

**Ways &
Means Committee
Regular Meeting Minutes**

DATE & TIME: May 18, 2021 – 5:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by dialing 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID 930 2109 0582
PRESIDING OFFICER: John Gavaris, Chairman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Natalie Kelder, Amber Feaster, and Jay Mahler
PRESENT: Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr., Lynn Archer, Tracey
Bartels, Heidi Haynes, Mary Beth Maio, John Parete, and
Eve Walter (arrived at 5:28 PM); and Legislative Chairman
David B. Donaldson
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Brian Cahill, and Jonathan Heppner; Legislative
Counsel Chris Ragucci; Legislative Counsel Victor Cueva;
Minority Counsel Nicholas Pascale; Deputy County
Executives Marc Rider, and John Milgrim; Commissioner
of Finance Burt Gulnick; Comptroller March Gallagher;
Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco

- **Chairman Gavaris called the meeting to order at 5:02 PM**
-

Motion No. 1: To approve Resolution No. 207 – Authorizing The Replacement Of The Fire Alarm System And Heating And Cooling Controls At The Ulster County Law Enforcement Center, In And For The County Of Ulster, New York, At A Maximum Estimated Cost Of \$600,000.00, And Authorizing The Issuance Of \$600,000.00 Bonds Of Said County To Pay The Cost Thereof

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the issuance of \$600,000.00 Bonds for the establishment of Capital Project No. 592 for the replacement of the fire alarm system and heating and cooling controls at the Ulster County Law Enforcement Center.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Archer

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, Maio, and Parete;
and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 8
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 2: To approve Resolution No. 211 – Authorizing The Purchase Of County Fleet Vehicles, For The County Of Ulster, New York, At A Maximum Estimated Cost Of \$1,217,000.00, And Authorizing The Issuance Of \$1,217,000.00 Bonds Of Said County To Pay The Cost Thereof

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the issuance of \$1,217,000.00 Bonds for the establishment of Capital Project No. 569 for the acquisitions to the County Vehicle Fleet necessary for the replacement of existing vehicles because of extensive rust and corrosion.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, Maio, and Parete; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 8

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 3: To block Resolutions No. 213, 217, 219, 224, 226, and 228

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Maio

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, Maio, and Parete; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 8

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 4: To approve the following Resolutions:

Resolution No. 213 – Authorizing The Issuance Of An Additional \$2,757,911.00 Bonds Of The County Of Ulster, New York, To Pay Part Of The Cost Of The Rehabilitation Of The Shawangunk Kill Bridge, In And For Said County

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the issuance of \$2,757,911.00 Bonds for amendments to Capital Project No. 539 for the construction and construction inspection phases of the Project, for a total project cost of \$3,352,910.94.

Resolution No. 217 – Authorizing The Issuance Of An Additional \$14,500.00 Bonds Of The County Of Ulster, New York, To Pay Part Of The Cost Of The Preliminary Planning And Design Costs For Improvements At The Ulster County Fairgrounds, In And For Said County

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the issuance of \$14,500.00 Bonds for amendments to Capital Project No. 550 to increase the funding available for design services for development of a disinfection system for the Fairgrounds’ sand filter waste water discharge as required by New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, making the total project cost \$132,900.00.

Resolution No. 224 – Authorizing The County-Wide Replacement And Upgrade Of Technology, In And For The County Of Ulster, New York, At A Maximum Estimated Cost Of \$785,668.00, And Authorizing The Issuance Of \$785,668.00 Bonds Of Said County To Pay The Cost Thereof

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the issuance of \$785,668.00 Bonds for the establishment of Capital Project No. 587 for “Technology Upgrade” to replace and upgrade the County’s network infrastructure with network equipment that is up-to-date in terms of functionality and manufacturer support.

Resolution No. 226 – Authorizing The Replacement And Upgrade Of Technology At The Sheriff’s Office, In And For The County Of Ulster, New York, At A Maximum Estimated Cost Of \$185,056.00, And Authorizing The Issuance Of \$185,056.00 Bonds Of Said County To Pay The Cost Thereof

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the issuance of \$185,056.00 Bonds for the establishment of Capital Project No. 558 to replace personal computers.

Resolution No. 228 – Authorizing The Issuance Of An Additional \$501,623.00 Bonds Of The County Of Ulster, New York, To Pay Part Of The Cost Of The County’s Share Of The Cost Of The Purchase And Installation Of Electric Bus Charging Equipment, In And For Said County

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the issuance of \$501,623 Bonds for amendments to Capital Project 568, Electric Bus Charging Infrastructure Project to adjust the layout and include considerations for future transit fleet electrification.

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Maio

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, Maio, and Parete; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 8
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 5: To discuss Resolution No. 238 – Adopting Revised Ulster County Fund Balance Policy

Resolution Summary: This Resolution adopts the County of Ulster Fund Balance Policy as amended and attached.

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Archer

Discussion: Legislator Ronk stated he is not opposed to increasing the ceiling but that he has concerns with shortening the range of acceptable unrestricted fund balance, providing reasons for his position. Legislator Archer noted that the amendment proposed is consistent with GFOA's best practices, that the last change to the Fund Balance Policy took place in 2013, and that she is open to discussion on the target range. Further discussion pursued on the history of the County's unrestricted fund balance, effects of increasing the fund balance to the levels proposed, and what level may be considered over-taxing. Comptroller March Gallagher requested further consideration and specification on surplus funds.

Motion No. 6: To postpone Resolution No. 238 – Adopting Revised Ulster County Fund Balance Policy

Resolution Summary: This Resolution adopts the County of Ulster Fund Balance Policy as amended and attached.

Motion Made By: Legislator Archer
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, Maio, and Parete; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 8
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Postponed

Motion No. 7: To discuss Resolution No. 239 – Replenishing The Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund Of The County Of Ulster

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes and directs the Commissioner of Finance to make a transfer totaling \$1,450,562.72 from unassigned fund balance to the Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund.

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Haynes

Discussion: Legislative Chairman Donaldson confirmed this Resolution is restricting unrestricted fund balance, asking if it's possible to utilize a portion of the American Rescue Recovery Funding instead. Legislator Ronk expressed concern with the heavy restrictions of the Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund. Legislator Archer stated she approves postponing the Resolution for further clarification of other funding sources.

Motion No. 8: To postpone Resolution No. 239 – Replenishing The Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund Of The County Of Ulster

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes and directs the Commissioner of Finance to make a transfer totaling \$1,450,562.72 from unassigned fund balance to the Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund.

Motion Made By: Legislator Archer
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, Maio, and Parete; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 8

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 9: To approve Resolution No. 240 – Setting A Public Hearing On Proposed Local Law No. 2 Of 2021, A Local Law Requiring The Payment Of A Living Wage To Employees Of Contractors And Subcontractors That Provide Services To Ulster County, To Be Held On Tuesday, June 15, 2021 At 7:05 PM

Resolution Summary: This Resolution sets a public hearing for Tuesday, June 15, 2021 at 7:05 PM in the Legislative Chambers, Ulster County Office Building, 6th Floor, 244 Fair Street,

Kingston, NY, and/or via videoconference to the extent allowable pursuant to existing New York State Legislation, on Proposed Local Law No. 2 of 2021.

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Donaldson

Discussion: Legislator Ronk informed Committee members that he will be voting no on this Resolution, stating that the desire and intent of the sponsor is good but he has concerns over the potentially negative consequences for contractors and increases to County expenses. Further discussion pursued on allowable exemptions being authorized and determined by the Director of Purchasing.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Archer, Bartels, and Parete; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

Voting Against: Legislators Ronk, Haynes, and Maio

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 3

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 10: To approve Resolution No. 243 – Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Execute A Certificate Of Need Application With Required Assurances For The American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) With The United States Department Of Treasury

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the Chair of the Legislature to execute the Certificate of Need application and execute the application, with need assurances, and any amendments thereto, to the United States Department of Treasury for The American Rescue Plan Act for funding in the amount of \$34,491,474.00.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Archer

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, Maio, and Parete; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 8

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Old Business: None

New Business:

2022 Departmental Budget Request for Non-County Contract Agency Funding

Chairman Gavaris noted this decision is required as part of the newly adopted Legislative Non-County Contract Agency policy, and that the Legislative Programs, Education, and Community Services Committee has requested funding in the amount of \$908,750, equal to the 2021 Adopted Budget value. Legislator Ronk and Legislative Chairman Donaldson expressed interest in increasing this value. Legislator Parete mentioned the possibility of moving some organizations to the County Executive branch. Discussion pursued on the historical values of contract funding, the possible issues with County Executive authority, and the history of the Family of Woodstock supervised visitation contract.

Motion No. 11: To approve a 2022 Departmental Budget Request for \$908,750.00 to be fully input into the Other Home & Community Services Department.

Motion Made By: Legislator Gavaris

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, Maio, and Parete; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 8

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Chairman Gavaris asked the members if there was any other business, and hearing none;

Adjournment

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

No. of Votes in Favor: 9

No. of Votes Against: 0

Time: 5:33 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster

Minutes Approved: June 8, 2021

**Ways &
Means Committee
Regular Meeting Transcript**

DATE & TIME: May 18, 2021 – 5:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by dialing 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID 930 2109 0582
PRESIDING OFFICER: John Gavaris, Chairman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Natalie Kelder, Amber Feaster, and Jay Mahler
PRESENT: Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr., Lynn Archer, Tracey Bartels,
Heidi Haynes, Mary Beth Maio, John Parete, and Eve Walter
(arrived at 5:28 PM); and Legislative Chairman David B. Donaldson
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Brian Cahill, and Jonathan Heppner; Legislative
Counsel Chris Ragucci; Legislative Counsel Victor Cueva;
Minority Counsel Nicholas Pascale; Deputy County Executives
Marc Rider, and John Milgrim; Commissioner of Finance Burt
Gulnick; Comptroller March Gallagher; Deputy Comptroller
Alicia DeMarco

Chairman Gavaris: Resolution 207: Authorizing the replacement of fire alarm and heating controls for the Ulster County Law Enforcement.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Second? Legislator Archer. Any discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

20-211: Authorize the purchase of county fleet vehicles. Can I have a motion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Move it.

Legislator Gavaris: Second, Ronk. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Legislator Gavaris: Opposed?

Legislator Ronk: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Gavaris: Yes.

Legislator Ronk: Do you mind if I make a motion to block down to 228? All the bonds?

Chairman Gavaris: Feel free to do so. Motion. A second for that?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll second that.

Legislator Gavaris: Legislator Maio. Any discussion? All right to block. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: On the block?

Group: Aye.

Legislator Gavaris: Legislator Archer. Any opposed?

So carried. What was that number you ended at Legislator Ronk?

Legislator Ronk: 228.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, so 238: Adopting the revised Ulster County fund balance policy. Motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Second, Legislator Archer. Discussion? Legislator Ronk.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, I have a question on that.

Legislator Ronk: Dave can go first if he wants.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, the um, where is the money for this coming from?

Legislator Archer: I'm not sure I know what your, your question is?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well, in other words, you're putting the money to revise the, oh, no, all right, revising the Ulster County fund balance. I'm sorry, I was I was

Legislator Ronk: looking at the next one

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I was looking at the next one. Yes.

Chairman Gavaris: Leader Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you. Um, I'm not in favor of this as it's written, I've got some pretty deep concerns about setting the base so high, I'm not necessarily against, you know, increasing the ceiling on what we should have in fund balance. Um, you know, I might feel differently if we went, you know, 5% to 18%, or something like that. So we wouldn't have such a, a low ceiling with the 5% to 10%. But again, it's, you know, all the language in the fund balance policy is that we will strive to have, it doesn't say that we have to have only 5% to 10% currently. I just, I feel like our auditors, if we pass a policy like this, and then don't have, you know, in, in the range that, you know, we're looking for here, then we're going to get dinged on audits and things like that, for something that is aspirational, in a way. Um, I, I really feel like having that much fund balance, I understand, you know, the the GFOA guidelines have increased, but my concern is that if we're keeping that much money in reserve, that we're over taxing the taxpayers. I, I really feel like, you know, if we keep our rainy-day fund that high, it, it A) discourages the use of it and B) when a rainy day really comes, we're going to be outside of our own policy. Um, you know, I just again, you know, having, having the low end so high I think is, is of concern to me.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: Yeah, and, and, I appreciate those comments. The intent here was to put it on the table for discussion. So I do appreciate that Legislator Ronk. Um, I think that a couple of things that I'd want to point out, it is a best practice that the GFOA is recommending, and it's two months versus what I believe in the past had been one month. And so two months is kind of right smack dab in the middle of that range, just based on this year's budget. Um, so I'm willing to, you know, kind of talk, what number, I, you said, the bottom line is the 5%. Would you be willing to have the 10%, the high end of the lower end, because we haven't changed this in a number of years. I think the last time was 2013 or 2012. Is that correct?

Legislator Ronk: My memory, you know, doesn't go back that far on, on, this, I'm not, I'm not really sure.

Legislator Archer: Yeah, I think we were looking at it back then. I, I don't know if Amber or Natalie recalls what the, the last change, was it 2012? I guess they don't.

Chairman Gavaris: Amber or Natalie?

Legislator Archer: Anyway, so we haven't changed it in a while we've been, we've been tracking or trending the past couple of years in the 8, 9, 10, 13, 8, 15. So we've been trending at the higher end, I just feel it's important. And I believe that they ran it past the auditors to just kind of double check.

Legislator Archer: Amber, you have the date?

Amber Feaster: 2013.

Legislator Archer: Okay, I knew was somewhere in there. Thank you. So I, I, I think it's important to, you know, kind of set some guidelines, and I think 5% is too low, given where we've been. And we also kind of put in there, I think something that gives them time to remedy. It's not expected all at once, you

know, to try and get it done in one year. Two years, I think, is meaningful to make adjustments accordingly. Would that be something you'd be okay with?

Chairman Gavaris: Let, let me let, let me let Chair Donaldson go first?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, I mean, I, I tend to agree with Legislator Ronk on this, and I'm concerned about the high end of this. You know, because after all you're holding on to this money and we're holding onto the taxpayers money. And to me, it's, you know, it could be a lot of money if you're on a holding on to 18. I don't we've gotten over 13 ever. Maybe, I don't know. Burt, do you know?

Legislator Archer: We were at 15 last year, or the year before that.

Commissioner Gulnick: I looked at the last 16 years. 13% was the highest over the last 16 years. And on average, it was about eight and a half.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Okay, yeah, see that's my concern is holding that much amount of money. And also, the, the problem is, when you know from bonding purposes, then, you know, the, the way, you know, for the cost of borrowing money, when they see that we're not in our, in other words, not following our own policy, if we go below it, it could affect our bonding rating. So I'm concerned with that. I mean, I could understand maybe upping it somewhat, but I think, I can go on where this one goes is, it's too high.

Chairman Gavaris: Minority Leader Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. You know, I, I don't know if I'd be willing to make 10 the, the low level, I'd have to think about that. Um, you know, my biggest concern, and, and again, you know, we, we, hover, we hover in the, you know, in the, in the high single digits, you know, typically on our fund balance, and I know that we've had a healthy fund balance for the last you know, many years. But I mean, that it's, it's a sign of a couple things, you know, the economic recovery following the Great Recession, um, you know, and smart financial planning. You know, and, and being, you know, fiscally responsible as a body, you know. I've, I've always, you know, said that we're, you know, you know, one or two terms in the legislature away from financial ruin, again. You know, if, if you get a group of people who's not making the right decisions, um, you know. I, I would say that, you know, I understand that the laudable goal of the, of the two months of operating expenses. Um, you know, that having been said, we just went through, you know, a global pandemic, that we were expecting to cripple the, the government, and we came out the other side, you know, fiscally stable. And I don't know that we can. I'm not gonna say that nevermind, you know, let's just say we've been through a really rough time, and we came out the other side fiscally stable, and I think it's because of the proper planning that we have here, in the county. I just don't, I, I don't agree with putting that much money aside in, in the, you know, you know, the taxpayers money sort of just in the bank on the in, on the 'in case things go bad'. You know, because if we, a lot of times don't use fund balance, during the budget time, as we're planning for our next year, we would have to raise taxes. And then on the other end of that, if we come out in a, in a better spot, you know, then, you know, we have overtaxed the taxpayers. That's my, my biggest concern here is, you know, taxing the taxpayers for more than we need to operate the county government. I think that that's a bad practice.

Legislator Archer: Well, I can

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: Yeah, I concur, I'm not looking to do that. I'm looking to also ensure, we've been drawing down fund balance, I want to just make sure that at the end of the day, you know, we were we were going to be in a hole this year, and we ended up with almost, what \$11, \$12 million surplus. So I, I, it's just a matter of I the 5% to, to 8% is, is not enough, maybe there's a happy medium in, in the way in which we would look at it, but I do think it needs some change. And I would like to see us getting closer and again, not at the expense of the taxpayers, but ensuring that we have sufficient funds to protect us should something occur so that we're not looking at having to tax taxpayers and we're not looking having cut services, because we don't have sufficient funds.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion?

Legislator Ronk: Burt had his hand up, John.

Chairman Gavaris: Burt, go ahead.

Commissioner Gulnick: Yeah, I just wanted to add, I did look at the, the 16 years, only three of them were above 10%, just as, as reference.

Legislator Archer: Great, right. Yeah. That's what I had.

Chairman Gavaris: March.

Comptroller Gallagher: Thank you. I just wanted to note that over the last five years, the Comptroller's office has spoken about fund balance in our quarterly report several times. And it might be a good idea, while you're looking at this to also look at specifying that you're speaking just to general fund, as well as maybe looking at adding suggestions about what should happen if there's an overage, so I just wanted to mention those two things. Thanks.

Chairman Gavaris: Anybody else? All right. I'll, Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Legislator Archer, are you willing to postpone this for a month and, and have discussions on you know, if we want to make a change where the right numbers are? And, you know, going back to what March just said about what to do when they're overages? And are we only talking about the unrestricted fund balance? Or?

Legislator Archer: Absolutely, I mean, the whole intent was to put it on the table for discussion. So I don't think we have it perfect. But you know, let's, let's have more dialogue around it and see what, what best suits where we're at today.

Legislator Ronk: Okay.

Chairman Gavaris: So Legislator Archer

Legislator Archer: I'm willing to, I make a motion to postpone.

Chairman Gavaris: Second?

Legislator Ronk: I'll second that motion.

Chairman Gavaris: Second, all those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? Thank you.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you Legislator Archer. I look forward to the discussion.

Legislator Archer: Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, now Chair Donaldson. Resolution 239: Replenishing of the tax stabilization fund.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, I was

Chairman Gavaris: Move? Can I have a motion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Where is this, yeah where is this actually coming from?

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson? Chair Donaldson?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Move it. Second? Legislator Haynes. Now go ahead Chair Donaldson, sorry.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, is this actually coming out of the fund balance, or is it going to be? Or is it meant to come out in the American rescue money?

Chairman Gavaris: Leader Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. The, the resolution states that it should be transferred from the unrestricted fund balance. Now I, I did have a concern when I read the resolution, because the bottom of the resolution says there's no financial impact. I, I guess, I, I guess it's it's budget neutral, because it's just transferring from one fund to another, but I still think there's a financial impact there. But um, yeah, but yes, it Legislator, Chairman Donaldson, it would be coming from the unrestricted fund balance.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well, wouldn't it make more sense to wait until we get the American rescue money and then therefore, take it out of that, because instead of taken out of our existing fund balance because that's what that money is meant for. Is one of the things that that money is

meant for if you just take it out in the fund balance. Um, it's basically and, you know, cutting into our fund balance when we don't need to.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Archer first then Ronk.

Legislator Archer: Yeah, I, I, I'm not sure that, that would meet the criteria. But we also had a surplus.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Because.

Legislator Archer: So it, I think we're, I, yeah, I'm, I'm, I don't believe that the I we could use, and maybe I know, we're still all just digesting the frequently asked questions that we received on this. So it's not clear to me. I don't know.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well, we took the money out because of the you know, because of Covid expenses.

Legislator Archer: Covid, exactly.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: So, therefore, we can replenish it because of the COVID expenses. And so I believe, if, if the resolution reads that from the rescue money then I'm in full support of it. But if I just taken it out of the fund balance, I would I think I'd rather see it just coming out of the American rescue money.

Chairman Gavaris: Minority Leader Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. Yeah, I, as it's written, I, I can't support this resolution. I just, I don't see, I don't see the utility in taking money out of an unrestricted fund balance that this Legislature would have to act to, to, you know, appropriate and put it into a heavily restricted fund balance that the Legislature would have to act to appropriate from. I, I understand the, the point of view of the sponsor. And, you know, I, you know, when we were spending the tax stabilization fund in the first place, it was important to me that any reimbursements that we got from FEMA were put back into tax stabilization. Um, I, I just don't, I don't see the utility in doing this at this time. I, I tend to agree here with Chairman Donaldson that if we're able to use the American Recovery funds to replenish the Tax Stabilization Fund, then I could be in favor of that. But I don't support taking it out of the unrestricted fund balance. To me, it's just taking money that that the Legislature could appropriate for any reason that comes along, and then heavily restricting it.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: I'm, I'm okay if we want to postpone it till we get more clarification on what's the most more appropriate fund, or way in which to put the money back in. But we took it out, and I think we should replenish it. And while I know it's restrictive, it was there for a good cause. And I think it's important for Ulster County taxpayers that we replenish it. So I'm willing to go ahead and postpone it till we get better clarification as to what is the best source of funding for this.

Chairman Gavaris: Is that a motion to postpone it?

Legislator Archer: Yeah.

Legislator Ronk: I'll second that.

Chairman Gavaris: Second.

Legislator Archer: Thank you.

Legislator Gavaris: All those in favor.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? Thank you.

240: Setting a Public Hearing on Proposed Local Law No 2 of 2021, payment of living wage. Motion?
Legislator Ronk.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Chairman, Chair Donaldson, second. Discussion? Leader Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: I'm gonna be a no tonight on this. You know, I, you know, I understand. Again, this is one of those that I under I understand the, the desire the sponsor, and the intent, I think is good. I think it has the potential to put a lot of our contractors especially our not for profits in a, in a bad spot, and or cost the county taxpayers a significant amount of additional dollars. So, um, you know, without, without specific criterion for exemptions, I mean, you know, this allows the purchasing director to promulgate regulations that would, you know, allow for exemptions, I just, I can't see A) putting that, you know, kind of authority on it, you know, to make policy, you know, like that to to appointee of the Executive's office. But in addition to that, I just think that, you know, the, the goal is laudable, I just don't know if the execution is there. And I've always felt that way about this ever since Legislator Parete started bringing it up, I think back in 2015.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Parete.

Legislator Parete: I just might add that any exceptions and as exceptions to everything in life, exceptions that we can't even think of, at this point, or maybe for years, but any exceptions that may be carved out and suggested have to be brought back to the Legislature. So I don't think there's any hazards in, in the Purchasing Director carving out exceptions that would be too far out of the, the mainstream.

Legislator Gavaris: Any other discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? Ronk, Maio, Haynes. I think that's it. So motion carried.

243: Authorizing the Chair of the Legislature to execute an agreement for a Certificate of Need application. Can I have a motion? This is a late one. That was [inaudible]

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Second? Archer. Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

And new business. The, part of our new policy we have to award funding for the non-contract agencies. I mentioned at last meeting and the meeting before. The request is for the \$908,750 I believe. Which was the adopted budget amount for 2020. If, I'll look for a motion for that amount or any other amount if somebody wants to make it

Leader Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I, you know and I think that you and I spoke about this, Mr. Chairman. You know, I, I personally believe that we might want to increase this amount a little bit, I think that some of the organizations, and it was actually I thought about this after we'd spoken, you know, some of the organizations were given a lower amount in our adopted budget, because things weren't open for the full year, and then we were also, you know, assuming that things were not going to be fully open, um, you know, again, you know, in 2021. I, I, I just, I feel like, you know, we're gonna see, you know, organizations like UPAC fully opening, the arts are going to be fully open, I just, I wonder if we shouldn't maybe think about the adopted 2019 number instead of the adopted, you know, 2021 number?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Do you know, what's the adopt in 2019 number was?

Legislator Ronk: I, I don't, offhand. I'm just going to, you know, what, you know, what we were appropriating when, when all of these organizations were fully open and operating?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Do you have that number Amber?

Amber Feaster: Just one moment, I'll pull it up.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I thought about the idea. In other words, increasing it slightly by 10%. Or just making it an even million. What do you think about that Legislator Ronk?

Legislator Ronk: I mean, I'd rather go with a number that, like, has some backing and something that we've done in the past and just saying an even million, but I'm willing to, I'm willing to roll with whatever the committee thinks.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: Amber, do we have what we spent in 2018 and 2019? You know, just to give a frame of reference for where, you know, what we have done in the past and, and while Covid had an impact, you know, we'll have a better sense of how much of an impact.

Legislator Ronk: I think that's what she's working on now Legislator Archer, is coming up with that number.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Parete, you had your hand raised?

Legislator Parete: Yeah I did. Part of the conversation we've been having concerning the reform of this, these issues was organizations like Cornell Cooperative, Family, or Gateway. They are not, and, and, and the, the expanse of their, their, their, their contributions to the community are a little bit more than your normal or your regular non-for profits. And there was conversation with some people from the Executive's office about putting Cornell, taking Cornell Cooperative right out and putting it under the Executives funded budget, and maybe Family and maybe, maybe Gateway. And, and then that way, we could be focusing whatever number the body chooses, on the non-for profits that have particular needs or particular programs. But certainly, Cornell Cooperative as an example is, is far more significant than many of them.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair, let, Amber you go first.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yup.

Amber Feaster: Um, the 2019. I'm sorry, the 2018 contracted value was \$643,450. 2019; \$672,250.

Chairman Donaldson: Where did we come up with the \$908k?

Amber Feaster: So, oh, okay. I'm sorry. Let me um, the libraries wasn't included in that. \$753,085 for 2019. So \$908,750 is the 2020 adopted budget.

Legislator Gavaris: As well as the '21, correct?

Amber Feaster: Correct.

Legislator Ronk: Right, not the, it's not the 2020 revised budget. I understand now. Thank you. I'm fine. I'm, I'm fine with that number.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well, yeah, I do I I'm

Legislator Gavaris: Chair Donaldson, let me just, let me make

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah.

Chairman Gavaris: to make this streamlined, to follow a process. I'll make a motion for \$908,750 but the money would be put into the Other Home and Community Services lines and it could be redistributed later. So I'll make that motion myself.

Legislator Ronk: I'll second that motion.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: It's good. I'm, I'm good with that. Um, you know, but, I, I agree with, with Legislator Parete's is saying and we had this discussion in the past, you know, same thing like Soil and Water or you know the Cornell Cooperative, they are almost like, quasi-governmental in a, in a way. And as a result, you know, having them in the budget that we deal with, I think it would be better served that, you know, the Executive works with the County, in other words with Cornell Cooperative comes up with the number that they're going to work. If they're not happy with that number, they can always come to us to try to get a little more, I guess. Um, but I think that would make more sense, to me. I mean, and same thing with I don't know about the Gateway one, but I, I would agree with that. And then Family of Woodstock, because they run through so many programs. They're in, you know, like, in some ways, I think, Legislative Programs has one of them, then the others, you know, we have all these other ones like Legislative Program as the non-custodial parent visitation, which are required to do in here or where we're trying to nickel and dime them, no matter in, and, and as a result, we could actually have a lawsuit on us if we do not carry out those non-custodial visitations. And if they can't do it, because of them being cut.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Any other discussion? I'll just add to that. And I think, you know, Legislator Bartels has said this many times before, there are agencies that, and I agree, that should not be under this funding, should be part of the budget itself. And I think, you know, I think for tonight, I think we have to do this, and let's get this part done. But we should maybe even have a special meeting to discuss our opinion on whether these should be and then get, you know, our auditors or other input and, and, and fix this going forward. Leader Ronk.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Right, we can have this discussion with the County Executive's team also.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, that's what I, what I was gonna say is that, you know, the only thing it would take to you know, change where these organizations end up in the budget would be the Executive's Office, you know, including, say, Cornell, Soil & Water, any of these other programs that the Chairman's been talking about into the Executive Budget, rather than into the Legislative Program side in the budget.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Sorry, I just wanted to apologize for being late. Above the zoom link, it gave 5:30 as the time and so here I am.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: You're still late.

Chairman Gavaris: Deputy Executive Rider.

Deputy Executive Rider: Yeah, so we have talked about having Cornell and Soil & Water, kind of looped in with the Department of the Environment. And we can take that back to Evelyn, have no issue with that. I think the one Family of Woodstock contract that's here, the reason it's not in the Social Services budget, in here is because there seemed to be a conflict. And there was always an issue,

because they are there, they're doing visitations that for some reason, shouldn't be overseen by DSS. So that's why it's been here. And it, it seems to make sense,

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Oh right.

Deputy Executive Rider: not here. But the other two that I spoke about are things that we should definitely, you know, Cornell, typically in a given year will present their budget to us and you, and for whatever reason, it's always just left up to the Legislature to add it in. So it would make sense that we included in the Executive Budget.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, so that, basically, I think, now that I remember what you're talking about, Marc, the non-custodial visitation. That, wasn't that done through Social Services? That's what my understanding was. Now, what you're saying it's more like a CASA situation? Where you know, like CASA works with Social Services, but they're, they have to be independent when they see a, a client because they actually they may hold Social Services accountable.

Deputy Executive Rider: Right. And so this this contract, I think, is supervision that is facilitated through a family court order, and has to do with that, which is why, for some reason, you know, our super our social services attorneys are oftentimes opposing these individuals in family court sometimes, or defending them, either one, but I think it's It was decided in the past that it made sense that it was separate from the DSS.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Alright, that makes sense.

Chairman Gavaris: Minority Leader Ronk. You're on mute

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I was just gonna say that. I, I think that it's, you know, it's good to have this discussion about individual organizations. But I think that this is more about the larger pot of money and we can, sorry. And we can have, you know, further conversations as we move towards the budget process.

Chairman Gavaris: I agree

Legislator Ronk: about individual groups.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried. Can I get a motion to adjourn?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I make a motion to adjourn.

Legislator Ronk: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: Ronk. Any discussion? All those in favor? Thank you all. We'll see you at seven.