm on and I'm on his side on this, I think but, um, you know, when he looks at his tax bill and says his taxes have gone up X number of dollars, over the last 10 years, it's certainly not because of the legislature and, and the county. Because, you know, that may be town taxes and, and school district taxes, but the county tax levy is lower today than it was in, in you know, 10 years ago. So, to, I, I take some, I take some offense to that being used in this case, because it's definitely not the county's doing. Um, you know, unfortunately, it's, it's tough to, it's tough to drill down to, you know, the county taxes versus the school versus you know, the school the school districts easier because it's a different tax time. But, uh, additionally, one thing I want to point out and I think that it's, you know, it bears pointing out is Legislator Maloney talked about how we are probably not likely to gain this authority in in a election year, because state legislators would be would be less than willing to carry a tax increase in an election year. You know, but this would allow us to do it sometime in the next term. That's, that's not correct the way the state legislature works. State Legislature is having elections this year, we would need to do this all over again next year, if we don't get the authority this year. It's not a, it's not a two-year thing, because our two year term does not match up with the two year term of the, of the state legislature. So every bill that's in the state legislature this year, has to get reintroduced next year. I personally don't believe that we're even going to get a bill introduced in either house to raise taxes this year. Um, again, I, I tend to come from the opinion that we, you know, we, if we, if we needed to raise taxes, because we were having a lack of funding or you know, and we were unable to fund programs and things of that nature, then I would say, yeah, maybe we should look into this as an option. But just to raise it, because we're the lowest in the area, I can't support that. You know, again, I'm, I'm, I'm moving to postpone, obviously, so we can have this discussion amongst ourselves. But since we got into the meat and potatoes of the issue, I wanted to make sure to put my my beliefs on the record. And I believe that this is the right place to have this conversation, in part because a

lot of the concerns of this are financial, and this is the right place to have those conversations. So with due respect to Legislator Maloney, I don't think that, you know, this is a place to hold this up or to have, you know, conversations about the primary issues regarding the resolution. I think that this is the place to have those conversations because, you know, it's attacks and most of the concerns of attacks are financial.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Tamara.

Tamara Murray, Emerson Resort & Spa: Yes, thank you

Legislator Maloney: Mr. Gavaris, if I could, as a legislator,

Chairman Gavaris: No, let, I'm going in order. Tamara's up next.

Tamara Murray, Emerson Resort & Spa: I just wanted to take a quick second to thank you and thank you to Legislator Bartels for encouraging to allow us to speak tonight. Just kind of adding on to what my colleagues have already shared. As most of you know, members of the lodging coalition board, have spoken with most of you to relay our concerns regarding this resolution. Every step of the way, I believe we've been very clear that we were looking to work with the legislature to replace Resolution 11 with a more solid plan for the future. Throughout the conversations that I've had, it's, it's been dismaying to hear that legislator were not aware of some or all of the issues that we've been dealing with such as the staggering losses that we've incurred, cutbacks in county tourism promotion which has resulted in our properties shouldering more of the monetary burden for tourism, marketing of the county, and numerous other ongoing challenges. There's also continues to be a disconnect and truly understanding how our rate structures are managed, taxed, and perceived by our guests. Another common thread throughout our conversations has also been hearing responses and it's been brought up this evening, hearing responses of not expecting this home rule request to be approved at the state level. We've also begun our own conversations with state government officials who have agreed that the chances of this request passing are slim, again due to raising taxes in an election year, but also due to the nebulous language of the resolution as it's currently written. If the resolution were to pass the legislature and go to the state, only to not be approved by the state, I guess where I'm at a loss is then I don't understand why then we're all wasting so much time on it. Again, the lodging coalition understands this as a Home Rule request. There's a lengthy process. But at the same time, it seems would seem to me to make more, more sense to vote down this resolution in favor of working together on a resolution that is fair, equitable, and has the support in the tourism industry. I think that there would be better odds of that passing when it did go through to the state. So, thank you again.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Steve.

Steve Turk, Rocking Horse Ranch: Is that me? Is that me?

Chairman Gavaris: There you go. Yeah.

Steve Turk, Rocking Horse Ranch: Hey everybody, I have Shelly my wife to my left, and this is my daughter, Sam, third generation, Rocking Horse Ranch. So less than an hour ago, we received a very distressing phone call. So my little spiel here has gotten a little disjointed, and I apologize for that. We

were notified by our insurance provider that our general liability insurance premium will go up by 50%. And our deductible is going to go up by another 75%. You know, the, the main reason obviously, these whatever the inflationary clauses are but because they claim we don't fit their programming anymore. My feeling is, some of you folks in hospitality, entertainment and recreation will probably not get away unscathed. It's a serious, serious problem for us where, you know, we're already into, you know, the multimillion dollar, you know, capacity here for our insurance premiums. And this just has me like in a state of shock right now. So you're gonna have to like, give me a little bit of a patience here. And of course, this is all happening. You know, as fuel costs are rising before our eyes, inflation is at what seven and a half percent, highest level, I think it's going to be highest level in 45 years, definitely 40 years that we've ever seen. And my fear is, my fear is, in this particular case, when you're addressing sales tax, or an occupancy tax, you're really just seeing the top line, and not seeing what we're going through. You know, it's like this multi-layer cake, and the icing sure looks sweet and creamy on top, you know, but I gotta tell you, what we are paying, what we're paying, what we're going through for frontline, mid-level, senior level, and of course, our level. It's just, it's just unbelievably challenging. And of course, you know, we say this to ourselves. It's like, why now? Why during COVID, we survived two years. The last time this lodging coalition was this [inaudible] was when we were talking to the County Executive, and we were on the backside, our balls of our back, we were like, which way is the surface of the water? We didn't know if we were swimming to the bottom of the pool or swimming to the top of the pool. The Governor was giving us no information, not tell you what the County Executive stepped up and helped us and pushed us through. It was a long three-and-a-half-month closure. I got to tell you, and we're still reeling from it. So you know, we just look around and we lot of people on the screen heard the informational feedback from the film, Hudson Valley film, he was crowing like a banty rooster. I mean, what the heck. I mean, is that the amount of money they're bringing in the amount of money they're spending amount it? Um, you know, at the same time, I know he mentioned tax incentives and tax breaks, and I didn't even realize it, so I scrambled to the screen, and holy cow, if you look at the county, how much time and money we put where we're giving to these, to these social, the celebrities. And he went on to say what was her name Jennifer Lawrence, that the state of Massachusetts was going to contribute toward her \$15 million, that now the state of New York, of course, that's the state, not the county is considering doing the same thing to bring the star power in, as far as the film industry. And we're sitting here, like, what, and we're sitting here challenged with not only an 8% state and county sales tax, but then now we're talking about an existing bed tax and, and increasing that. You know, and as well listen, and I grew up since 1958-59, with a lot of local farmers, raw third, second, third, fourth, fifth generation, but my goodness, a lot of these farms, a lot of the agritourism that's developed and has been a byproduct, a lot of my generation bringing these, you know, pick your owns, the cideries, some of the wineries, they are getting phenomenal incentivization. Guys, what are you doing? And it looked at hotel industry, look at the resort industry in the Catskills. Which, by the way is definitely Ulster County, no question about it, they're decimated. They're done.

Somehow, some of us have miraculously survived, we figured it out. And how we are sitting here today is just beyond me. So while we're focusing on this occupancy tax discussion, it is unbelievably stressful for us because we really should be recruiting people that just aren't there. It's like trying to recruit vapor, we should be planning our projects, working on these projects, that have been stalled now for two years, believe me, I don't need my guests coming to tell me I've got to put \$3 million into my hotel rooms by July 1st this year, ain't gonna happen. It should have happened over the past two and a half, three years. Some of the folks on the screen might have stayed at the property, they know, I know what we look like. And believe me, we need to reinvest into this facility, it is so critical that we put the money right back

into this area, which means more jobs, more, by the way, unlike the film industry, which brings yes, they bring jobs in but then boom, they're gone. Our jobs are permanent. We've been dealing with the same construction company for 10-12 years, we've been dealing with [inaudible] for about 30 years. I mean, you all know the folks we're dealing with, you do know them. You were there for us two years ago, two years ago, please be there now. We feel the tax, our staff feels the tax, their profit sharing plan is going to feel the tax, our guests really do feel the tax. And just to raise this tax because others are doing it. We are so unique in the Hudson Valley, we are so unique in the Catskill region, we are so unique as a county destination. How should this thing be happening? I mean, if we're going to raise this water level, then let's do it for everybody here. Whatever industry we're in, whether ski areas, other sources of hospitality, recreation, food distribution, anything else that would be affected by this tax level. I appreciate it. I'm still just getting over this whole thing with the insurance. So thank you, everybody. Thank you for letting me be part of this discussion.

Chairman Gavaris: Tom.

Thomas Smiley, Mohonk Mountain House: Thank you, I just wanted to address some of the comments of Legislator Ronk, I didn't mean to imply that any of our tax increase was driven by a change at the county level, or it just was more just stating the fact that that that's how much our local contribution to the community has gone up. And it's, it's major, and it's a major thing to have to absorb. And then to hear that, you know, it's, there's a discussion of raising our taxes further, it just, it's, it's a struggle. So that's all. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: Two quick points. I don't know how many ways to say it. The only, I think, tangible argument to a deterrent of somebody staying at a certain place in Ulster County would be the all inclusives. It's a much higher number and it's taxed off that much higher number and they give it to you as one number. And we're all committed, working on it now to get it done before we ever get the chance to go anywhere else. So those what I most of what I just heard, you'll be better off regardless of what we do here getting permission.

Secondly, I would like some clarity, I'm under the impression, I would I was going to answer, Ken right when he first mentioned it, usually I get that right point of order as a legislator in a legislative meeting, but um, that I'm under the impression that it is a longer period of time and and that's one of the legal reasons that I was perceiving it that way that we don't line up for something like this to happen with two year terms not lining up. You'd never get anything done. So I was under the impression that it that we do have an extended period of time. Is is Chris, is Chris Ragucci on the meeting. Could we just ask him real quick, get a lawyer's opinion. I know Ken works up in Albany and has a better knowledge of this then probably I do. But is Chris on the meeting and can we just ask him his, his legal opinion?

Chairman Gavaris: I don't know if Council is on right now.

Counsel Ragucci: I'm here.

Legislator Maloney: Chris. um, what is your legal opinion, as far as if this got up to Albany, the legislators up there, kicked it back to approve it and kicked it back to us? Would we be on an immediate clock or would we have an extended period of time?

Counsel Ragucci: I'm not aware of any immediate clock. I mean, I'd like to look into it a little further. I don't want to give an off the cuff answer, but I'm not aware of an immediate any kind of deadline per se.

Legislator Maloney: Thank you. That's how I understood it as well. But let's, maybe we'll get some clarity on that. I don't think it works as an argument not to do it at all, because we might be on a clock, I think it's more of an argument to go ahead and get it up there. So we give ourselves a chance. But we'll, we'll talk in caucus. I know there is a motion and a second.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you.

Legislator Ronk: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you can see my hand or not.

Chairman Gavaris: Yup, Legislator Ronk, go ahead.

Legislator Ronk: Um, so just to Legislator Maloney's point, I'm sorry, if I wasn't clear, I was talking about having to do this all again, if the state legislature did not approve our home rule request. So if, if they approve it, I believe that we have some time. Because that just gives us the authority to levy the tax. What I'm saying is, I, I see very little possibility that this is going to pass the state legislature this year, because they are having an election year this year. And, um, you know, tax increases don't look good in an election year. Um, you know, and then we would have to go through the whole the whole home rule process again, at our level next year. I, it, it was my, you know, the way I understood your comments earlier, Legislator Maloney was that, you know, we would have time, if the state legislature didn't pass this, we would then have time for them to do it next year. And that my point was, we would have to have a whole new process next year if they don't pass it this year.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Any other discussion? All right. All those in favor of postponed to next week?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Any opposed? So carried, thank you. And thank you to everyone for the, who spoke tonight.

All right, leg, Resolution 17: Setting a Public Hearing for Local number three, local law requiring payment of a living wage to employees and contractors. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it for discussion.

Chairman Gavaris: And second? Legislator Walter. Discussion? Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Oh, thank you. So my understanding is we got, is that there was an initial list, perhaps that was created of contracts that would be covered under this, is that correct?

Deputy Executive Rider: Is that a question, I mean, I believe I sent over a list of contracts.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Okay. So, I mean, I don't know if, if that's been distributed, or there's been a discussion about how many contracts? I'm just, I'm very interested in the financial impact of this, you know, we, we passed the the increase to \$15 at the end of last year. So we're, you know, we're starting to see that effect. So I'm curious. I mean, I very much want to have a solid sense of what the impact would be on this.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Cahill.

Legislator Cahill: Thank you, Chairman. If there was a list sent over, I did not receive it either. And I certainly would like to see that. So we and I think that was what our original hesitancy was the first time was we weren't quite sure what the financial impact would be. And so if there is a list of contractors that would be impacted by this, I would certainly like to see it before I vote on it.

You know, one of the things that we found when we did \$15, was there were repercussions that we're still feeling to this day, by some of our contractors who had to come back to us for more money for contracts that we had already agreed to right, to amend those contracts, give them more money, because we require them to pay more. And if we're going to do it again, I would like to know what that financial impact would be prior to voting for it this time rather than having it the other way around. So if there is a list, I would certainly like to see it and what the actual financial impact would be to the county. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Maloney, then Petit, then Walter.

Legislator Maloney: Sure. And I think Laura can speak to it, she's already I believe, spoken to some people that are in some of the contracts that we've sent over and they're already making \$20 an hour or so. It's going to be difficult to come up with an exact number because you don't know contracts coming down the line. You also don't know what all these people are making in these contracts. Some of these are type of people that are working for these groups that are not for profits. And companies that are already making \$20 an hour or they're not at 15, they're at 17 or 18, there will be a financial impact, obviously, it will be passed along to us. I didn't, I didn't run and mention this while I was running. It wasn't on my mind. It was something I never thought about until I had people come and give me their testimonials off the record, people that are literally getting services from DSS and working full time essentially for DSS. I wish, I wish this robust, and demand for data and numbers. I wish I heard this in Ways and Means over the last three or four years, while giving out it seeming millions of raises, people making 100, \$115,000 a year. Elected officials now aren't making enough, no discussion, done. We need good people. Give them the raise, creating 62 new positions, filling positions. Very, very, very little blowback. You know, a couple of years ago, I had heard Deputy Executive Marc Rider talk about that when we were talking about some big time appointments and raises for high end appointments, and how we'll never find quality people. Meanwhile, we all just learned how low paid most of DPW was. See, we don't think about, we don't think about the the rank and file. We don't think about the people that are literally literally receiving services. But man we'll push this off for months and eventually probably vote it down. And they'll continue to get services from DSS while they work full time with the least of us, for the least of us. For our grandmother for our, our troubled youth, with the people struggling with opioids,

they'll do it for 15 bucks an hour, we and, and that's and we're not going to worry about it. We're not going to take on that. But budget cycle, we're going to be giving \$100,000 a year salaries left and right with very little discussion. So when I heard that, I put it up. And it's and if this doesn't pass, that's fine, too. But it's food for thought. Because a lot of times we outsource, so we don't have to think about it. We could save a couple of bucks on this contract. A lot of it's stuff we should be doing in house. A lot of these things, some of the things we're doing in house, I've talked to the rank and file over at DSS. They tell me that I'm doing this, we're hired, we hired this not for profit to do this, we're both doing basically the same thing. One day, I'm doing this one day, we really have to have a discussion what's going on over at DSS at times as well. And, you know, like I said, there are people that are really struggling, they're doing God's work, and we're not paying enough. And if we want to keep kicking the can down the road because we don't have enough information. It's pretty basic, you can kind of look at a contract, understand how many people are probably making 15 bucks an hour and and figure out what it's going to be to raise them to \$20 an hour. There will be a financial cost everyone on Ways and Means and a couple of these other committees and eventually the floor perhaps have to decide whether that's a financial cost that they're willing to pass on, if not vote it down.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Petit.

Legislator Petit: Thank you. The, the list was sent out very late today, I saw it pop up on my screen about 3:30. It had 261 contractors on there, I'd venture to say about a third of them are private social workers who make well over \$20 an hour. A couple of them I recognized as people I spoke to who also said they pay their staff over \$20 an hour. The, the 7.5% cost of living that occurred in January is up over 8% right now. We can't keep expecting to contract out for services, while we're paying near or close to minimum wage. We're not going to get quality people there's not going to be any retention. We have to increase what we're paying these folks. And just to follow up on what Legislator Maloney said, we, we created positions last year that were well over 100,000. I've never made over 100,000 in my life, not even when I was working five jobs at a time to support my five kids as a single parent. We're doing this because we don't have to pay legacy costs, because we don't have to pay the health insurance benefits, and, and it's disingenuous and it's unfair to to expect these quality services to be provided to people in need through social services or any of the other aspects and not give them at least close to a living wage. It was brought up last month and one of the meetings that impacted our contracts by about a million dollars, and that was at \$1.80 an hour with the the minimum wage going up. So I would venture to say it would be between two and two and a half million is going to be the impact of this this resolution, we did bring in 34 million in unexpected sales tax revenues, to put that back into our economy is going to be a benefit for us. So I guess I'll leave that up to you. But I would like to see this resolution moved forward, so we can speak to it on the floor.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I just want to make a motion to postpone it for next Ways & Means, so we have an opportunity to see this information, since we haven't gotten back at it. And I'm also just since I haven't seen it, I don't know. But, you know, the secondary issue that we had with the \$15 was an argument that compression would result in increases beyond those who make less than 15. I think we were hit more by compression than by people shifting from 15 higher. So I'm hoping that is addressed somehow on this documentation, or somehow we will be able to weigh the impact of that as well. But anyway, I'm making a motion that we postpone it so that we can actually see this information.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you, can I get a second?

Legislator Fabiano: I'll second that.

Chairman Gavaris: Fabiano. Any discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? Legislator Ronk, you're opposed?

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, I'm, I'm opposed. I'm ready to, I'm ready to vote no tonight. So I'm, I'm going to be against the postponement.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. Postponement carries. Thank you.

Resolution 18: Appointing an Independent Administrative Hearing Officer. We don't have a name yet. So can we make a motion to postpone this to next week?

Legislator Walter: Make it.

Chairman Gavaris: Second, Fabiano. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried, thank you.

Resolution 29: Funding Capital Project 601, ARP small business and economic recovery. There's a technical amendment. Legislator Cahill.

Legislator Cahill: Yes, and, and I hope I get this straight. So the technical amendment would be that there will be a committee form that would include representatives from the County Executive's Office and two representatives appointed by the Legislature, two members of the Legislature to review all the applications that come in, before forwarding them over to UCEDA for approval. So in other words, the legislature would get the first crack at applications and once they're deemed worthy, right, then they would be, go over to UCEDA board for approval.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Can I just ask for a point of clarification. I think there was a technical amendment that was circulated, it wasn't, that had to do with the

Legislator Cahill: Oh, the type

Legislative Chair Bartels: financing, the technical amendment that, that we all saw,

Legislator Ronk: putting this into a budget line and not a capital

Legislative Chair Bartels: exactly, to take it out of a capital project and move it into a budget line.

Legislator Cahill: Right.

Legislative Chair Bartels: We, could we move on that one first, because that's something everyone's actually seen. And then maybe we talk about whatever the other proposed changes are.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move that amendment as it was sent to us earlier.

Chairman Gavaris: Second?

Legislative Chair Bartels: Will Legislator Cahill remove motion

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah.

Legislator Cahill: Yeah, I'll remove my motion, for the amendment.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah. All right. So second for that one, Legislator Walter. Discussion now, Legislator Cahill?

Legislator Cahill: No, I'm good. I moved, I'll move to yes on the amendment.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. All those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? All right, so carried. All right. Now, can I have a motion to postpone to next week?

Legislative Chair Bartels: Well wait, can I

Legislator Cahill: No, hold it. So I want to make a motion to amend that resolution number 29 now, unless you want to postpone it and do it then but I thought we were amending it tonight, right

Chairman Gavaris: No, go ahead, do that tonight.

Legislator Cahill: Right. So the the amendment will then create a committee of members of the executive appointed by the Executive and two Legislators that will review the applications for these requests, and then forward those to the UCEDA board for approval to pay out. Right. The money will be allocated as these are approved by the legislature as I understand it. And if I have that wrong, I'm sorry, I got all of this in the last hour and a half.

Chairman Gavaris: Second, Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Well, I'll second it for the purpose of discussion, but then I actually have, would like discussion.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Chair Bartels, go ahead.

Legislative Chair Bartels: So you know, I I've been pretty vocal about this proposal as it's drafted and I've had some conversations with legislators and with executive staff members about it. You know, I'm open to the idea of changes but I would like to see changes in writing rather than, no, no offense Legislator Cahill, I know you just got this an hour ago. But I think, especially if we're talking about substantial changes, I don't know if that's the only change that you're bringing, that you or the executive offices are bringing forward this evening. But my understanding is there were, you know, other, other changes to be proposed the idea of this not, no longer being first come first serve, which you're alluding to in, in, in that, but again, it's something that that at the least I'm not sure we're I'll be when it shakes out, but at the least I would need to see in a in a written form in order to be able to, to speak to it coherently.

Legislator Cahill: I just forwarded you the draft resolutions that I got late this afternoon, I thought honestly thought that the whole committee got it. I apologize. I didn't know that they didn't go to everybody. They only went to a handful of people here, I see.

Legislative Chair Bartels: It's possible I got it, but I definitely didn't see it if I didn't get it.

Chairman Gavaris: Exec Kelly.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you, Chair. So the other part that was being discussed is that instead of being the first in first out, that was the CARES Act criteria determined by the state and the funding funders on that this would move similar to the non for profit, where this would be a I want to I don't want to stress the competitive part, but it would be based on need, and based on a scoring rubric rather than a first to apply. So that is the other change. And that is based on feedback and conversations. Lots of conversations and feedback over the last two months from the legislature. I hope that answers the question.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: So this, we didn't discuss this in Economic Development, correct.

Legislator Cahill: This amendment, no it just came out today.

Legislator Maloney: So are we gonna get to go over this and vote on this in Economic Development?

Legislator Cahill: Probably not. I don't know, that would be up to Vicky.

Legislator Maloney: Is this, do you, would you consider it was a substantive change.

Legislator Cahill: That would be up to the Clerk of the Legislature to determine whether it goes back. Am I right about that Chairman Gavaris?

Legislator Ronk: We could send it back ourselves Legislator Cahill.

Legislator Cahill: Okay. Well.

Legislator Maloney: I'd request that to happen.

Legislator Cahill: You know, well, we'll discuss it in caucus, I guess. I'm not ready to do that, now here in this committee.

Legislator Maloney: I mean, we're talking about basically a business bailout, and it's a major amendment to it, and Economic Development didn't even have it. Now, we're throwing it into Ways and Means seems proper that we would get a crack at this in our committee.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Nolan.

Legislator Nolan: Thank you, Chair. I think that this is a healthy discussion to have in Ways and Means and could lead to these amendments being introduced on the floor and adopted that, in that fashion.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yeah. I feel like the I my concern is that I think considerably more amendments are potentially, potentially warranted, although I'm not sure I would support it even with those. But I will say that the ARP team had reviewed it and scored it, and there were certain elements that came very low. And I would hope that, you know, a sense of responsiveness, but particularly would be looking at some of those elements that that scored low and identify if there are perhaps ways to revise this approach that would meet the needs of the ARP committee felt were not met. I haven't heard any comments, you know, back as a response to where the ARP committee was. But I you know, if it was blatantly, it blatantly did poorly across the board, but there are certain elements, particularly and I just feel like it would be wise to not just ignore the work that that committee did, and, and but rather use that work to improve this, if possible.

Chairman Gavaris: Tim.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: I just would maybe respond a little bit to some of these comments, which, you know, I think I should indicate that part of this amendment comes from conversations I've had with many of you about some of your concerns. First to Legislator Walter, I would point out that this passed, I believe, unanimously through the ARPA committee, I have not seen the scoring sheet. So I can't speak to what elements of that scoring were weaker or stronger. But I would just indicate that this did pass unanimously through that committee, I believe, and then that we have made every attempt to address concerns from this body. And, you know, I think we were here a month ago, talking about this program and explaining that there is a desperate need, and we heard some of that from our hospitality and lodging partners tonight. We're hearing that every day from businesses in our community. Many of whom are forced to close every week because of conditions that have come about due to the pandemic. So in those meetings, I was asked if it really mattered if we waited another month? And I said, Yes, it did. And since then we have seen businesses close. If we continue to wait on this, I

fear that we will continue to see businesses close. So I just wanted to stress the urgency from our perspective.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Walter and then Ronk.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, thank you. Um, so first of all, you have every ability to get the scoring sheet from the ARP committee, so nothing should have stopped you from receiving it. And the ARP committee, not to necessarily speak for them, but their, their approval of it is yes, they went through us not yes, we think this is fine, or yes, we want it. But yes, this went through us. And that's how the ARP Committee is. It, it scored, it got a D, honestly. And so they're, unanimous, sorry, and Legislator Sperry is here, she might be able to speak to it, was that it passed through the steps that the ARP committee wanted, but it does, it's not a vote of, of support from them necessarily.

Legislator Walter: Sorry about the dogs.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, thanks. Um, you know, just since Director Weidemann brought it up, I'd like to know, is there any empirical data that if this resolution were to pass, where, you know, this month, or what have passed last month at their businesses that would not have closed? I mean, you know, I appreciate the conjecture, and, and it makes a great soundbite. But, you know, this is a relatively small, one-time infusion of cash for these businesses. You know, as far as, as far as I know, and you deal with a lot more with this on a daily basis than I do. But, you know, many of these businesses are closing because of workforce issues and other issues that that an infusion of cash would not fix. So where's the empirical data that this is the the linchpin to keeping these businesses open?

Chairman Gavaris: Tim.

Director of Economic Development Weidemann: I'm happy to gather the data that right now, I can report anecdotally, but I think we would all acknowledge, I would be surprised and would encourage anybody who doesn't acknowledge that our businesses in many sectors are struggling right now to go talk with more business owners, because that is what we do every day, all day long. And we hear it loud and clear. And I don't mean to be aggressive about this, I feel compelled to just speak, you know, directly about the struggle that we're seeing. And so I just, I don't mean to be contradictory. I just want to do my job as Director of Economic Development to express that concern.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Deputy Executive Rider, then

Legislator Ronk: Mr. Chairman, one, can I follow up?

Chairman Gavaris: Sure, go ahead, follow up.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, you know, again, I'm, I'm you know, feel free to gather the data if you'd like I, you know, at, at no point did I say that, I think that businesses aren't struggling, so to say that I should go out and talk to more businesses. I mean, you know, I, I respect where you're coming from, but what I'm asking for is empirical data that will show that this program will solve the problem. And that's where

I struggle, and, you know, quite frankly, the, you know, I, I find, you know, it interesting in my, you know, this is my 15th year in the legislature, I just find when when department heads come and actually talk me out of voting yes, on something more than they talk me into it. When, when, when giving testimony in committee, um, you know, and and I feel like, you know, one of the things you're doing here is talking me out of what we were I was closer to a yes, on this than I was last month. You know, I again, I understand that businesses are struggling, I just don't know that this is going to be, you know, the, the linchpin that stops them from closing their doors. You know, this may be a small stop gap. But you know, if, you know, if \$35,000, or whatever this is going to be is, is going to be the linchpin to keeping your business open long term, then I, I think there's other concerns there. You know, again, this might help a little, but I, you know, and every business in Ulster County could benefit from this much money, which is one of the concerns I have about, you know, the limited number of businesses this is gonna be able to help.

Chairman Gavaris: Deputy Executive Rider, then Chair Bartels, Legislator Walter, then Maloney.

Deputy Executive Rider: I'll be really brief. Earlier this month, the County Executive spoke at the chamber breakfast, and there was a Q&A afterwards. There was two questions that came up from the members of the chamber. And one of the questions directly related to this program and the other one was the nonprofit program. Those were the only two questions asked by the chamber businesses to the County Executive that day. So these programs are on the top of the businesses mind.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. Yeah, I mean, I understand that these programs may be on top of the businesses at the chamber breakfast mind, you know, the those businesses, I would argue if it were on the top of their mind, those businesses were were in the know about about this program. And until, until an hour ago, this was a first in first out program, which was consistently one of my complaints about it, which meant that we weren't assessing need first, we were assessing based on who got their applications in first, arguably, the applications aren't even need based at in relation to a loss of revenue, since a demonstrated loss of revenue in the in the existing proposal from the CARES, from the CARES package, unlike the PPP programs did not require to show a loss of revenue calculation for business. So the need, the best I can gather at the need was based on the percentage of mean income, as demonstrated by a tax return of the business owner, or a verification that 51% of employees met a certain threshold. So, you know, we could go down a rabbit hole about the type of seasonal businesses that might pay minimally pay their employees minimally that might be eligible, and what they might or might not be using this money for. And that's long been my concern, and I do, you know, I welcome changes to the program, I just, I need to see them, I did not get an email that I can find at this moment. I was in meetings all day. So if it came in the last hour, you know, it may be in my inbox, but you know, I'm not prepared to vote on, on those changes until I, until I see them. And, you know, I, I do share many of the concerns that have been raised and, you know, Legislator Ronk just brought up, you know, I think an important point as well. And that, you know, this next proposal is for a million dollars, \$100,000 of which is program delivery, and advertising, which if we change the, the spectrum of it, we would, we would arguably need to use because we'd need to do some outreach to, to get to businesses in need, and \$50,000 in in overhead, which is 15% of the overall over overall costs. So we're going to going to impact a small, very small number of businesses in you know, county wide. So, again, and and to to Legislator Walters point, you know, we not only have the ARPA scoring, we also did a legislative wide

survey, asking for ranking of every proposal that's been raised, however, small or large, however, local or broad. And this, this scored very low on that. And again, it's, it was scored, I'm assuming, based on the proposal as it was presented, which is the CARES proposal, but it may be that in order to move something like this forward, we need to, we need to make changes, which I appreciate the executive staff is, is suggesting changes, but again, I have to reiterate, I haven't seen them. So you know, I would, I, I would be supportive of, at least allowing the week to be able to look at what's, what's, what's now before us.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Walter, then Maloney, then Ronk, then Litts.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. So, you know, the challenge I have with the concept of the businesses talking about how excited they are about this, or I don't know if that word was used, but bringing it up at the meeting. And the challenge I personally have with this one is it's the only one on the table. And, and, you know, I can imagine to help our businesses, there are several different approaches that could be taken, that I could, you know, maybe ones that are directed just to pay employer employees higher, which you know, relates to the earlier resolution of paying employees more, or maybe focusing on just the shuttered buildings so that a business does not operated with a closed business on either side of them. And I would imagine that if this if the business community had a list of a variety of different approaches to help improve businesses in Ulster County, this might not be the one they pick. And so what gets me the most is that I, I feel like there are well I'm not completely, completely against this, I can already imagine at least two or three, I'd be more for. And this is the ARP money, and every time we spend it, then we don't have it for something else. And I just feel like I much rather explore other possible opportunities of ways we can help our businesses that might really hit the marks on the ARP, really address some of these other concerns that then we can get behind because I would not be surprised if the legislature would really, really get behind the right business proposal here for ARP. I just don't think this is number one, this to me, probably, it's number four, or five. And I'd really like to see one through four, and go through those first, because I know that this is not on the top of it for me, and for many legislators.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you, next Legislator Maloney. But first, just a reminder, though, so it sounds like there's not a lot of support to do anything with this, except for maybe postpone it. So if your comments are related to that, let's try to streamline this because we got a large agenda still to go so Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: Yeah, you know, I, I think everyone also has to think about as we claim, with no tangible evidence, which is what I think Ken was referring to that we're saving businesses. And we've all talked offline, I don't want to disparage any businesses, because the money was there to be gotten. But we've all discussed already, some businesses that probably shouldn't have gotten this, the same argument that you can use to save a business, it's the same argument I can use that you're gonna put another business out. You save one business, but there's a business directly across the street, the same that offers the same exact service. And they go out of business. So you've literally put someone out of business. And that leads me to a point that I that I think we really need to talk about every government bailout that I've ever seen, I've never seen one not done by industry, whether it's restaurants during COVID, banks, airlines, we talk about the cruise, cruise ships, it's by industry, because that's the only rational proper way a government can take tax dollars and bail businesses out to ensure that first, you're helping the right business. And second, that everyone has the same opportunity, and you're not going to hurt anyone.

So this is, you know, this is just for me, dead on arrival. And it's, and it's to a point where we're getting to a point where two people raised their hand at the chamber breakfast and asked about it. I mean, that, if that's, if that's an argument at this point, then that worries me. But have we had one executive plan come forward, that we've ever had issues with, I mean, even about ARPA, but other things as well, where they've ever said, you know, part of being a good leader is admitting when you're wrong. And maybe it's not a great idea. Maybe we should just say, You know what, you guys make good points, we're going to listen to the legislature on this, let's move on to something better to spend these ARPA funds on. But when are we not going to just double and triple and quadruple down and trying to keep hammering, hammering, hammering away something that has so many blatant issues, and I hope everybody thinks about that, because in my hometown, we gave money to somebody that has three competing businesses that do the same thing right around them. I know one of the owners of the other business that's a mile away, the exact same business he's hurting, he didn't get any of this money. We may have just put them out of business. We, we have to think about that. And if we're going to be in the the bailout business, it has to be by industry. And we have to ensure that everyone in that industry in our county has the same access and knowledge of the program. To me, this is not good.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk, then Litts, then Uchitelle.

Legislator Ronk: I just, you know, I want to also talk about, you know, Deputy Executive Riders comment about the two questions at the chamber breakfast, with all due respect and not casting any aspersions. But there's nothing that says that the county executive staff, who were I'm sure, making up a great deal of the room didn't, you know, tap one of their friends in the Chamber of Commerce on the shoulder and say, Hey, make sure you talk about the, you know, the economic development money and make sure you talk about the not for profit money. Um, you know, these are the people

Unidentified Speaker: laughter

Legislator Ronk: I'm glad you like that one. But, you know, but I'm being serious. You know, quite frankly, you know, to Legislator Maloney's point about the insiders being the ones to get the money. You know, the, the inside businesses are the ones that are in that room in the Chamber of Commerce, you know, chamber breakfast, I'll tell you right now, there's not a lot of businesses in the Town of Shawangunk in that chamber of commerce breakfast or the Town of Plattekill, or the Town of Marlborough, or the Town of Gardiner, or the Town of Wawarsing. There's a lot of businesses in the greater Kingston area that are there and I know that I keep harping on this but I, I plan to until my last day in the legislature, you know, we need to find a way to get some geographic diversity. And I hope that the amendment that's made it, you know, moves us closer to that. But I'm nowhere near ready to vote yes on this tonight.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Litts.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yes, thank you for the opportunity to maybe put some clarity here to the issue. People, I think forgot how we got here. How we got here is this was a state program, under CARES I Act, the criteria was set down by this state. The EDA oversaw the administration of it with, with county staff. But the criteria of who gets it, who was eligible was set by the state. And how we got here is 29, or 30, some 35 businesses ate up the \$1 million that the state put forth. But we had almost 300 applications. So they said, Hey, let's do a CARES II Act with the ARPA money. That's how we got

to this point. There was no criteria on needs based or anything at the state level. And we were just trying to take some of the applications of the 300 that did not get the money, and, and go for CARES II. That's how we got here.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Uchitelle.

Legislator Uchitelle: Yeah, I just want to say everyone's concerns, I think are, are perfectly valid. But these are the same concerns. And perhaps, you know, those that, that feel like I might be putting this on them will, you know, seek to put this on the executive team. These are the same concerns that we've heard in the last month. And what I want to know is what's the work that's happening, for us as legislators, the great statesman, that we are, to pick up the phone and call whoever we need to call and form a small coalition of what we're able to support, reach out to the Office of Economic Development, reach out to the county executive team, and put together a plan, you know, we're having the same conversation again. And yeah, you can fault the exact for that, but but really, we've got to take responsibility for putting forward a plan that that does, the addresses the issues that we're that we're bringing up here, which are valid issues. So without until we have something like that in front of us, I'm going to support this plan, I realized that I'm not on this committee. So it's a bit of a an empty statement here. But you know, I have so many businesses closing in my district there are, I just heard of another business closing, not in my district, but also in Kingston, one of the businesses specifically cited access to capital as one of the things that they need. These are businesses that I know for a fact have applications that are in the pipeline, some might say that they are in the know, fine, we can say all those things all day long. But until we put forward a plan, and get on the same page and do something, businesses are going to keep going out of business, and I'm not good with that. I would support this, I would support something better than this as the person who, who just wants to get money to businesses, I'm probably the easiest to please. So maybe I'm not the right person to lead this negotiation if that's what needs to happen. But if it's a small group of us that step up to make that happened, let's make that happen. This is my plea to everyone to you know, pick up the phone tomorrow, make whatever calls we can make to put something forward. It's clear, this isn't moving forward tonight. But by the time we meet in in, you know, a month from now, there's going to be more businesses that are going out, and I'm just not good with that. So that's my that's my pitch. And I just asked that we move forward with something please soon.

Chairman Gavaris: Tim you had your hand before, you're no longer, you're good. Okay. Deputy Executive Kelly.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you, Chair. I, I just wanted to reflect that we have been having those conversations, and that is reflected in the amendment. I know you guys all got that just this afternoon. So in order to discuss what's been put in writing on both this and the next resolution, we certainly would welcome joining the caucuses or if anyone wants to reach out to myself or Economic Development. We're certainly happy to continue. We do think there's a need. I know that we've been talking about this for two months. We still strongly believe that there's a need and this will help numerous businesses in the county. So we look forward to continuing the dialogue.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, any other discussion? All right, so I believe we left off with, excuse me, to postponing for next, Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: I think that the, I think you have an amendment, did, did Legislator Cahill bring forward a

Chairman Gavaris: That's right he did, no you're right.

Legislator Cahill: Yes. Yes, the amendment was

Legislative Chair Bartels: and I seconded it for the purpose of discussion. So that's what's before us right now, is Legislator Cahill's amendment. So I don't know if you want to withdraw your amendment and we

Legislator Cahill: Oh, sounds like I should probably withdraw the amendment and postpone it. And we can postpone it till next week. And then that way, everybody has an opportunity to look at the amendment and have a better understanding of what it entails. And, and, you know, kind of going back to what Legislator Uchitelle said, you know, there are, it does propose having a committee of people from the Executives Office and two representatives of the legislature on a committee to review these applications. So that kind of, you know, is in the direction you were going, right. So, yeah, I'll withdraw my amendment at this time.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Bartels, you're withdrawing your second? Yeah. Thank you.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yes.

Chairman Gavaris: Alright, so now,

Legislator Ronk: I'll move we postpone till next week.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. The second on that, Legislator Walter. All right. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried. All right. Motion's postponed.

Resolution 32.

Legislative Chair Bartels: I'll move to postpone till next week.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Second? Second, Legislator Cahill. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried, thank you. All right.

Resolution 69: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 150,000, Family Woodstock. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: Move.

Chairman Gavaris: Second? Can I get a second? No second? Chair Bartels. Discussion? Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thank you. So this is the one that was postponed because we're lacking the information needed related to the language of increased salaries because of the \$15 an hour increase. I did just receive it. I will say that none of the increases appear to be related to the \$15 an hour law after all. No, no individual really had on this particular resolution had less, these are more cost-of-living increases. They're, to me, reasonable increases. These are not people who are highly salaried. You know, they're typically in the 30s anyway. They're, you know, they hover around the \$15, \$20 an hour, but they're not highly exceeding it. But so, again, to summarize, this is not about the \$15 an hour resolution. This is about them requesting some more money because they're increasing salaries of some staff, but that these increases in my perception are not unreasonable. I do recognize you all haven't necessarily gotten to review that. But that's my two cents.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? All right. All those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried. Just to note, Legislator Ronk had to jump off.

97: Funding Capital Project 602 funds trails, open spaces. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Second, Chair Bartels. Discussion? I believe Peter was here, was going to speak, I don't see the, is he still here?

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Yes.

Chairman Gavaris: There is. Okay.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Peter Karis from Open Space Institute.

Legislator Walter: But before he does Legislator Gavaris.

Chairman Gavaris: Yep. Go ahead.

Legislator Walter: May I, I'm just we had a, a process that says that anything that hasn't been reviewed yet by ARP, we would postpone until they got to review it. They have not come up with a scoring for this at their last meeting. They are meeting tomorrow. So my request is that 97, 98, 99, maybe that's it. We do postpone till our next meeting so ARP, what is it, 1-0 what Natalie?

101, postponed till our next meeting because that's our protocol is that we let ARP have their say first.

Chairman Gavaris: 101

Deputy Executive Kelly: 101

Chairman Gavaris: That's a motion. Second? Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Um, yeah, I would second it, but, but like as an earlier, can, can we have Mr. Karis, because he's here. Can we have Mr. Karis

Legislator Walter: Yeah. Sure. I just wanted to put that out there first.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. Because again, I just want to next, next week. We have a lot going on. It's our first in person meeting back, I feel like we're going to be pressed for time. And certainly, if we need to speak about it more, I would want Mr. Karis to be back next week. But I think since he's here right now, if we could afford the opportunity for some discussion on these issues, so that we can educate ourselves in advance of next week's meeting.

Chairman Gavaris: No we'll definitely let him speak tonight, but that was a second though, correct.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, sure.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay, thank you. All right. Mr. Karis, go ahead.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: Sure. Thank you, Legislators. I'm happy to be here tonight. Again, my name is Peter Karis. I'm Vice President for Parks and Stewardship at Open Space Institute. And we are currently work, looking to partner with Ulster County and allocating about 2.1 million in ARPA funds to make improvements to three sections of rail trails within Ulster County, one section from New Paltz to the town of Gardiner on the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail. Second project from, on the O & W from Accord to Kerhonkson. And a third project from Ellenville North to the Eastern Correctional Facility.

Peter Karis, Open Space Institute: We've made a presentation to the ARPA Committee, I believe it was two weeks ago, and also had had the ability to be before the Capital Projects and Transportation Committee where they voted to accept these resolutions.

But in essence, OSI is proposing to, to use ARPA funds to to design, bid, and hold contracts and construct these rail trail improvement projects totaling about nine and a half miles. On the Wallkill, I will say specifically the over the past two years and actually since 2013, OSI has been piecing together and improving the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail. At the end of last year we completed almost 13 and a half miles from the City of Kingston line at Rockwell Lane, all the way South to Sojourner Truth park in the Village of New Paltz. And we also have advanced planning for the two sections on the O & W. So essentially, these three projects are ready to go.

Back to the Walkill, this funding would actually leverage almost \$2 million of investment to date by the state, by OSI, and their generous donors and also from the Hudson River Valley Greenway as part of the Empire State Trail Improvements. So this would extend that Wallkill Trail another six and a half miles south to the Hamlet of Gardiner in Accord, on the O & W, in Accord and Kerhonkson. It's an existing trail open to the public, it's in really need of refurbishment. There's a lot of conditions there that need to be fixed. And then in Ellenville, it's actually a little more degraded. But, but the project would connect

an improved section or rail trail, actually, to route 52 in, in Ellenville and, and hopefully connect to an existing federally funded project to connect over to Burn Road Park at the base of the Smiley Carriage Road in Minnewaska State Park. OSI's larger vision is for an interconnected trail network east the Hudson through Ulster, Sullivan, and Orange Counties totaling about 250 miles. It, would it when we're finished, I think in about 10 years, hopefully, it'll be the largest feeder trail system into the Empire State Trail in the state touching three, as I said, three counties and over 20 communities along that along these lines. So this is a continuation of our program, and we are ready to go.

As part of the proposal there is a small overhead request for about \$95,000 that covers all of OSI's time, and, and the team of people that work on these projects at our organization. That is being matched by, by OSI is in kind service for 95,000. And as a partnership, we're doing that so that everybody has a financial interest in the delivery of these projects. But these three specific projects would benefit six municipalities in Ulster County, New Paltz, both the Town and the Village, Town of Gardiner, the Town of Rochester, the Town of Wawarsing, and the Village of Ellenville, and if you add in the Hamlets of Accord and Kerhonkson, that totals eight. So I'm happy to answer any questions. We're, we're moving and ready to go with these projects. And our hope and our understanding from the ARP Committee is that they're, they're producing their rubric and their scoring for these projects. We believe based on our understanding that these will score very highly. And as I said, we're, we're really excited about this partnership with Ulster County and a continuation of our public access improvement, improvement work. So I'm happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Gavaris: Anybody have anything? No? All right, thank you. All right, Chair Bartels if you could, rescind your second, and Legislator Walter rescind your motion, we have to go back and vote on blocking. We do vote on the block for those. Alright, so

Legislator Fabiano: I'll make the motion to block them.

Chairman Gavaris: We already did first and second, we just cut in with motion to postpone. So there was a first and second for that. So all those in favor of blocking 97, 98, 99, and 101. Favor?

Group: Aye. Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? All right, blocked. Now motion, Legislator Walter, motion to postpone until next week?

Legislator Walter: I make a motion to postpone the block.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay, second. Chair Bartels. Yep. Thank you.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Sure.

Chairman Gavaris: All those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried, thank you. All right.

105: Confirming the appointment of Loren Johnson as Director of Department of Transportation. Can I have a motion? Motion, Chair Bartels. Second? Second? Legislator Walter. Discussion? All those in fav, Legislator, Chair Bartels, go ahead.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Well, I think I see that Mr. Johnson's here with us. I don't I don't know if he can come on camera. Just be nice to introduce himself.

[inaudible].

Legislative Chair Bartels: There you are.

Chairman Gavaris: There he is. Mr. Johnson,

Loren Johnson: Hello.

Chairman Gavaris: Hello,

Legislative Chair Bartels: Welcome.

Chairman Gavaris: Would you like to just introduce yourself real quick.

Loren Johnson: I, sure, certainly. First and foremost, thank you, Chairman and fellow committee members. As you know, my name is Loren Johnson. I come by way of a rich history in constituent services and providing a customer experience. And I hope to bring that to Ulster County, as a whole. I have a strong belief and creating equitable services for all and really looking forward to working with you guys to serving the public as a whole.

Chairman Gavaris: Any questions for Mr. Johnson? All right, all those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried, thank you.

Resolution 110: Amending Capital Project: 577 McKinstry Bridge, can I have a motion?

Legislative Chair Bartels: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Move it. Second, Fabiano.

Legislator Fabiano: Second, yup.

Chairman Gavaris: Discussion? Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

Resolution 112: Approving the execution of a contract for \$2,641,285 for A. Colarusso And Son. Can I have a motion?

Legislative Chair Bartels: I'll move it.

Legislator Fabiano: I'll second it.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair. Second, Fabiano. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

113: Amending the 2022-2027 Capital Improvement Project, Amending Capital Improvement Project Number 390, Sundown Bridge. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Fabiano: Move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter. Second, Fabiano. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

115: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 250,800 for Barton & Loguidice. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Chair Gavaris, can we block a few of these?

Chairman Gavaris: You can do whatever you like.

Legislator Walter: I think, sorry, are we on 115 or 116?

Chairman Gavaris: We are on 115.

Legislator Walter: So can we block 115 through 1

Legislator Fabiano: 26.

Legislator Walter: 26. Does that make sense? Or a bit? That's a flag. How about 125?

Chairman Gavaris: Okay, can I have a second?

Legislator Fabiano: I'll second that.

Chairman Gavaris: Second, Fabiano. All right. All those in favor of the block?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. Opposed? All right. All right. On the block? Motion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried. All right.

126: Establishing Capital Project No. 623, 2022 Bridge Flag Response. Can I have a motion? Legislator Water. Second?

Legislator Fabiano: I'll second it.

Chairman Gavaris: Fabiano. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

128: Authorizing an amendment to the grant with Catskill Watershed Corporation. Can I have motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Second?

Legislator Fabiano: I'll second it.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Bartels. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

129: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 22,280 for Eastern Heating & Cooling. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Fabiano. Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

130: Approving the execution of a contract for 437,000 T. McElligott, Inc. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Chair Bartels. Discussion? Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Can I just asked for clarity, so it's a, it's a \$1. This is, this is to rent space for equipment that we're storing. Could someone just work, could someone just clarify what exactly this is for?

Deputy Executive Rider: This is T. McElligott, this is a contract. The one I think you're talking about is the next one.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Oh, yeah, it is. Okay. Thanks.

Chairman Gavaris: All those in favor?

Legislative Chair Bartels: Disregard.

Chairman Gavaris: All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

131: Establishing Capital Project 624, SUNY Ulster children center renovations. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Fabiano. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? Opposed? So carried.

133: Authorizing the execution of a lease agreement with Ulster UCEDA for space at Enterprise West. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Bartels. Discussion? Legislator, Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, that this is what I'm meant my question sorry, I was distracted.

Deputy Executive Rider: So, we relocated some of the warehouse space up on Golden Hill to Enterprise West. And they are doing a lease back for \$1, and we'll cover half of the utilities in the space that we use. We plan on this being a short-term location for some of the DPW equipment and we're looking for a longer-term relocation that doesn't involve Enterprise West. So we hope to not be here anymore than six months.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

137: Setting a Public Hearing for when the sale and or transfer of three easements for county-owned properties. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Chair Bartels. Discussion? Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Can, can someone just walk me through this for a minute, this I recall this back in '18 and it got contentious and then it stopped being contentious and then it went away, so now it's back. So can someone just give me the, the short story.

Deputy Executive Rider: So happy to do that. Dennis was here, but unfortunately, it went long and he had to be down in New Paltz. So we're required to have a Public Hearing. This is for three easements to allow for affordable housing to be built down at the kind of down by Point of Praise Church. There was

a lawsuit with the company at one point and they, we needed to have some kind of property interest over part of their property. They wanted to like tie this into that which we weren't willing to do. That's now been taken care of. And so now we're willing to bring this forward. This also allows I think that there's the Best Western has asked for this, I think to prevent access through their property.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Can I just ask a follow on, Chair Gavaris.

Chairman Gavaris: Yup, go ahead.

Legislative Chair Bartels: So again, for clarity, for clarity sake, so we'd be surpassing the property in order to allow for the easements but would we maintain ownership of the property? Or are we transferring the property to

Deputy Executive Rider: We're just do, we're transferring it as an easement. We're, we're, this is, we're, this is over the rail corridor.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Right and we're, we're holding

Deputy Executive Rider: So we're keeping the property

Legislative Chair Bartels: Okay,

Deputy Executive Rider: Yes.

Legislative Chair Bartels: That's all, just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Deputy Executive Rider: Legislator Greene has her hand up.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Chair Gavaris, you have Legislator Greene's hand up.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, I don't see her on the screen. So, Legislator Greene.

Legislator Greene: Thank you. Um, I just want to check and I came in late and just heard the tail end of it, but I do recall wetlands and that that was one of the reasons not to develop the senior housing there. And am I correct that it was an issue?

Deputy Executive Rider: There, they are building it not, I don't believe there's, it's in a, in the 100-year floodplain, which was a concern. But I, I believe that's kind of in the jurisdiction of the Kingston Planning Department on moving that forward. This just allows for that. Legislator Cahill may have different information.

Legislator Cahill: Yeah, so in our last committee meeting, it was brought forward that the City of Kingston had declared a negative declaration on a SEQR review of that property, which was what was holding us up from going on forward with the easement. Once the City of Kingston gave him the green light, we gave them the green light as well through our committee.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Fabiano.

Legislator Fabiano: Yes, Brian, maybe you can refresh my memory. Isn't this something we tried to do, when you were a Legislator back in, in your other term?

Legislator Cahill: I don't, I don't remember that far back.

Chairman Gavaris: Just, just refresh my memory. Where exactly is this piece of property.

Legislator Cahill: So it's actually back then it was behind the Holiday Inn, but now it's behind the Best Western. And it's a property they'll enter through Hurley Avenue cut through it behind, and they needed a right of way over our railroad tracks to build the place. That's really what it boils down to. And they were really, there was, I don't know if it was that far back. I don't think it was. I think this is more like [inaudible]

Legislator Fabiano: Yeah, okay, I'm thinking, I'm thinking of something else that ran along the thruway. I remember Legislator Loughran at the time, had a big issue with it, they were going to put senior housing there and between the floodplains and really nothing happening there for seniors. I just want to make sure that's not the same piece of property.

Legislator Cahill: No, this is different.

Legislator Fabiano: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Bartels.

Legislator Greene: Yeah, that but if I may, Deputy Rider cited Pointe of Praise, which is at a different location. And that's where I remember the wetland issue. So are we talking about behind Best Western? Or are we talking about Pointe of Praise?

Deputy Executive Rider: I believe it's all the same property.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, I was just gonna say it is the same project that Dean is referencing, it's all the same thing. Because I remember the long discussions with Legislator Loughran.

Legislator Fabiano: All right, I'm gonna, yup.

Deputy Executive Rider: Pointe of Priase Church is 243 Hurley Ave.

Legislator Fabiano: Thank you Trace.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. Legislator Uchitelle then Erner.

Legislator Uchitelle: Thank you Chair Gavaris. So this is a, I've, I've been in contact with one of the neighboring businesses this easement is a, is a big sticking point between the neighbors. And that's what's before us tonight is the easement. There's going to be like, it's not the project, and all of the, the scope of the project is not intended for us to have an additional environmental review or, or planning review. This is really about the easement here and I while I totally recognize that there, there is, that is a unique plot of land that's right next to the Thruway and I walked it just a few months ago, when the neighboring property, the Best Western reached out to me. It's, it's there's a there's a graded road, what appears to be, used to be a road that heads out south from the rail corridor that leads to Hurley Avenue, and that's where they want to access the parcel that's on the north side of the easement. So everything to do with our easement, in my opinion, and looking at it, I think and, and physically, like walking the entire corridor just a couple of months ago, I think is, is perfectly reasonable. They're going to have to meet everything that they need to meet with the City of Kingston. And, and that's not you know, that's not the question that's before us tonight. But this easement is, in my view, totally doable. And would resolve a major, major sticking point for a very important, I don't wanna say important because it's not, there's not, not less important businesses, but a, a real keystone hotel in my district. The Best Western that really needs this issue resolved because this without us granting the easement it puts them in a very, it puts the property owner without an easement in a very antagonistic position with the Best Western that then has to access their property through the Best Western property. And we can resolve that this month and that's my hope. This is in my district, and it's my hope that we'll resolve this easement for them.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Erner.

Legislator Erner: Thank you. Can we just clarify that the Best Western is on one side of the thruway, Pointe of Praise is on the other side of the thruway, where exactly is the property in the easement gonna be?

Legislator Uchitelle: It's, they're both going to be on the East side of the thruway. Yeah.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other, Fabiano.

Legislator Fabiano: Yes, I'm, I'm gonna have to be in a no on this because now that's coming back to me. This project wasn't a good idea, years back. And I don't feel it's a good idea today, especially for the people who are going to end up living in these facilities. So I will, I will be a no.

Chairman Gavaris: Discussion?

Legislator Uchitelle: Can I just say one more thing?

Chairman Gavaris: Sure, go ahead.

Legislator Uchitelle: It's, it's been clear from the last time the legislature decided not to approve the easement that not approving the easement is not going to kill the project. The project is the, the owners of the property, like fully intend to proceed, and will and, and are going to exhaust every opportunity to create an easement. So if we if we don't do it, they're going to keep

Legislator Fabiano: That's fine but I don't, that's totally fine, but I don't have to support it.

Legislator Uchitelle: No, I understand that. I just wanted to be clear that that's no,t I think we're on the same page, Legislator Fabiano.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, I mean, I think that, as Deputy Executive Rider said, last time, there were also these complicated mitigating circumstances that had to do with legal action. And it even it even came to threats on the legislative floor. I mean, it was a singular kind of experience in my legislative term, and maybe Legislator Fabiano is remembering some of that as well. That said, you know, I'm comfortable moving forward to a public hearing. I mean, this is where we're going to air out any of the concerns that might come forward. So, you know, I'm comfortable moving forward to a public hearing today. And then if there's more information that I need to get, I'll endeavor to do so between now and next month when I'm assuming we'd have to actually move on it.

Chairman Gavaris: If nothing else, then all those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

Legislator Fabiano: I'm opposed.

Chairman Gavaris: Fabiano opposed, okay. Thank you.

138: Authorizing the Chair of the Legislature to into an intermunicipal agreement with various municipalities for Summer Youth Program. Can everyone, just make sure you're mute, somebody is not on mute. Nope. Am I the only one hearing this noise right now?

Legislative Chair Bartels: No, I think we have

Legislator Fabiano: I hear it.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay.

Comptroller Gallagher: I would suggest you're being zoom bombed, perhaps.

Legislative Chair Bartels: I was just going to say we have a zoom bomber.

Deputy Executive Rider: I would, right

Chairman Gavaris: All right, well that's the first one I've had.

All right, I thought there was someone raising their hand for a motion. Sorry, I didn't see it. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Chair Bartels. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

140: Amending the 22, 2022 Ulster County Budget to accept allocation of Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Treatment Act money. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Legislator Cahill.

Legislator Fabiano: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: Discussion? All those in, Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Oh, no, no, that's okay. Go ahead.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried. Let's see.

141: Amending the 2022 Ulster County Budget, Department of Social Services. Can I have a motion? Walter. Second? Second?

Legislative Chair Bartels: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Second, Chair Bartels. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

142: Approving the execution of a contract for 705,188 for Family of Woodstock. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Chair Bartels. Discussion? Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah. Can I just for, for clarification purposes, this resolution, I realize it's a revenue, um, in the detail, it speaks about 12,736 going to Family of Woodstock, for the cost of placing families in motels after hours, and then 692,452 going to Catholic Charities to operate the warming center. Is this in addition to what we're ready contracting with Catholic Charities for the warming center for or is this replacing the funding source through this revenue?

Deputy Executive Contreras.

Deputy Executive Contreras: Yes, hi, um, no, this is for the Code Blue plan. So this is our reimbursement to the county for the funds that we paid Family of Woodstock and Catholic Charities, for the warming center and for hotels and motels after hours.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Okay, so it's a, it's a reimbursement to the county, it's not going again to the to because it speaks to the contract with those, with those two organizations, but that's just in, in a narrative to define the money's already spent. Thank you.

Deputy Executive Contreras: Yes. Correct.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, actually, to clarify, it's both. It, it reimburses money we've already spent but it also goes through 2022 to pay for pay for it, the services going forward. So it's both.

Chairman Gavaris: All those in favor? Opposed? Fabiano, you're opposed or you're in favor, I'm sorry.

Legislator Fabiano: I'm in favor.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. Thank you. All right, no opposed.

143: Authorizing the Interim Commissioner of the Ulster County Department of Health enter into an intermunicipal agreement with New York State Office of Mental Health. Can I have a motion?
Legislator Walter. Second, Bartels. Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

144: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for \$185,000 with the Hudson Valley National Center for Veteran Integration. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Cahill. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? so carried?

145: Amending the 2020 budget, heard an echo again,

145: Amending the 2022 Ulster County Budget to reflect additional funding from New York State Department of Health for Epidemiology and Laboratory. Motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Second?

Legislator Fabiano: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: Second. Fabiano. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried. Thank you.

146: Approving the execution of a contract for 105,000 for Family Home Health Care, Inc. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Cahill. Discussion. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

148: Authorizing the Chair of the Legislature to enter the necessary agreements with the New Paltz Rural Cemetery for the purpose of providing a veteran cemetery. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Cahill. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

149: Approving the execution of contract amendment for \$8,640 with Touch Legal, Inc. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Bartels, discussion? All those in favor? Opposed?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

149, yup 149, execution of a contract, nope, all right.

150: Approving the execution contract amendment for 97,246.60 for New York State Technology Enterprise. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Second? Cahill. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

151: Amending the 2022 Ulster County budget to accept allocation from New York State Office of Prevention of Domestic Violence, as amended. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Bartels. Discussion? Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I mean, you said as amended so just calling people's attention that the state doubled the amount they are giving us so it's, it's twice as much but the amendment is in the resolution.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried. Thank you.

152: Amending the 2022 budget to create two full-time Assistant Public Defender positions. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Cahill. Discussion? Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

153: Authorizing the Chair of the Legislature to enter into an agreement with New State Office Of Indigent Services. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Second? Legislator, Chair Bartels. Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

155: Approving the execution of a contract for 252,477.12 for West Publishing Corporation. Can I have a motion? Walter. Second, Chair Bartels. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

156: Approving the execution of a contract for 917,568 for Atlantic Tomorrow's Office. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Legislator Fabiano. Discussion? All those in favor? Chair Bartels. Any discussion Chair Bartels or are you

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, yeah, no, sorry. I was just getting to my, you know, again, I'm not gonna belabor the point because I, you know, I feel like we talked about this a bunch, but it just is always so and just may be something that I'll never get over. But it's so shocking to me, close to a million dollars in, in copier leases, which is really what we're talking about here. Right? I mean, you know, we've had the same, I've had the same conversation for as long as I've been here and the numbers just get bigger and bigger. So maybe I'll just until my last day here, just raise it. I just, I don't know, maybe there's no other way this is the way we feel is the you know, the best most financially sound way to move forward and Legislator Gavaris, I know, you've raised the, the same issue as it related to radios and other rentals. I just sometimes think it's the path of least resistance. And it's just it's a, it's a lot of money. So I'm going to support it. I don't, I don't have an alternative proposal to bring to the table at the time. But at this moment, but I just, I don't know, I feel like it bears, you know, making us all take a moment to realize we're spending a million dollars on renting copiers.

Chairman Gavaris: Deputy Executive Rider, then Legislator Cahill then Fabiano.

Deputy Executive Rider: Yeah, I'll just quickly say that it's a five-year contract that comes with basically everything, all services, if they need to be fixed, which they do often need to be fixed. We used to do this in a much more kind of ad hoc way. We had several leases, with several different companies. And it, it was not efficient or effective. When I was Purchasing Director, we did this transition, we transition to National at the time. And now with an RFP, we selected Atlantic, as you know, they were more competitive, and they are actually cheaper than our current provider, so.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Cahill.

Legislator Cahill: Thank you. I'm gonna bring some of my private sector experience here with me. One of the things that we did at IBM that really cut down on people using copiers and printers overall, is that we had to use our badge and departments were charged back for everything that they printed, unless it

was absolutely necessary. So like, the legal department wasn't required to do it. But like, where I worked, if I was just printing an email or printing, you know, a document, you know, we would have a bill, we would get a bill back to our department for the amount of paper that we were using and the printer itself, right. And that really the you know, the manager would come to a meeting, say, hey, this is how much you're spending on that printer and copier every year. So that may be something that we should consider, you know, because I honestly believe that we probably print 80% more than we have to, the way, the way electronic things go today. As far as spreadsheets, databases, emails, text messages, whatever they are, you don't have to print them anymore. So I would suspect that, you know, if we put a much greater effort on reducing the amount of stuff that we actually produce, we would save a lot of money down the road.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Fabiano.

Legislator Fabiano: Marc Rider answered my question.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay, thank you. And I'll just follow up on what Chair Bartels said. Yeah, this is another one I was going to speak on as well, this is just like the radio contract. You know, at some point, we should be evaluating whether or not it makes sense for us to buy equipment and hire a person to be the repair person. I mean, it just, for this kind of money. It seems like you know, a lot of expense for, I just have a hard to believing you have that much break, breakdown of equipment. And if you do that doesn't say very much for the equipment itself. If it's breaking down that often that you need to have service done that frequently to warrant a, you know, a bill this high, but all right. Any other discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

158: Supporting New York Assembly Bill A9037 and New York State Senate Bill S8165. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Second?

Legislative Chair Bartels: I'll second for discussion.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Bartels. Discussion?

Anybody discussion? No?

Legislative Chair Bartels: Well,

Chairman Gavaris: Go ahead Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: The sponsors here, maybe we can afford a moment for the sponsor to speak to it.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah, if you'd like.

Legislative Chair Bartels: If he's willing.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Erner.

Legislator Erner: Sure. Yeah, this, this is asking the state to do another round of what they did last year. They allocated \$2.1 billion last year. And we, in our county, a lot of workers had applied for it and got it. And it was really life changing for them. We heard from many of them at an event I attended toward the end of January in my district. And we also heard from many workers who were denied at the time because the funds ran out. So this is a call to re up that it's already supported by the Senator and Assembly member representing my district and much of the county, Hinchey and Cahill. And so that's what we're just asking for the state to do. And I'm happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Gavaris: Discussion? All right. All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

So forthcoming resolutions, Resolution 14, the termination of the lease agreement for the Board of Elections. Any update on if that's coming up, there's talk about May, if I'm not mistaken, for the Board of Elections.

Deputy Executive Rider: The last update that we had, it will be and I think after working with the Commissioners, at the BOE and making the move, where it works for them and not in the middle of an election cycle. July 1st is going to be the, the lease start date at the Daily Freeman building. So if not, this month it's probably next month, may be time to move this resolution forward, actually. I would ask that you delay it one more month, but then we should, we should look at putting it forward next month.

Chairman Gavaris: All right and also Resolution 96 is going to be forthcoming as well.

New business, the CMA agreement, we had two one-year extensions that we could approve. I don't know if we want to do that tonight, or if you want to do it next week, or have discussion. I guess if there's, does anybody wants to make a motion to approve it then, Chair Bartels, you want to make that motion. Yeah, you're on mute, Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thanks, Legislator Maloney's, I mean, I, I don't want to make that motion right now. I'd rather

Chairman Gavaris: Okay.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. Legislator Maloney, go ahead.

Legislator Maloney: I just wanted to, before you go, after this is done, I just wanted to circle back around for a quick discussion on 96.

Chairman Gavaris: All right well lets, all right, well let's finish this up, all right if there's no, if there's no appetite to do this then, we'll hold off on that for now.

Comptroller Gallagher.

Comptroller Gallagher: Hi. Thanks. I'll be really brief. I know it's been a long night, and there are other meetings happening tonight. I just wanted you guys to know we're in the middle of our, our sort of annual risk assessment process. My office is still struggling with ARPA accounting. I've said this at the ARPA meeting. But I want you to know what I can see is lagging by nine weeks in the system. So I can't see anything that's post 12/31, in terms of ARPA expenditures, and I'm hoping to be working with the administration on that. I've made several requests in that regard. And then I wanted to just mention to you guys that sales tax so far, we received two payments in February for January, we're up 25% overall. That differs a little bit from the memo that you have from the Commissioner of Finance because I'm including yesterday's payment. And then I wanted to circle back to Occupancy Tax, since that has been a big conversation. To say that, you know, we have collected 3.2 million in Occupancy Tax for last year. That is an 89% increase over the prior year, obviously because of the pandemic in part, but probably also because the voluntary collection agreement. So 3.2, 2, 3.2 million, look back to 2019 we collected 2.03 million, so you have \$1,200,000 more than our best year ever. And I just want to say one other thing, which is that other counties are sharing how much they collected through their voluntary collection agreements. Um, we are not able to share the way that the Commissioner of Finance and our County Attorney interpret the law but I will tell you that there is no other county that is coming to where we are and they most of them have higher occupancy taxes. Thanks.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you, Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: I'll give an update. This is about the ARPA Water, Sewer Infrastructure. I guess we'll be, well, I hope we have time in caucus tonight to talk about it. And I'll be coming to the Republican caucus in a couple of days to talk about it. But it's been brought back down, I guess the executive has had a lot of contact with some supervisors and town board members from around the county who are really hoping that we take some funds. I've been talking to Chris Kelly at length, and we have some interesting ideas for even the application process to maybe improve knowledge of the county as far as water infrastructure around the county, since it is a job the municipalities, I do think the county when it can, should, should do what they can to make sure the towns, which many times lag behind the times to kind of be a part of the conversation. And maybe this could, could be part of that as well. And Chris Kelly, gave me some, some insight that I had never thought about that that could actually be part of this as well. So I'll be talking to everybody in caucus and seeing where everyone's at. I know a lot of the towns are, are very interested. And from what I'm being told from Chris, the executive is on board. They're around 3 million right now. And they think the towns that are going to be coming and that I've reached out and, and what they've tentatively reached out about, but 3 to 5 million will probably be what we need to put in there to make sure all the towns that are interested are going to get what they need. But there is going to be you know, they're going to have to provide a little bit where it's not just going to be a handout, they're going to have to have a project that has not started yet. That will only happen with regards to sewer and water infrastructure. So if anyone has any questions or wants to reach out, I've talked to Herb, I've talked to a couple of people. And I, I think it's something that would be a positive part of the portfolio that we put forth with regards to how we spend the ARPA funds.

Chairman Gavaris: Deputy Executive Kelly.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Legislator Maloney. I do want to reiterate that we've supported a water and sewer municipal program, since we received the funds. It's one of the four main called for uses of ARPA funds. It's something that in every conversation I think I've had with any municipal leader that they're not typically asking for very large sums of money. Usually it's gap, its, they've got a capital stack where they're accessing funds from either EFC they have a grant there, they're going to bond out for a portion of the project of using their own ARPA funds. And this, the assistance that I think that this program could potentially provide is some of that gap funding that would make these projects come to fruition. So we certainly look forward to continuing that conversation. I know that if you all reach out to your supervisors, I'm sure that they'll be talking about this as well. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Fabiano.

Legislator Fabiano: Yes, I just want to echo Legislator Maloney's comments, I myself had been in touch with my town board, the executives office, Mr. Kelly here, and I think you're going to find out that these towns for extensions of water and sewers aren't going to really be asking for much because they have other sources to help them move their projects forward. And I just want to remind everybody how important water and sewer is to local communities for growth in public health, environment, all those areas, so we should do our best to accommodate these towns that are looking for some of this funding, and then to put them on, to put them on good footing.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Alright, anything else? All right. Before I ask for a motion to adjourn, just reminder next meetings at 5:00 and it's in person. So be prepared. Hopefully it'll be good to see everybody again in person. If nothing else can I get a motion to adjourn?

Legislator Fabiano: I move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Fabiano. Second Cahill. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? All right. Thank you, everyone. Good night.

Legislator Fabiano: Good night.