

**Ways & Means Committee
Regular Meeting Minutes**

DATE & TIME: July 12, 2022 – 5:00 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meetings, Meeting ID: 876 4456 7496
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, Maloney, Petit, & Uchitelle, Counsel Pascale & Ragucci – UC Legislature, Deputy County Executives Contreras, Kelly & Rider, Sheriff Figueroa – UC Sheriff, Deputy Comptroller DeMarco & Samuel Sonenberg – UC Comptroller’s Office, District Attorney Clegg & Kassondra Seyfert – UC District Attorney, Director Litwin, Asst. Director Scott – UC Recovery and Resilience, Director Erichsen - UC Emergency Services, Director Doyle – UC Planning, Director Jordan – UC Purchasing, John Quigley – Town of Ulster Supervisor, Tim Rodgers – New Paltz Mayor, S. Deacon Bill Mennenga – Redeemer Lutheran Church, James Murphy – UC Residents, Mid-Hudson News

Chairman Gavaris called the meeting to order at 5:01 PM

Motion No. 1: Moved to APPROVE Minutes of the June 14th & June 21st Regular Meetings

Motion By: Legislator Fabiano
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: Minutes APPROVED

Resolutions for the July 19, 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 Bartels
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

Motion No. 3: **MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution No. 11 FOR 1 MONTH**
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 FOR 1 MONTH**

Resolution No. 168: Authorizing A One-Time Reimbursement To Ulster County 2021 Real Property Taxpayers

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes a one-time reimbursement to the Ulster County 2021 Real Property Taxpayers in a total amount of \$34,312,169.

Motion No. 4: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 168**
Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

Discussion: See attached transcript

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

Resolution No. 288: Requiring The Reporting Of Wages For Employees Of Contractors And Sub-Contractors That Provide Services To The County Of Ulster, Adopting Updated Procurement Manual Pursuant To General Municipal Law Section 104-b

Resolution Summary: This Resolution requires the reporting of wages for employees of contractors and subcontractors that provide services to the County of Ulster and adopts an updated procurement manual stating such.

Motion No. 5: **MOTION TO AMEND & APPROVE Resolution No. 288**
Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

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 ADOPTED AS AMENDED**

Resolution No. 308: Declaring Ulster County’s Intent To Act As Lead Agency Under New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) For The Purpose Of Constructing A Government Operations Center And Appurtenances To Be Located At Paradies Lane In New Paltz – Department Of Emergency Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution declares Ulster County’s intent to act as lead agency under New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) for the construction of a governmental operations center to be located at Paradies Lane in New Paltz.

Resolution No. 309: Amending Capital Project 607- Government Operations Center And Authorizing The Acquisition Of Real Property Located At Paradies Lane In The Town Of New Paltz For Purpose Of Siting A Government Operations Center And Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Execute Any And All Documents Required For Said Acquisition – Department Of Public Works (Buildings And Grounds)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends Capital Project No. 607, Government Operations Center and authorizes the acquisition of real property at Paradies Lane and authorizes the Chair of the Ulster County Legislature to execute any documents related to the acquisition.

Motion No. 6: **MOTION TO BLOCK Resolution Nos. 308 & 309**
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: Deputy Executive Rider stated..... We have wells and septic’s that will be more than benefit, more than adequate for the Government Operations Center. If it's chosen that we would turn the rest of it into housing, and we have to turn to the village then it would be on whoever would be the developer to incur those costs, it would not be on the county to incur costs of adding sewer and water. So I just want to be clear on that...

See attached transcript for additional comments and conversation

Motion No. 7: **MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution Nos. 308 & 309 FOR 1 WEEK**
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: Resolutions POSTPONED FOR 1 WEEK

Resolution No. 339: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$1,364,900.00 Entered Into By The County – Gorick Construction Co., Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with Gorick Construction Co., Inc in the amount of \$1,364,900 for demolition services at the former Ulster County Jail.

Motion No. 8: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 339
Motion By: Legislator Cahill
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Fabiano, & Ronk
Voting Against: Legislators Gavaris & Walter
Votes in Favor: 4
Votes Against: 2
Disposition: Resolution ADOPTED

Resolution No. 341: Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program -Establishing Capital Project No. 642 - ARPA Homeowner Energy Improvements And Job Training Project - Amending 2022 Capital Fund Budget - Department Of Finance, Division Of Recovery And Resilience

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 – 2027 Capital Improvement Program and establishes Capital Project No. 642 – ARPA Homeowner Energy Improvements and Job Training Project in the amount of \$90,000.

Motion No. 9: MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution No. 341 FOR 1 WEEK
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

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. 343: Setting A Public Hearing On Proposed Local Law No. 9 Of 2022, A Local Law To Provide For The Collection Of Delinquent Village Real Property Taxes, To Be Held On Tuesday, August 16, 2022 At 7:20 PM

Resolution Summary: This Resolution sets a Public Hearing on Proposed Local Law No. 9 of 2022, a local law to provide for the collection of delinquent village real property taxes.

Motion No. 10: MOTION TO DISCUSS Resolution No. 343

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: See attached transcript

Motion No. 11: MOTION TO POSTPONE Resolution No. 343 FOR 1 WEEK

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

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 FOR 1 WEEK

Resolution No. 344: Adopting Revised Ulster County Fund Balance Policy

Resolution Summary: This Resolution adopts a revised fund balance policy to direct the Commissioner of Finance to address the unassigned fund balance excess.

Motion No. 12: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 344

Motion By: Legislator Ronk

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 346: Approving The 2022-2023 Ulster County Community College Budget – SUNY Ulster

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the 2022 – 2023 Ulster County Community College Budget with a county contribution of \$6,400,863.

Motion No. 13: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 346

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 347: Amending Capital Project No. 541 SUNY Ulster – Facilities Equipment - Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Ulster County Community College

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends Capital Project No. 541 for an additional \$340,000 for SUNY Ulster Facilities Equipment.

Motion No. 14: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 347**
Motion By: Legislator Ronk
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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 349: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$63,495.00 Entered Into By The County – The Offset House, Inc. D/B/A Catamount Color – Department Of Tourism

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with Catamount Color in the amount of \$63,495 for travel guide printing and distribution.

Motion No. 15: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 349**
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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 352: Authorizing The Department Of The Environment To Submit An Application To The New York State Water Quality Improvement Project (WQIP) Grant Program For Water Quality Projects – Department Of The Environment

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the Department of the Environment to submit an application to the New York State Water Quality Improvement Project Grant Program.

Motion No. 16: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 352
Motion By: Legislator Walter
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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 353: Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Execute A Contract With The New York State Office For The Prevention Of Domestic Violence – Enough Is Enough Initiative - Department Of Probation

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the Chair of the Ulster County Legislature to execute a contract with the New York State Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence for the Enough Is Enough Initiative and receive state aid in the amount of \$170,388 through the year 2025.

Motion No. 17: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 353
Motion By: Legislator Walter
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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 354: Authorizing An Application For Comprehensive Opioid, Stimulant, And Substance Abuse Site-based Program Grant Funding — Ulster County Sheriff’s Office

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes an application for a comprehensive opioid, stimulant, and substance abuse site-based program (COSSAP) grant funding.

Motion No. 18: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 354
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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 355: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget To Approve Reclassification Of A Part Time Grant Manager To A Full Time Peer Recovery Advocate - Ulster County Sheriff's Office

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County Budget to approve reclassification of a part time grant manager to a full-time peer recovery advocate with an additional \$18,636 in appropriations that are offset by additional OD2 revenues.

Motion No. 19: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 355**
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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 356: Authorizing An Application For Funds Under The Law Enforcement National Initiative To Improve Public Safety, Enhance Agency Operations Via Training, Recruitment And Retention And Building Community Trust Grant - Ulster County Sheriff's Office

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes an application for funds under the Law Enforcement National Initiative to improve public safety, enhance agency operations via training, recruitment, and retention and building community trust grant. If awarded, the anticipated funds for 2023 are \$123,000.

Motion No. 20: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 356**
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 357: Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Enter Into A Lease Agreement With Industry Village 1151 LLC - Department Of Public Works – Buildings And Grounds

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the Chair of the Ulster County Legislature to enter into a lease agreement with Industry Village 1151 LLC for a 5 year lease with a total expense of \$259,907.28 for the Department of Public Works.

Motion No. 21: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 357

Motion By: Legislator Cahill

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 358: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$13,992.00, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00, Entered Into By The County – New York Communications Company Inc. – Ulster County Sheriff’s Office

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment in the amount of \$13,992 with New York Communications Company Inc. to extend the term of a lease agreement for radio communications equipment with associated maintenance for the Ulster Regional Gang Enforcement Narcotics Team.

Motion No. 22: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 358

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 359: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget To Realign Salaries And Create A “Deputy Chief ADA” And A “Justice Courts & Diversion Unit Chief”

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County Budget to realign salaries and create a Deputy Chief ADA and a Justice Courts & Diversion Unit Chief for an additional expense of \$2,056 for the remainder of 2022.

Motion No. 23: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 359

Motion By: Legislator Ronk

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 360: Authorizing Execution Of Inter-Municipal Agreements For Expenses Related To The Improving Criminal Justice Responses (ICJR) To Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, And Stalking Grant Program, Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget - District Attorney's Office

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the execution of an intermunicipal agreement for expenses related to the improving criminal justice responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking grant program and amends the Ulster County Budget for an additional \$117,410 in appropriations and offsetting state revenue dollars.

Motion No. 24: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 360**

Motion By: Legislator Walter

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 361: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$295,188.26, Entered Into By The County – Tyler Technologies, Inc. – Department Of Information Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment in the amount of \$295,188.26 with Tyler Technologies, Inc. to extend the term of the agreement for software maintenance and support services.

Motion No. 25: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 361**

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 362: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$50,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Tay Fishers Community Cornerstone – Youth Bureau

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract in the amount of \$50,000 with Tay Fishers Community Cornerstone for Kingston Community High School Hoop program to support positive youth development activities.

Motion No. 26: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 362
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 363: Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Execute A Grant Application With Required Assurances For The NY Connects Program With The New York State Office For The Aging – Office For The Aging

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the Chair of the Ulster County Legislature to execute a grant application for the NY Connects program with the New York State Office for the Aging in the amount of \$257,300 of state aid through March 31, 2023.

Motion No. 27: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 363
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 364: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$948,150.00, Entered Into By The County – Catholic Charities Of Orange, Sullivan & Ulster – Department Of Social Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$948,150 with Catholic Charities of Orange, Sullivan, and Ulster to extend the term of the agreement for operation of a warming center through September 30, 2023.

Motion No. 28: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 364

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 365: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$45,000.00, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00, Entered Into By The County – Abbott House – Department Of Social Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$45,000 with Abbott House to increase the not to exceed amount for foster care services.

Motion No. 29: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 365

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 366: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$250,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Abbott House – Department Of Social Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$45,000 with Abbott House to increase the not to exceed amount for foster care services.

Motion No. 30: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 366

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 367: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$22,250.04, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00, Entered Into By The County – Bonadio & Co. LLP – Department Of Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$22,250.04 with Bonadio & Co. LLP to extend the term through 12/31/2023 for corporate compliance consulting services.

Motion No. 31: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 367
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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 368: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget To Accept Increased Funding From The New York State Office Of Addiction Services And Supports For A Cost Of Living Adjustment – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County Budget to accept increased funding from the New York State Office of Addiction Service and Supports for a cost-of-living adjustment for a total of \$36,300.

Motion No. 32: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 368
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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 369: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget To Accept Increased Funding From The New York State Office Of Addiction Services And Supports For One-Time Funding To Support Electric Repairs For The Residential Services - Reintegration Program – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County Budget to accept increased funding from the New York State Office of Addiction Services and Supports for one-time funding to support electric repairs for the residential services reintegration program in the amount of \$37,750.

Motion No. 33: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 369

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 370: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget To Accept Increased Funding From The New York State Office Of Mental Health For A Cost Of Living Adjustment And An Adjustment For The NYS Legislative Add: Veteran P2P Pilot Program – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County budget to accept increased funding from the New York State Office of Mental Health for a cost-of-living adjustment and adjustment for the Veteran P2P Pilot Program in the amount of \$146,683.

Motion No. 34: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 370

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 371: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget To Accept Increased Funding From The New York State Office Of Mental Health For A Stipend Increase For Supported Housing And For Funding For The NYS Legislative Add: Veteran P2P Pilot Program

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County Budget to accept increased funding from the New York State Office of Mental Health for a stipend increase for supported housing and for the Veteran P2P Pilot Program in the amount of \$378,500.

Motion No. 35: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 371

Motion By: Legislator Walter

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 372: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget To Accept Increased Funding From The New York State Office Of Mental Health For A Cost Of Living Adjustment – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County Budget to accept increased funding from the New York State Office of Mental Health for a cost-of-living adjustment in the amount of \$94,677.

Motion No. 36: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 372**

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 373: Amending The 2022 Ulster County Budget To Accept Increased Funding From The New York State Office Of Mental Health For A Cost Of Living Adjustment – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Ulster County Budget to accept increased funding from the New York State Office of Mental for a cost-of-living adjustment in the amount of \$4,836.

Motion No. 37: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 373**

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 374: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$29,521.00, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00, Entered Into By The County – Access: Supports For Living Inc. – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment in the amount of \$29,521 with Access: Supports for Living, Inc for crisis intervention services.

Motion No. 38: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 374

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 375: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$9,067.00, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00, Entered Into By The County – Astor Services For Children & Families – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$9,067 with Astor Services for Children & Families for various Health Home Care Management programs, Support Services programs, and Crisis Intervention services.

Motion No. 39: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 375

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 376: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$180,349.00 Entered Into By The County – Gateway Community Industries, Inc. – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$180,349 with Gateway Community Industries, Inc. for Supported Housing Community Services.

Motion No. 40: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 376

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 377: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$30,766.00, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00, Entered Into By The County – PEOPLE: Projects To Empower And Organize The Psychiatrically Labeled, Inc. – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$30,766 with PEOPLE for support services and supported housing for psychiatrically labeled individuals.

Motion No. 41: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 377**

Motion By: Legislator Walter

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 378: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$93,596.00 Entered Into By The County – Rehabilitation Support Services, Inc. – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$93,596 with Rehabilitation Support Services, Inc for community residential services, supported housing community services, and non-Medicaid care coordination.

Motion No. 42: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 378**

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 379: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$72,856.00 Entered Into By The County – Family Of Woodstock Inc. – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$72,856 with Family of Woodstock for non-Medicaid care coordination, respite services, primary prevention services, advocacy/support services, and family peer support services outreach.

Motion No. 43: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 379

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 380: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$141,998.00 Entered Into By The County – Mental Health Association In Ulster County, Inc.– Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of contract amendment for \$141,998 with Mental Health Association in Ulster County advocacy/support services, non-Medicaid care coordination, family peer support services, supported housing community services, assertive community treatment program, health home non-Medicaid care management, health home care management, supported education, self help program, drop-in center and outreach.

Motion No. 44: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 380

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 381: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$14,037.00, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00, Entered Into By The County – Family Services, Inc. – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$14,037 with Family Services, Inc for primary prevention services to prevent or delay substance use and abuse in individuals, families, and communities.

Motion No. 45: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 381
Motion By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 382: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$7,105.00, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00, Entered Into By The County – HealthAlliance Hospital Mary’s Avenue Campus – Department Of Mental Health

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$7,105 with HealthAlliance Hospital Mary’s Avenue Campus for crisis intervention services, inclusive of stabilization, triage, hospital diversion and linkage to community-based services/supports.

Motion No. 46: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 382
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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 383: Establishing Capital Project No. 639 – Hall Of Records Building Roof Restoration — Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget — Department Of Public Works (Buildings & Grounds)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 639 – Hall of Records Building Roof Restoration in the amount of \$560,600.

Motion No. 47: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 383
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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 385: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$510,600.00 Entered Into By The County – Titan Roofing, Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract for \$510,600 with Titan Roofing, Inc. for repair and restoration of the roof at the Ulster County Hall of Records.

Motion No. 48: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 385**
Motion By: Legislator Walter
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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 386: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$492,196.00 Entered Into By The County – AECOM USA, Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract for \$492,196 with AECOM USA, Inc for design service for the replacement of the Turnwood Bridge.

Motion No. 49: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 386**
Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Cahill, Gavaris, & Walter
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 6
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 387: Establishing Capital Project No. 640 – DPW Large Culvert Program – Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Public Works (Highways And Bridges)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 640 for County Route 109A Culvert #8 Awosting Road in the amount of \$60,000.

Motion No. 50: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 387**
Motion By: Legislator Fabiano

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 389: Amending The 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program - Establishing Capital Project No. 641 Route 28A/CR 50 Embankment Stabilization, Town Of Hurley - Amending 2022 Capital Fund Budget - Department Of Public Works (Highways & Bridges)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 – 2027 Capital Improvement Program and establishes Capital Project No. 641, the Route 28A / County Route 50 Embankment in the amount of \$50,000.

Motion No. 51: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 389**

Motion By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: See attached transcript

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

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 6

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 391: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$101,060.00 Entered Into By The County – Complete Building Solutions, Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment in the amount of \$101,060 with Complete Building Solutions, Inc. to extend the term of the agreement through 7/31/23 and update locations.

Motion No. 52: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 391**

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 392: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For Rates Anticipated To Exceed \$50,000.00 Entered Into By The County – The Gordian Group, Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with The Gordian Group, Inc for job order contracting software licensing and support services for rates anticipated to exceed \$50,000.

Motion No. 53: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 392

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 393: Approving The Execution Of A Contract Amendment For \$13,970.00, Causing The Aggregate Contract Plus Amendment Amount To Be In Excess Of \$50,000.00, Entered Into By The County – Dutchess Overhead Doors, Inc. – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract amendment for \$13,970 with Dutchess Overhead Doors, Inc. to extend the term of an agreement through 7/31/23 to include additional overhead doors in the maintenance agreement.

Motion No. 54: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 393

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 394: Establishing Capital Project No. 643 - UCAT Bus Purchase 2022 - Amending The 2022 Capital Fund Budget – Ulster County Area Transportation (UCAT)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution amends the 2022 Capital Fund Budget and establishes Capital Project No. 643 for 2022 UCAT Bus Purchase in the amount of \$2,991,807.

Motion No. 55: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 394

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 ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 396: Supporting And Authorizing A Grant Application To The Federal Transit Administration To Accept And Administer 5339(b) Funding For Bus Replacements And Support Vehicles And Authorizing The Ulster County Executive To Execute Any Required Applications Or Agreements To Accept Funding- Ulster County Area Transit (UCAT)

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes a grant application to the Federal Transit Administration to accept and administer 5339(b) funding for bus replacements and support vehicles with anticipated revenues of \$940,504.

Motion No. 56: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 396**

Motion By: Legislator Ronk

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: See attached transcript

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

Voting Against: None

Votes in Favor: 6

Votes Against: 0

Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 397: Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Execute An Intermunicipal Agreement For The Sharing Of Information Relating To Short-Term Rental Properties With The Town Of Lloyd – Department Of Finance

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the Chair of the Ulster County Legislature to execute an intermunicipal agreement for the sharing of information relating to short-term rental properties with the Town of Lloyd.

Motion No. 57: **MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 397**

Motion By: Legislator Ronk

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

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 ADOPTED

Resolution No. 398: Authorizing The County Of Ulster To Increase The Allocation Of Sales Tax Distributed To The Towns Pursuant To Section 4 Of The Sales Tax Agreement With The City Of Kingston – Department Of Finance

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the County of Ulster to increase the allocation of sales tax distributed to the Towns in the amount of \$1,500,000.

Motion No. 58: MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution No. 398
Motion By: Legislator Cahill
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

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 ADOPTED

The committee discussed the 2022 Budget Calendar for the 2023 Executive Recommended Budget and their expectations regarding the budget submission.
See attached transcript.

Deputy Comptroller DeMarco provided a brief update on the Fund Balance Report previously distributed by the Comptrollers Office and a property tax audit.

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

Adjournment

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Fabiano

No. of Votes in Favor: 6
No. of Votes Against: 0

TIME: 7:10 PM

Respectfully submitted: Natalie Kelder
Minutes Approved: August 9, 2022

**Ways & Means Committee
Regular Meeting Transcript**

DATE & TIME: July 12, 2022 – 5:00 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meetings, Meeting ID: 876 4456 7496
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, Maloney, Petit, & Uchitelle, Counsel Pascale & Ragucci – UC Legislature , Deputy County Executives Contreras, Kelly & Rider, Sheriff Figueroa – UC Sheriff, Deputy Comptroller DeMarco & Samuel Sonenberg – UC Comptroller’s Office, District Attorney Clegg & Kassondra Seyfert – UC District Attorney, Director Litwin, Asst. Director Scott – UC Recovery and Resilience, Director Erichsen - UC Emergency Services, Director Doyle – UC Planning, Director Jordan – UC Purchasing, John Quigley – Town of Ulster Supervisor, Tim Rodgers – New Paltz Mayor, S. Deacon Bill Mennenga – Redeemer Lutheran Church, James Murphy – UC Residents, Mid-Hudson News

Chairman Gavaris called the meeting to order at 5:01 PM

Chairman Gavaris: Sorry, July 12th meeting of Ways & Means to order. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes from June 14th and June 21st meeting?

Legislator Fabiano: I'll move it.

Legislator Walter: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: Move it. Second? Legislator Cahill. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

Resolution number 11: Requesting enactment of State and Senate Assembly Bill for special law in relation to hotel and motel occupancy tax. Can I have a motion?

Chair Bartels, motion. Second?

Legislator Fabiano: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: Fabiano. Discussion? Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: Yeah. We have caucus after this. I think it's time to just pick a number. And if it, if it passes, it passes if it doesn't, it doesn't. But I don't think there's much more to talk about 3, 4%, and just do it. I'm surprised it's taken seven months, and we still don't have, you know, and know where anybody's at. But in caucus tonight, I'll be kind of asking for a, an overall number. I just assumed, I assumed four, we'll see if it's three and then vote on it.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Cahill.

Legislator Cahill: Thank you. So there was a committee appointed to review this wasn't there?

Legislator Maloney: There was and I was, you know, I was

Legislator Cahill: [inaudible] results or

Legislator Maloney: I was, I was told early on that, for one, I thought I'd be chairing it. I didn't. And then I was also promised that we would not let the lodging coalition kind of, you know, just completely destroyed the process. And that was apparent early on that that wasn't going to happen. And we weren't going to, you know that that and I think it got to a point where nothing was getting done. And we were allowing a few multimillionaires to completely pervert the process.

Legislator Cahill: Through Chair Gavaris to the Chair of the Legislature. Chair Bartels, are you aware of a, a report that's going to be submitted by this committee or some sort of recommendation from the committee as to how we should proceed?

Legislative Chair Bartels: Not, no, not yet. But the, the working group is still working. I think that there's you know, there have been several meetings. I know that the lodging coalition has also, in terms of what Legislator Maloney's bring, bringing up about the lodging, I don't want to repeat the language. But the lodging coalition offered to host several meetings with the executive team to which members of the legislature were invited to but the working group has been working separately. Chair Gavaris, Chair of this committee, Chairs that working group. And, you know, I think that there's you know I, I appreciate the frustration that Legislator Maloney feels, especially given that this is something we've been talking about over the years. But I also think that we have a certain amount of time to get this, to get this together. And, you know, I, I would like to move with a sense of urgency as well. But I don't feel the need to necessarily move, just pick a number and move it this month. And I also think that there were certain other things that were still up for discussion about whether or not we were going to be settling on a number that was the same number for all types of lodging. There was a question about categorizing impermanent structures as lodging, impermanent permanent structures as lodging, we all know that there are certain, there are certain facilities that have cabins that are temporary, that are

actually technically deemed impermanent, but they are, they're owned by the owners of the property. They're not something that's brought on by the people who are camping at the sites. So all these are things that I think we still have yet to work out. And I'd rather, I'd rather get to the point where we the legislature, have something solid rather than just throw a number at the wall and hope that someone's going to carry it. So that's, that's where, that's where I'm at to answer your question Legislator Cahill.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Legislator Fabiano, then Uchitelle, then Maloney.

Legislator Fabiano: Yes. Through Chairman Gavaris to Chairwoman Bartels, would it be okay, if we postpone or take no action on this until that report is done and submitted to us?

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yeah, yes, I think that would I think that would be fine. And I think it's fine to talk about it in caucuses as well. I mean, I think it's fine to solicit engagement from more of the legislature beyond the working group, to Legislator Maloney's point.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Uchitelle.

Legislator Uchitelle: Thank you. I just want to bring something up, which is the reason why I'm not pushing really hard on this, even though I agree with Legislator Maloney's points, just about all of them, frankly, which is that my understanding is if we, if we found someone to carry this, or like if we, the legislature isn't meeting right now, except for like emergencies, basically. And if we passed this, it wouldn't have any weight that would carry over into the next legislative session, because they're about they're going through an election, which means they're gonna have new legislators on January 1st and when January 1st comes, we're going to we would need to do something then anyway. So my understanding is, that's the window that we, we need to operate as at the very beginning of the year, rather than at the end of not just the year, but their actual term expiring, because it's not going to carry over into the next term.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Maloney, you still want to speak?

Legislator Maloney: Yeah, well, our, our Legislative Counsel originally said once we pass this, it sits there it that terms didn't matter that we weren't on a timeframe. If that, if that legal opinion has changed, then it's changed unbeknownst to me. I just had a question to either, either chair that just with these, the, the four months or so and the multiple subcommittee meetings, do we have one, can, can we share one definitive finding or suggestion that has come out of those out of these four months of subcommittee meetings? Can we have one or two, what is definitive thus far? What have we, what have we gotten out of those three or four months and all those subcommittee meetings? Is there, is there anything? Is there one thing?

Chairman Gavaris: As of now, no, the report they were waiting for is going to hopefully shed a lot of light on the impact that these groups have on the county's economy. That's one of the reasons why we're sort of waiting on this. It has, you know, well, 1%, 3%, pipes and whatever the number winds up being, there is an impact on that.

Legislator Maloney: And this report is coming from where?

Chairman Gavaris: There's a consultant that they had hired,

Legislator Maloney: Who's, who's they?

Chairman Gavaris: The lodging coalition, they're hired a consultant.

Legislator Maloney: Oh, the lodging coalition has hired a consultant to report to us and give us gospel numbers about how much it will affect their business.

Chairman Gavaris: [Inaudible]

Legislator Maloney: I just got back from Massachusetts, by the way, and it still never occurred to me, where, what, what, I forgot to check that bed tax again. I've been going away almost every weekend for soccer for the last two years. And I tell myself while I'm on the thruway or whatever else I'm gonna get there. I'm going to check this bed tax and I still have forgotten to check that bed tax.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. So Legislator Gavaris or Chair Gavaris, but in reference to the other committee, do you have a sense of a timeline that we would possibly have more information?

Chairman Gavaris: I don't, but I could follow up with them to see when that report will be ready.

Legislator Walter: And will that sorry, would that be the time or will you then take the, will the working group, take that report and meet [inaudible]

Chairman Gavaris: Oh, no, yeah, we would have to take the report and process it, of course.

Legislator Walter: Okay. So yeah, it would be useful only because if we are postponing it, and I'm not saying we are, but if we are, it'd be good to have at least an idea in our heads when we would really be reasonably in a better position to vote.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other comments? All right. Well, if we're not going to do any other motion, then I'll call for a vote on it.

Legislator Walter: Well.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move we postpone it for a month.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I'll second that.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Second, Legislator Walter. Just all right. All those in favor of postponing?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? Okay. All right. Thank you.

Resolution 168: Authorizing one time reimbursement for real property taxpayers. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it for discussion.

Legislator Fabiano: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: Move it. Second, Legislator Walter. Discussion? Legislator Fabiano.

Legislator Fabiano: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: Now look for discussion. No discussion. All right I'll, Chair Bartels. No? All right. All those in favor then? Opposed? Looks like all opposed. All right, motion has been defeated. Thank you.

One, I'm sorry, Resolution 288: Requirement reporting of wages of contractors and subcontractors. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it for discussion.

Chairman Gavaris: Move it. Second? Legislator Walter. Discussion? Legislator Uchitelle.

Legislator Uchitelle: Yeah, the version that's in your packet should be the one with that last change to you know, that was what we agreed on with the executive and we talked about last time, so I held it from pushing it to the floor just because a couple of our colleagues had still questions about it. So I

figured if anyone still has questions, or anything else, you know, we can talk about it now. Otherwise it should be good to go.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed?

Natalie Kelder: Can I just clarify that it's as presented before you.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah, as presented, with the amendment.

Legislator Ronk: I'm opposed Chairman. Chair, All right.

Chairman Gavaris: Everybody is aware, it's with the amendment, correct? Okay. All right. So all in favor, one opposed. All right. Thank you.

Resolution 308: Declaring Ulster County intent to be lead agency under SEQRA. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Walter: Can I move that we block, perhaps 308, 309, 339. I have a feeling it's the same conversation.

Legislator Ronk: I'll second that.

Deputy Executive Rider: Can I real quick, 339 has nothing to do with 308 or 309.

Legislator Walter: Oh, sorry, sorry, 308, 309.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, second Legislator Ronk. All right, all those in favor of blocking? Discussion? Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: I'm gonna, I'm gonna ask I mean, I'm not going to make the motion yet. Because I know there's other things you probably want to talk about. But I'm going to ask that this be postponed at this point for one week, I've been playing phone tag with the appraiser, the second appraiser. So we don't have the appraisal in hand now. In fact, I highly, highly suspect we won't have it in time for next week. But I'd like to just postpone it for the one week at this point. And I know other issues have been raised and there other things other people want to talk about. But again, I just want to put that out there. And I'll make them motion at the appropriate moment.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. So to last month, I remained very, very concerned about this property as the one that selected some of the similar reasons related to the cost of the property. But and, and the idea that we should be investing in way larger property space than we actually need for the emergency services. But I'm also concerned about the fact that we don't give more time and energy into some of the other properties, especially that rose to the top, for example, the Golden Hill property and reusing that. I have reached out to the Village of New Paltz Mayor to understand a little bit more about the water sewers possibility for this property. This is relevant because it was a scoring item on that, on the, on the scoring that we were shown last week, as, as a key element of having municipal access. And so I wanted to know the reality of that. And the, the fact is, is you know, it currently has a sewer, and it has well, which may be very, may be fine for the emergency services. But that, and I don't have the exact amount, or I may not even have the exact amount but close ballpark for next week. But it, it seems like to actually have the sewer connection to this property would be in the millions of dollars. And so I think the reason why that's relevant is one, I think we should be thoughtful about the fact of the real costs of having this in this location, which again, you know, just for the sewer connection would be likely in the millions. But also, since we were shown a formula and shown a matrix with a grid and Golden Hill lost by like a half of a point. Because and and that one of the points systems was municipal access, well, then maybe that should be rescored and all of a sudden Golden Hill would be the top one. So I just think, you know, I would, I would encourage the Executives Office to be taking a deeper look at whether this is truly the best location for this, given the cost and the implications and the again, the fact that it does not readily and easily and without a large costs have access to municipal sewer and water.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: Yeah, you know, I've actually had members of the public reach out with concern on this project. One was a retired Highway Department member from New Paltz, who was talking about how this property was actively trying to be gotten rid of ever since they were turned down for some kind of amusement park there. I don't, I haven't seen that scoring system, but maybe we I don't know if brownfields got a high enough negative score because that definitely would have brought it down below Golden Hill. You, look, you have somebody that has a known relationship with many members of the county government, bought the property, couldn't do what he wanted with it, actively trying to get rid of it. It's a 50-acre brownfield that was already subdivided, refused to even sell us the one subdivided piece said no, you have to take the whole thing, we should, we, we said great, okay. None of this looks good, smells good, sounds good. It's a 50-acre brownfield. And then when I asked what we're going to do with the rest of the 45 acres when we're done, I said, we just going to put that on the tax rolls and be fair about it into an auction no, no, no, no, no, no, I was told we don't know yet. But we want to pick our neighbors. So I assume we'd be given it off to the EDA to start another one of these things that we do. It just, this is, Golden Hill, to me, looks like a much more rational approach. And I'm just surprised that we've gotten this far with a 50-acre brownfield from somebody that's quite involved with a, with this

piece of property. And I know I'm not the only one on this meeting that has had people from the community, I've talked to another legislator that had members of the community reaching out about real concerns, not just with the fact that it's a bad, it doesn't look like the best spot, but that these relationships that exist.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, thanks. I, you know, I, I've sat through, you know, several of these meetings so far, I sat through the presentation three times. You know, we seem to have a lot of amateur engineers in the legislature, amateur, you know, sighting specialists, you know, amateur, you know, dowers, or, or whatever, you know, I just I feel like, you know, at some point this is going to become disrespectful to the people who work at the 911 Center. And I just think that we should make a statement as a legislature that we know better than, then GPI and we know better than the Executives Office and start moving forward on Golden Hill. Because, you know, we, we can sit through and, and bicker about whether Golden Hill's better, whether water is going to be available. I mean, I, I, I know that the Mayor of, of New Paltz says a lot of things and not all, not all of them are 100% accurate. So I mean, I don't take I don't take that word, you know, right to the bank. But I, I just, I mean, we can sit month after month after month and talk about how we know Golden Hill is better than this site. And we know and we can, you know, banter about conspiracy theories about moneyed interests, or we can just, you know, start working and moving forward on the kind of facility that our 911 dispatchers deserve. So that's, that's how I feel about it. I'm, I'm pretty much done.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Cahill, and then Fabiano.

Legislator Cahill: Thank you Chair. So, you know, I obviously, you know, and I think most legislators, I will assume to speak for most legislators when I say that, I don't think anyone's against the center. And I don't think they're by us doing our due diligence, and, and looking at something that we requested, which is a separate appraisal of the property for the legislature to compare what the offering price is by the property owner, and what the county is looking at purchasing, what, what our appraiser will tell us what it's worth, I don't think that's showing disrespect at all. Matter of fact, I think it's

Legislator Ronk: I want to be clear, Legislator Cahill, I want to be clear, I said nothing about the appraisal, and I will support a postponement until we get the appraisal.

Legislator Cahill: That's, that's, okay, all right,

Legislator Ronk: but nothing but nothing that was said in this meeting. So I mean, I'm sorry, I shouldn't say nothing.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. All right,

Legislator Ronk: very little that was said in this meeting so far has anything to do with the appraisal. I've heard about water,

Chairman Gavaris: [inaudible]

Legislator Ronk: I've heard

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Legislator Ronk, he's retracted.

Legislator Cahill: I would like to make my point there, that, Yeah. Right. We weren't, we weren't talking about any of the things that were mentioned about, you know, saying let's just drop it and move it to Golden Hill that I don't think I certainly don't feel that way. And all I want to do is see a comparable appraisal for the property to see if the county's getting a fair deal. That's all. That's all I want to see. Once I see that I'll make my decision. It's not going to have anything to do with politics. It's not gonna have to do with anything other than, you know, what's been presented through the presentation, the requirements for the training center, and I mean, the operation center, and you know, what, what's in front of us. So, you know, that's it. It's just doing our job, in my opinion, right, getting the second appraisal, looking at it, doing our due diligence. It's that simple.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Fabiano.

Legislator Fabiano: Yes. What I wanted to say first of all, what Legislator Maloney said, I was the other legislator that had received some calls from local attorneys and some local real estate people here in my town, who quite frankly came out and told me that that at this point, do, they do not like what they're seeing, at all. My second point is, I think the emergency people who work in this county at the end of the day aren't really going to care where this facility is located. They just want to make sure that they have one and they have, and they, they have a new one. It's our responsibility at legislators that that we make sure the county, the residents of Ulster County, the taxpayers of Ulster County, get the best bang for their buck. And if it ends up being at New Paltz, that's fine. But if the numbers stay the way they are right now, I will definitely be a no.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Uchitelle

Legislator Fabiano: [inaudible] that we can look at.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Uchitelle.

Legislator Uchitelle: Thanks. I just wanted to clarify that, just because I, I heard a comment that I think was meant in jest to provoke thought, but just to totally clarify, I don't think anyone believes, and, and

certainly the conversation in the Public Safety Committee and with our, you know, with the folks in the public safety space at various levels, I don't think anyone believes that the Golden Hill site is going to be a better site for this emergency operation center. The best site is the site in New Paltz, for a variety of reasons I'm not going to go into again, that is the best site, it is more expensive. And I realized that if it's the will of, you know, of the legislature not to go with it for cost reasons that it won't be because it wasn't the best it'll be because of the cost reasons. I just want to be very clear that the best site for what this property needs to do is the site in New Paltz. And for someone who's a legislator representing Kingston, I love things being in Kingston. I hear a lot we need more stuff in, in southern Ulster, not that New Paltz is as far south as some might like to see a project happening for southern Ulster. But, you know, a project that has a property that has space to do more with would certainly open the door for more to happen outside of Kingston. Maybe it's odd for me to be as a legislator from Kingston advocating for that, you know, maybe I should leave that to my colleagues from the south. But that would certainly open the door to that. And I hope that folks have that in mind as well.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, so I'd like to say that the idea of, of the New Paltz site being the best site is a very subjective term, there is a metric that was applied by a team as to what the site which site was better. And I think it's important to again, reiterate that the difference in the score between this site and the others in that more objective metric was very close. And as I pointed out, with the municipal access to sewer and water wasn't necessarily as accurate in the scoring as possible. I think that looking back at that scoring sheet, is what we ought to utilize rather than these opinions. And, and honestly, I would say for myself, and I think for other legislators, it is actually not the best site. It's not the best site for this. It's not the best site for future housing, necessarily. There's a lot of reasons why I'm concerned about it and I just want to be clear that I don't think we all do agree that it is the best site.

Chairman Gavaris: I'm going to go to Deputy Executive Rider, but first, because you're probably going to make a response to what I'm going to say. So buckle up for a second on you. But you know, one of the things that I looked at when we saw the presentation, I didn't catch it that night, but I noticed it afterwards is there was really a third option that was not presented to us, which is building a new building, at Golden Hill to the, would be the right of the existing 911 center. There was an outline in the drawing. There was an outline in the drawing but no information about how it scored the positive, the pros, the cons, nothing was talked to us about but yet, it is an option. And I don't know why it wasn't explored. It was only a renovation of the Golden Hill Mental Health, I'm sorry, the health department building, or a new construction at New Paltz. The third option doesn't seem to be any information. And I did reach out to Deputy Executive Rider and he was going to try to find something. So I'll let you go ahead and speak now, Deputy Executive Rider.

Deputy Executive Rider: Yeah and so I'm working on that our, our main architect has been on vacation and returns to the office tomorrow. So I was assuming that you all would probably postpone this for a

week anyway. And he said that he could get me that documentation by the end of the week. They did do some high-level costing it out because it has to be two story's, and elevators and fire escapes and it was actually more expensive than the mental health renovation. So the one very important point I want to make and, and it has to do with every RFP that this county puts out. And a lot of scoring, scoring gets you to a certain place to decide whether it's an RFP, then there's interviews and there's other things looked at for, for who you choose. Yes, the scoring seemed very close between the Golden Hill site and, and the New Paltz site. But even if things are tweaked in one way or the other and even if Golden Hill scored slightly higher, there is a lot of reasons that New Paltz, as Legislator Uchitelle said, is the correct and, and the best site. We have paid licensed consultants who are recommending that site. We have an Emergency Services Commissioner who wants and, and recommends that site or Director. It is by far the superior site when it comes to the, the different kinds of fiber and electricity redundancy. The access to the Thruway and the centralized location in Ulster County and having a satellite to the south. It is by far a superior site. We have wells and septic's that will be more than benefit, more than adequate for the Government Operations Center. If it's chosen that we would turn the rest of it into housing, and we have to turn to the village then it would be on whoever would be the developer to incur those costs, it would not be on the county to incur costs of adding sewer and water. So I just want to be clear on that. But this is the, the site that was selected by our architects, our engineers, and on our overall team, working, we are eagerly awaiting a second appraisal. We hope that it comes in this month, hope that it comes in next week. But if it doesn't, then we're, we're just waiting. I've put everybody on hold. The entire team cannot move forward with a government operation center, and while I know Legislator Ronk was speaking in jest, I really do not want to see us move on to the second site without fully vetting out and doing everything we can to move forward with the New Paltz site.

Chairman Gavaris: Can we please put in the record the exact comment that Deputy Executive Rider said that they, it will be on the developer to pay for the water and sewer? Because such has not been the case, especially most recently at Golden Hill where the county wound up paying for demo. I'd like to please have that as part of the record.

I lost track who was first so I'm gonna go with Legislator Walter, then Fabiano, then Bartels.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, so um, I'd be curious to know how well,

Legislator Ronk: Mr. Chairman, Legislator Maloney's had his hand up since the, way before the last time that he

Chairman Gavaris: All right, you gotta start using the hands up thing then because I can if I don't see you, I'm writing it down as I see it. But if I don't catch you please

Legislator Walter: Legislator Maloney, would you like to go before me?

Legislator Maloney: No, go right Eve, I'll go right after you.

Legislator Walter: Thank you. So I'm also curious on whether, you know, the experts really also considered the feasibility of selling off that land to use for housing. You know, obviously, the owner was probably very interested in utilizing it and had their own problems. And the fact that it doesn't have water and sewer, the fact that it's located right by a Thruway that it's disconnected from the community. I just wonder how successful it will even be to sell it off to a developer for housing. And then during that entire time period, it'll be off the tax rolls. And so I'm just I would also be curious to know whether some real assessment has been made on the likelihood that we would truly be able to sell off that property in order to develop housing, because I feel like it's probably I don't know if it's been looked at, but it feels pretty unlikely that that that would be a successful sale anytime soon.

Chairman Gavaris: I'm just going to go to Deputy Executive Rider, so we can get that answer if we can. Deputy Executive Rider, if you have a response.

Deputy Executive Rider: I mean, so, so housing was one option, we didn't really task, the consultant to take that much into account, that the extra money that would come back, because if you recall, from looking at the two proposed sites, the two different sites, even with the three and a half million purchase price of the site, they're within a hund, like a 500,000. They're within a million dollars of each other over the long term. For the more again, that being a superior site, they believe that it could come back to one and a half 2 million for development of some kind housing was one option because we, you know, need more affordable housing in Ulster County. It could be that we would sell off that for manufacturing, we could look and decide that we want to have more government services there and, and build out another, you know, government center, there's a lot of options. Everything still on the table. Housing is one of those options and I understand, you know, the concern of it being out of the town now I will say that Town Supervisor Bettez is very interested and is applying for a DRI project to make that as a another kind of downtown area right in that location and thinks that housing would be a great addition to that site.

Legislator Walter: Can I just respond to one little thing. If you could just check because I believe when they showed us the price differential in the 500,000 was different, they kept repeating that doesn't include the sale of the property. And maybe I'm misremembering it but I pretty sure

Director Doyle: It does.

Legislator Walter: that that close price did not include the sale.

Deputy Executive Rider: It does not include the sale or no

Legislator Walter: Right, so it's not really 500,000 different.

Deputy Executive Rider: No, it includes.

Legislator Walter: [inaudible]

Deputy Executive Rider: I'll go back and look it, it does include the purchase price, but I'll, I'll take a look.

Director Doyle: It does, yeah.

Deputy Executive Rider: It doesn't include the sale of the property to somebody else.

Legislator Walter: No, no, I meant that I don't recall it being include the purchase price, but

Deputy Executive Rider: It was in there.

Director Doyle: It does. Yeah, it does.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: Yeah, I have a lot of questions and concerns, even about the process that consultant used. I'm surprised that we did, we that this I mean, I can't imagine this being the best piece of property that they could find in our entire county. I hear a lot about electric speaking to an electrician that actually did the electrical work over at the 911 Center, in Dutchess County, they have one feet and a lot of backup generators and whatnot. So I've been confused by like one of the number one reasons for for this I'm hearing these, these different things that that don't jive with what I'm what I'm hearing from Dutchess County. I, I, I agree with Eve 100%, that that is, that's an opinion that we're just saying, Hey, this is by far and away the best site. And I think I heard Marc say that the renovation would, would it that the fabricating a building on Golden Hill would cost more than the renovation but I want to hear about a comparison for a new fabricated building on Golden Hill compared to the numbers that we're, we're getting from this New Paltz piece of property that a lot of us aren't happy with. And as far as some of the questions that that Eve is going after in New Paltz, and things like that, I hear the word amateur, you know, it's a carrot and a stick what's been going on with this legislature in the executive branch for many years now, when we hear veteran housing, economic development, development, 911 Center, call center, it's well, it's just fine. We don't want to look into it. If there's any amateur hour ish stuff going on. It's what this legislature has lacked in due diligence over the last 10 years or so. And what we've allowed to happen and find out later weren't great deals. What we're trying to do now is get real answers, and I'm sorry, but a lot of it's not making sense. On its face, 50-acre Brownfield, we need five acres or so, if that. I mean, and how this property and then you take all those other things into consideration. How do we even know who this consultant was and how they came across this, this prop, their matrix in this pro,

and how we came, how, how this ended up at the top of the list, it doesn't make a lot of sense. And I'm sorry, everybody wants this to happen. But everybody wants all these things to happen. That's the problem. We get into Ways and Means and it's always well, this really needs to happen. We don't have a lot of time. It's green, it's solar, it's this we're gonna get the this done over a Tech City and then and then we find out a year or two later, it was just not as good of a deal as it could have been or quite frankly a bad deal. And I'm sick of getting pushed around and bad information. And this is just this just doesn't look great. And Golden Hill does make more sense and I do not agree that New Paltz is just a superior piece of property to do this on. I don't agree whatsoever. And I think some of the stuff that Eve is looking into, should be easily answered by the Executive's team already.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Chair Bartels. You good? Legislator Fabiano.

Legislator Fabiano: I'm good.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay.

Legislator Fabiano: I heard enough.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: I'll make a motion to postpone since [inaudible] put out for next week.

Chairman Gavaris: Second?

Legislator Fabiano: I'll second that motion.

Chairman Gavaris: Second Fabiano. All right. All those in favor of postponement?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried. Thank you. All right.

Chairman Gavaris: Resolution 339: Approving the execution of a contract for 1.3 million for Gorick Construction. Can I have a motion? Legislator Cahill. Second? Can I get a second? Chair Bartels. Discussion? All those in fav, Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I'm just you know, I'm going to be voting no for the same reason is that I still feel like we should not have been paying for the renov, the demolition costs that were agreed to by the contractor. So I know it'll pass but I just want to be clear, why I'm going to continue to be no.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: You know, I think we also have to be cognizant when we put these numbers out there of what we think it's going to be. And then we do an RFP or an RFQ. And then the number comes in exactly. You know, there's different ways of doing demolition. There's different ways of doing a lot of projects. You know, if I was building a deck, and I told the guy I want to spend, you know, and then I let them tell me later, what materials they're going to use everything else. There's deconstruction, there's, there's total demo, there's different ways of doing demo. So we constantly do this in accounting, we're not the only we're not the only government that does this. And it's kind of a known thing that you have to watch out for in government, putting the number out there that you're willing to pay. And then suddenly, the number you get is that number that you put out before doing the RFP and the RFQ, without a lot of specifics on what we wanted done. So and I agree with Eve 100%. This was the public, the, the legislature, we were told whether there was fine print, in, in, in what you guys were able to do with this Housing Corp or not. Everybody was under the impression that this company was, that Penrose was going to be doing the demolition, and now they're not. And, and with all these other things, now we're trying to get them a grant in a bizarre way. The appraisal, nonsense, it's, it's really getting old with Penrose and how we're just, we're, we're really, it seems we're going way too far with the tax dollar. And they're not putting a lot of skin in the game, and it doesn't make a lot of sense.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, any other discussion? I'm gonna be no as well tonight, same reason as Legislator Walter. All right. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? All right, motions carried. Thank you.

341: Amending the 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement, Project Number 642 for ARPA home energy improvements. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Chair Bartels. Discussion? Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thanks, I'm gonna, I'm going to ask that we hold this for a week. Um, you know, I've, I've, I've talked in multiple committees about wanting, and it doesn't have to happen in Ways & Means. But I've talked to multiple committees about wanting to kind of pause on moving ARPA committee, ARPA resolutions through quickly. Given that we're at a we're at a point where if all of the, excuse me, if all of the resolutions that came before us this month, if all of them were to pass, we, we'd essentially would be basically out of ARPA funds. And I think we're, we're at that point where it would serve us to look at what's already passed, what we're, what we've already committed, what we've already spent, take an assessment and, and then also really set our own legislative priorities on what's left and come what may whatever that may be, because there's more, there are more projects that haven't even been brought to the fore that wouldn't even be able to be considered. That said, on this particular, couple

of the ARPA resolutions were postponed in other committees. This is the one that's making it to here. This one, I did get contact information to follow up on the this is being presented as both a retrofit fit, and a and a green jobs training program. The, the detail of the gene, green jobs training program wasn't, wasn't really expressed other than in general terms, that there would be interns in collaboration with citizen for local power on each of these projects, which my understanding is that we would fully fund each of these projects. And that, that then we would work with CLP, to make sure that their interns were on the projects. I am going to in this week, if if the committee agrees to postpone I am going to reach out to CLP, to, to better understand what that program is I understand that it's already in effect that it's an, it's an internship program that's already working. But I think that if we're going to fund this as an, as a job training program, we should have a sense of what it is that we're funding since it actually we're not funding the jobs training, we're funding the retrofit and utilizing the full funding of the retrofit to make sure that there's jobs to train on. So again, I don't want to even so much get into I think I have a long record as being very supportive of green things. So I know this will probably come as some surprise that I'm hesitant on this, but I'm just asking right now for the one week, hold. And then we'll we'll see next week where the committee is.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. And I apologize if this exists, and I missed it. I do remember several months ago, and I don't remember if it was from our team or the executives, we had this kind of tally that had expenditures already approved the pending one so do we have like the most updated or if not can we before next week, have that list that includes completed and pending? Or if I have it in my email [inaudible] point me to it?

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Yes, yes, we could definitely get an updated from, it's been circulated with the ARP committee but I cir, make sure that it's circulated to the full Ways and Means Committee, even the full probably the full legislature should look at it and Amber's done tremendous amount of work keeping us up to date on all that information. So I'll make sure that, that everyone in the legislature gets that.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you.

Legislator Ronk and then Maloney.

Legislator Ronk: I was just gonna make that motion to postpone it for a week but if Legislator Maloney wants to talk first, I'll hold off.

Chairman Gavaris: You want to talk first [inaudible]

Legislator Maloney: It was just a question about ARPA funds in general, that, are we getting reports back with regards to, you know, we set this much aside for set project, or whatever. I mean, we're giving money to people in the private sector now to do things. Are we, are we getting back that the money's not being used or didn't use as much? For instance, our even our water, sewer resolution? I've heard there's been some municipalities turned down. I know Rochester was turned down. So we're obviously not going to use all that money. Are we getting reports in real time of how much money isn't being used? So we know, and do we know any any money that's come back already? Do we know of anything already? That we thought was spent?

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: So in real time, I mean, in the strictest sense of real time, probably no. But we are, we are getting updates. And that's exactly what I'm talking about. You know, we're I mean, I think we're at a place where we should not just, you know, look at it on the list. But we should have a deeper dive and look closely at it. I believe and expect that there, there are going to be projects that either don't use the full funding or don't use any of the funding, there's going to be the potential of money coming back to us without a doubt. So to say that, at this moment, if if all the three projects this month, had, were, were expended that would be very near the end, if not at the end, that, that means based on what's committed, but knowing that some of what's committed is going, is going to come back. And I think Legislator Maloney, you're bringing up an important point, because, you know, there are an the ARP team is with us, say they're, you know, we've approved multiple projects, some of which include, like a funding mechanism, that's evaluative, like, like, the water and sewer like the nonprofits like the small business. And I know that they're working their way through those programs. But the money, like the checks haven't been cut for all of those, for all those programs yet. So and again, I also think just just speaking, speaking as one legislator, I mean, I think there's a possibility that we may look at, let's take water and sewer, for example, we may look at one project and say, wow, there's been more of a response than we thought, and we're having more of an impact than we thought we'd like to spend more money on this project based on demonstrated success. We can't have that conversation if we spend all the money right now, which is why I just think we're at a point where we should have the conversation with one another, we're the appropriators, about how we want to spend the balance. And that will involve a real up to date, up to the minute evaluation of where, where everything's at.

Chairman Gavaris: Deputy Executive Kelly.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you, Chair. So just in terms of some of the programs, the legislature and the executive staff are all scoring the non for profits, they're starting to get towards the end of that. And then we'll start to make those awards I would expect in the next few weeks. So there was, there was over 90 something applications for that. So going through those does take some time. The water and sewer, we did the pre application, which I also reviewed just to make sure that first the projects were ready in terms

of a timeline to spend them down, but then second to make sure that they topically fit. Water and sewer, some of the projects just simply did not. But the projects that were leftover and that have moved to the full application phase, we believe are going to be at least from first glance, they seem to be more project ready. In terms of implementation, the appropriation was at 5 million for water and sewer. I think we're right there in terms of about 15 or so projects that'll roll up to that amount that will probably you know, we have to put them through that second round to make sure that they are truly ready to execute on the funding and the project so We are working through that now we've issued at the request of several legislators for those projects that are deemed good passed the first round to let the applicants know that, you know, they're going to be, barring anything else or non legislative, it's it, these contracts will come back to the legislature, because there'll be an excess of 50,000 for the water and sewer. So they, they have to go through the second round. It's a lot of money on the table. So those are the two that are still going and then we're now working on the application phase for the small business ones as we just wound down CARES, phase one. So that's kind of the status check on those competitive ones.

Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. All right. Any other discussion? All right, is there a motion to postpone?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move we postpone.

Legislator Maloney: Does John have, does John Heppner have his hand up.

Legislator Heppner: Yeah, the mind, if you don't mind, Chair Gavaris.

Chairman Gavaris: I'm sorry. I have people who are not on video hidden, so I didn't see, I'm sorry, I apologize for that.

Legislator Heppner: I just wanted to flag. I want to thank the executives office. Speaking of water and sewer, and encourage the legislature's to listen to the testimony, we had a recent water hearing. And, you know, it's really impactful. You know, it's definitely a really serious issue in our county. And, you know, it's Saugerties in Mount Marion, it's, you know, West Hurley out in Olive, you know so if folks, you know, want to listen to that, can I ask the executives office to share that testimony?

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Alright, so again, motion, for postponing for one week.

Legislator Fabiano: I'll second it.

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

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried. All right.

Resolution 343: Setting a public hearing, for proposed local law number nine for law for collecting delinquent tax for village properties. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it for discussion.

Chairman Gavaris: Walter. Second, Ronk. Discussion? Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: This is something that goes back many years before half of the legislature that's presently here now. And we, we all know that we make municipalities whole while they're going through their foreclosure process or not getting paid taxes for delinquent properties in, on the town aspect and the school aspect of that share. And, you know, we just saw that, you know, the Town of Ulster, you know, thank goodness, I'm sure Mr. Quigley would agree that 701 Grant Avenue, the Town of Ulster got made whole for all those years. And, you know, these villages, a larger part of their budget, which is much smaller, can really be troubled. Going back, I think Ellenville, I was told today that Ellenville wanted this years ago, there was discussions about them not having their paperwork ready. The way this resolution is trying to read is that it would be an option for the three villages to opt in. Really, it just makes them equal to the municipalities with regard to that process of being made whole. And back in 2020, this is according to several village trustees in Saugerties and the, a former Saugerties Legislator, Executive Hein, and the, and the Commissioner of Finance, had a meeting and agreed to put it into the 2020 budget or something that this would start happening. And then the Executive left and it just went by the wayside. I spoke to two village trustees a month ago, they asked if I would put it in again, for it to be considered, it would be a tiny, tiny minut thing for the county. But it could be a real big deal for the, for these villages once in a while.

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

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. You know, I, I'll, I'll support a public hearing. But the thing I'd like our attorneys to confirm, and this is something that has been a stumbling block for many of us over the years as Legislator Maloney states, I want to say this is come up at least once in almost every term that I've served in, since I first got elected. You know, the concern is always looking back. And the question is, if we take over the responsibility for, you know, delinquent property, delinquent tax properties in the villages, do we then have to make the villages whole going back until, you know, any of these properties were supposed to be foreclosed on or when the tax or what taxes are owed, and it's my understanding that it's not just a moving forward situation. At least that's how it had been relayed to me in the past, that we would be on the hook for the money that these properties owe going backwards. And that, that's a

deal breaker for me. I, I, I don't have that much of a problem with with, you know, working on moving forward. But it's, if, if there's some way to block it from being a look back too, I'm fine with that. But otherwise, the county could be on the hook for a lot more than just a little bit of money.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Legislator Walter and then

Legislator Walter: You know, I'll, I'll wait and hear some of the responses. I guess what my primary thing was, since it is a public, even though it is a public hearing, and but this is the first week of Ways and Means of a possible postponement. I just I want some time to understand a little bit better. So that was all I was gonna say. But I've perhaps in the continued conversation, I'll, I'll feel a little bit more clear or something.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you, you know, I think it's reasonable. I realize it's a public hearing, but I think is reasonable to to wait the week maybe to get a few of these answers in the week. I share Legislator Ronk's concerns about the look back, and I recall, I recall this debate and discussion, and I'm gonna pull up my old notes. Because last time this came up, I believe it was Legislator John Parete, who brought it forward and I had a list of like, 30 questions particular to one village. That never, that I really never got, you know, satisfactory answers to. So I'll find those questions again. But a lot of those questions had to do with the look back, I would like to know, I would like to know how the villages how the three current the villages feel currently, you know, the the leaders of the current villages and their boards. Do, do they actually want this? I appreciate Legislator Maloney saying two trustees are asking for it. I would also like to know, if if, whether yes or no? What, what's on the books for all those three villages, and how far back the properties date. And I'd like to see that inventory so that we can understand what the implications would be to Ulster County, because I suspect Legislator Ronk's right now and I also would like to ask the legal question of whether or not we could craft an agreement. And I guess it's just restating what Legislator Ronk said, if we could craft an agreement that started from day one, because if some of these villages have properties that are on the books, like 701 Grant on our books, that go back 10, 15, 20 years and have tremendous tax burden, we're going to be taking all that on in one fell swoop. And I don't, I don't think we should. I'm not saying that we should say yes or no, but I think we should know exactly, and at any moment in time, we should be able to find out exactly what specifically we're getting into. So if I could get those three questions answered, I'd feel a lot more comfortable.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. Legislator Fabiano then Maloney.

Legislator Fabiano: My only thing was, you know, in all Ulster County, we only have three villages. I mean, that's why I, I never understood really what, what the problem was. But on the other note what I gotta say, in the past, when we've had public comment, or or a, or a public hearings on this issue, I've

never seen anybody from the village attend. I mean, if we have a public hearing on this issue, these mayors and, and trustee members should come to the public hearings and, and make their case. I think we should, we should make them whole personally.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: Yeah, I mean, it's kind of we I mean, we probably know some of the I mean, if people are not paying their village taxes, there's a good chance they're not paying things that would show up for us. And I don't think we'll ever get to a point where we're going to be making, you know, we didn't even know about 701 Grant Avenue for the last 11 years. It's bizarre to me that we're going to worry about the village taxes, but I would like I'll ask Natalie, if she can send I mean, I could probably do the legwork with, with some of Saugerties. But could we, could we send out a request from, to the three villages and just ask some of these things? Maybe they're not interested. I, I do know that two village trustees and the mayor from Saugerties several years ago, had a meeting with the executive and they came up with a deal for 2020. That's when I removed this in my first term, because I was told by my village board and and mayor that they had a deal with the county and it was all good. So and then that, that deal went away. This would be a vote of the village board, if they wanted to enter this agreement. I'm fairly certain we could probably legally put it in there that it's going forward and that we're not going to go back and pay whatever they are. But I'd also like to know how much is on the, the the books right now for these different villages, how much are they owed? You know, if we're talking about 300,000 with Saugerties, and 150,000 with Ellenville, and 75,000 with New Paltz, or something, maybe we feel more comfortable especially, I don't mind putting this off a week and requesting some of this. You know, I, my impression a couple of years ago was that these villages were, my village in particular was fairly intimidated by the county. And, and, you know, it's a big deal for them to go up and ask things of the county, which is why we probably haven't seen them come and demand these, these things. I'm pretty sure if you ask them honestly, why wouldn't these villages want to be made whole? Is there a single town, Supervisor Quigley's on here, is there a scenario where he, where the Town of Ulster would not want to be made whole? I mean, it doesn't make a lot of sense. And we've always anyone I've ever talked to said if you start from scratch, now, you wouldn't have any villages, that New Paltz is the one exception because of the college, there may be some, some element of a village you'd want to have. But you would start with just these municipalities, and you wouldn't do, you wouldn't have a village inside of a town. I know that's how Saugerties is so it, it, I just don't know why we wouldn't treat them as municipalities. And if we're so concerned about being stuck on the hook for a couple extra hundred thousand dollars that goes back a couple of years, maybe we should put our legislative big boy and big girl hats on, and go and figure out what happened with 701 Grant Avenue. \$10 million, but nobody cares about that. But we're worried about making the villages whole. I love it.

Chairman Gavaris: Deputy Executive Kelly, then Ronk, and then Walter.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you, Chair. So I think doing the research and finding out what's in arrears currently to the villages would be a good first step to understanding fiscal impacts. I know that there, we have an annual auction, where we do foreclose upon the properties. I know that the villages don't do that in the same consistent manner. And I'm only talking about Saugerties and Ellenville. So in terms of having a consistent process or you know, every three years they execute upon it and do the foreclosure process. I'm pretty sure that they haven't been doing that consistently. The other part is the Village of New Paltz does not foreclose. So they act under Article 10, which is a tax lien process. So they would have to change that and opt into Article 11, which if the three of them opt in, it's not just about us making them whole, we would include their properties within our foreclosure process. So there would be no more, the dynamic doesn't become like the village gets to pick and choose or set their own process, they'd be part of the county process. Also in the past, and, and this goes back here several years. Our understanding is that certain residents were told to not pay the village portion, but to make sure your whole on the county side. So if you're paying your county side, that means that we weren't going to enact a foreclosure process, because there was nothing in arrears to us. So there's certain dynamics there. I'm not going to presume I'm a, I'm a budget person. So I'm not going to presume what's out there. But I think it would certainly behoove us to find out what's out there. It's especially from Ellenville and Saugerties. So we know what that's going to be and to Legislator Ronk's point. I don't know within Article 10 article, we act under Article 11 for our process, are we able to set a new point where we're now responsible for the going forward in our three years begins on day one of some agreement? Or are we able to bifurcate this and separate it out where Ellenville, Saugerties, New Paltz, if they choose to be part of this agreement that we're in what we do with the town's would they pick up what's already owed to them? Would they be, would they be okay with that or are we picking up the bill on a day one? I'm not taking a position. I'm saying it's a piece of information, we should have to make an educated decision about this. And with a public hearing, setting one, it certainly does gives us that window to continue to gather that information. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: I mean, Chris said most of what I was going to say there's, there's been instance, after instance of people paying their county and their town taxes but not their village taxes because the county won't foreclose for that. And the villages haven't done their due diligence to, to collect those taxes and or foreclose themselves. So you know, that, that's and there was a case in Ellenville that kept coming up where a village official was telling people not to pay their, not to pay their village taxes.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. Um, so I will say that I know that New Paltz has nothing on their books. But I guess back to the original point that was brought up by Chair Bartels and Legislator Ronk through the Chair to Legislator Maloney, and in in light of the idea that even if this is a public hearing, it's useful that as much detail is in the public hearing that things aren't necessarily changed later, would you be comfortable if we postponed it for a week that we could add any of these elements such as the idea of moving, starting the clock now moving forward? I think other issues of you know, when would the

county get the the money to these municipalities? So would you be amenable, I would like to make a motion to postpone It a week, get a chance to speak to my village mayor a little bit more. But could we possibly, would you be willing to, if we identify there are certain elements that we would like to be added to it, even though again, it is a public hearing, would you be okay with those pieces?

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Maloney: I've mentioned before it'd be okay and then, you know, I'd, I'd like to reach out and see if we get back as well. I will say that that one thing I had heard about that that issue, as far as people purposely not paying their village taxes that would be taken care of with this. If we, if we, if we, if we gave this option to villages, villages would no longer have to deal with that happening, that would curtail that behavior. And I will say that Sullivan County already does this and we could also look over to Sullivan County, but they do do this for their villages.

Chairman Gavaris: Just a point of, just so you know point of order, that there's actually only two counties in the state that do not make their villages whole and Ulster County is one of them. The rest of the counties do make the villages whole.

Legislator Maloney: All right. I had looked real quick and found Sullivan. Thank you, John.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah.

Legislator Walter: Can I just,

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah.

Legislator Walter: I made a motion to postpone it for one week.

Legislator Fabiano: I'll second it.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. Second? Chair Bartels.

Chairman Gavaris: Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried. All right.

Resolution 344: Adopting revised Ulster County fund balance policy.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

346: Approving 2022 - 2023 Ulster County Community College budget. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

347: Amending Capital Project 541 with Ulster County, with SUNY Ulster facility equipment. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

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

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

349: Approving the execution of a contract for 63,495 for Offset House. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? All right, I'll come back to Legislator Ronk for afterwards.

352: Authorizes the Department of Environment to submit an application for the stormwater, New York State Water Quality Improvement project. Can I have motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Cahill. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

353: Authorizing the Chair of the Legislature to execute a contract with New York State Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Legislator Cahill. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried. Legislator Ronk, 349 Just want to record your vote for that officially? That was the Offset House. Legislator Ronk? Legislator Ronk? Can I be heard?

Legislator Cahill: Yes. I can hear you.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk can you hear? Apparently, Legislator Ronk is having issues. All right.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, I'm back. Sorry.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay, you're cutting in and out. I, just 349 you stepped away so just wanted to get your actual vote. You're a yes.

Legislator Ronk: I'm a yes. Sorry, I had to get a charger for my computer or it was gonna die.

Chairman Gavaris: No problem. Just want to get your vote there. Thank you.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah.

Chairman Gavaris: 354: Authorizing an application for a comprehensive opioid stimulant substance use site-based and grant funding.

Chairman Gavaris: Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Move it. Second, Legislator Walter. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

355: Amending the 2022 Ulster County budget to approve reclassification of part time grant manager to a full time peer recovery advocate. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: Move.

Chairman Gavaris: Second? Walter. Discussion? Legislator Walter. Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Is Legislator Uchitelle still here? If not, could the Deputy Executive,

Chairman Gavaris: He is. He is here.

Legislator Uchitelle: I'm here.

Legislator Walter: You're here. So just, just clarification if conversation. Do they have someone else who also is going to continue to support helping them with their grants? Or would this then result in them not having anyone who have that capacity? And whether you've brought that up at all? I just know there's a lot of grants that they're dealing with and or the Sheriff is here, hi Sheriff.

Legislator Uchitelle: Yes, that was brought up and I'll defer to Sheriff Figueroa to answer it.

Sheriff Figueroa: Good, good evening, everyone, I'm still a little under the weather, but I'm back. So we hired a part time Grant Manager initially, but we were never able to hold that person because it was a part time position. The funding for that position is still available from within the grant. Our peer advocates have been averaging 30 cases each, per month. Last year, we were still number two in the state. First quarter of this year, we are down 40% on overdoses, but the caseload continues. So what we're looking to move the money from the part time grant manager that we never had for the last year and a half to a full time recovery advocate. And we are in discussions with the Department of Health and Mental Health and the county execs office to use the opioid settlement money to help offset the costs in the future.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

Legislator Ronk: Chairman, I'd also like to vote yes on 352 and 353, which I'm told I missed.

Chairman Gavaris: Gotcha. Thank you.

356: Authorizing an application of funds for law enforcement national initiative to improve public safety for the enhanced operation training via training. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second?

Legislator Ronk: Second.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

357: Authorizing the Chair of the Legislature to enter into a lease agreement with Industry Village 1151 LLC. Can I have motion? Legislator Cahill. Second? Legislator Walter. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

Chairman Gavaris: 358: Authorizing, approving the execution of a contract amendment for 13,992, causing the aggregate to exceed 50,000 for NYCOMCO. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: Move.

Chairman Gavaris: Second? Walter. Discussion?

Legislator Fabiano: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: All those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

359: Amending the 2022 capital budget to realign salaries and create a Deputy Chief ADA. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it for discussion.

Chairman Gavaris: Move it. Second? Legislator Bartels. Discussion? Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: The DA is here is he want to give us a little bit of background on it?

District Attorney Clegg: Sure, be happy to do that. So what we've done is we've combined two part time positions into a full time position. I've already seen the benefit of that. Part-time positions address only the court, full-time position we can use for other services. The person that we have in mind for this position, has been with the office for 18 years, she has extensive experience, both in Justice Court and with this office, and using her as both a manager for our Justice Court where everybody probably knows that we have 3,000 plus court cases in Justice Court every year, it's where we meet the public the most, to make sure that we're doing our best with all of those cases. This person can add to the management level at that, at that position, and we're thinking so we get, we get plus, plus, plus for those positions to be combined. I've also elevated already within our office, Liz Culmone - Mills to be a Deputy Chief Assistant, and what she is adding is incredible management experience for our office, she's terrific. We have, everybody is doing double duty in my office right now. The fact that she's willing and is undertaken this responsibility is really helpful to both our office and the community. And it also improves everything in our office, make sure that we can audit and do all the, the management levels that we have to do to make sure our office is performing properly and, and she's undertaking this responsibility willingly and in an excellent way that I think she needs to be paid for that additional management responsibility.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, any other discussion? Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I'll just say, you know, my experience, especially when I was sitting in as the Chair of Law Enforcement & Public Safety is that the District Attorney, and I find the same thing with the Sheriff, like if they say that they need something, they most unquestionably need something. And so, you know, I, I think that we elected these people to do their job and if there, if he expressed this concern, and he's making these changes, I would trust that these are necessary.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Just with all due respect to the District Attorney, I got a lot of respect for him. I don't know that I've ever seen this much moving around of positions, realigning of positions reclassifying of positions in one department in a period of 12 months, which gives me pause to support this tonight. You know, I, I understand what Legislator Walters saying, but I mean, we reclassified positions in his office

in the budget without a desk audit. You know, for you know, I don't think that we've ever had the Sheriff come to us, asking for reclassification, without, without a desk audit, and without, you know, coming with, you know, what, what needs to be done. I mean, this isn't CSEA I mean, we could reclassify this to, to garbage collector if we wanted to, but, you know, I, I just, I, I can't support it tonight. You know, I understand where the DA is coming from, and I understand where Legislator Walters coming from I just, I just can't.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed?

Legislator Ronk: Opposed.

Chairman Gavaris: One opposed, thank you.

360: Authorizing the execution of intermunicipal agreement for expenses related to improving criminal justice responses. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Second? Legislator Cahill. Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

361: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 295,188.26 for Tyler Industry, Technologies. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Legislator Ronk. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

362: Approving the execution of contract for 50,000 for Tay Fisher's Community Cornerstone. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Ronk. Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

363: Authorizing the Chair of the Legislature to execute a contract, a grant application with required assurances from New York Connects program. Can I have a kind of motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Ronk. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

364: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 948,150 for Catholic Charities for Orange, Sullivan, and Ulster. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Ronk. Discussion? Cahill you have discussion or no? No. Okay. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

365: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 45,000, causing the aggregate to exceed 50,000 for Abbott House. Can I have a motion? I'll move it. Second? Author Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

366: Approving the execution of a contract amendment 250,000 for Abbott House. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Ronk. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

367: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for \$22,250 to cause the aggregate to exceed 50,000 for Bonadio & Company. Can I have a motion? Legislator Ronk. Second, Walter. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

368: Amending the 2022 Ulster County budget to accept increased funding from New York State Office of Addiction Services. Can I have motion?

Legislator Ronk: Move.

Chairman Gavaris: Second?

Legislator Wal, Fabiano. Discussion? All those in favor?

Legislator Fabiano: Second.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

369: Amending the 2022 budget to accept increased funding

370: Amending the 2022 budget to accept increased funding from Office of Mental Health cost of living adjustment. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

Legislator Ronk: Move.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

371: Amending the 2022 budget to accept increased funding from Office of Mental Health for supportive housing. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Cahill. Discussion? All those in favor?

Opposed? So carried.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: 372: Amending the 2022 budget to increase funding from Office of Mental Health for cost of living. Can I have a motion? Second, Walter. Discussion? All those in favor?

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: 373: Amending the 2022 budget to increase funding from Office of Mental Health for cost of living.

Legislator Ronk: Move.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

374: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for \$29,590, 521 causing the aggregate to exceed 50,000, Access Supports for Living. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Ronk. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

375: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 9,067 causing the aggregate to exceed 50,000, Astor Services for Children and Families. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Ronk. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

376: Approving the execution of a amendment for 180,349 for Gateway Industries. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Second?

Legislator Fabiano: I'll second it.

Chairman Gavaris: Fabiano. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

377: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 30,77-766 causing aggregate to exceed 50,000 for PEOPLE. Can I have have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Cahill. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

378: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 93,596 for Rehabilitation Support Services. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter.

Legislator Ronk: Move.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

379: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 72,856 for Family of Woodstock. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Ronk. All those, any discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

380: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 141,998 for Mental Health Associations in Ulster County. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Ronk. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

381: Approving the execution of a contract amendment of 14,037 exceeding 50,000 limit for Family Services Inc. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Ronk. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

382: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 7,105 exceeding 50,000 limit, HealthAlliance Mary's Avenue Campus. Can I have a motion? Legislator Ronk. Second? Walter. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye. Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

383: Establishing Capital Project 639, Hall of Records building roof restoration. Can I have a motion? Legislator Ronk. Second? Walter. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

385: Approving the execution of a contract for 510,600 for Titan Roofing Inc. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second Cahill. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

386: Approving the execution of a contract for 492,196 for AECOM USA. Can I have a motion? Legislator Ronk. Second, Walter. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

387: Approving, establishing Capital Project 640 for DPW Large Culvert pipe Program. Can I have a motion? Legislator Fabiano. Second, Walter. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

389: Amending the 2022 - 2027 Capital Improvement Program for number 641, Route 28 County Route 50. Could I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Ronk. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

391: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 100, \$101,060 for Complete Building Solutions. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: Move it.

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

Group: Aye. Aye

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

392: Approving the execution of a contract for rates anticipate to exceed 50,000 for Gordian Group. Can I have a motion? Legislator Ronk. Second, Walter. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

393: Approving the execution of a contract amendment for 13,970 causing the aggregate to exceed 50,000 for Dutchess Overhead Doors. Can I have a motion? Legislator Ronk. Second, Walter. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

394: Establishing Capital Project 643 UCAT Bus Purchase. Can I have a motion? Legislator Ronk. Second, Walter. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

396: Supporting and authorizing grant application for the Federal Transit to accept and administer 530, 5339(b) funding. Can I have a motion? Second? Walter. Discussion? Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Sorry. I unmuted too slow. I had a quick question on the 396.

Chairman Gavaris: We're on 396.

Legislator Walter: No. We aren't, no, aren't we on 397 now?

Legislator Ronk: No.

Chairman Gavaris: No, we're on 396. You, you were faster than you thought.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Oh good, discussion. Sorry. Just do, how many of these green buses do we have so far and, and what is, do you have a sort of plan, like in one year, two year, five year coming forth?

Legislator Walter: Deputy Executive Kelly, you have a response?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you Chair. We currently have three electric buses in operation, we'll be looking to procure another five and then part of what we're doing is, we have to really look at our charging infrastructure, which can be quite expensive to move behind, beyond kind of the immediate area, pulling out of Kingston, because you can't just plug these into normal charging stations. So it's not that we're going to stop procuring. These things can take 12 to 18 months just to get into our possession. But we certainly have to start looking at kind of satellite locations, where we can put these charging stations or potentially even look for locations where we can base the buses out of in order to charge them from there, initiate them from there and serve other parts of the county, because we still do have the limitation on how far they can travel.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter, do you want to follow up?

Legislator Walter: Yeah, related to that, I mean, have you reconsidered, kind of how the routings can work so that you have more of buses serving within a cluster, but connecting at certain places, so you would just do a bus connection, rather, and then I know, at one point, there was a conversation of kind of create these bridge opportunities, maybe even on call bridge opportunities.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Sure.

Legislator Walter: So is that part of the larger.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, so during, right now, actually, on the 18th we're making a presentation with Via for microtransit. So part of the microtransit pilot is to look at our fixed route scout, scheduling for our buses in conjunction with microtransit, which helps get people off of the fixed route into other areas. So part of this whole thing is right now looking at all of our routing to find maximum efficiency. So I had that discussion, actually, with the director today about existing software and how we can use that for some of this. But we, we may look at some other tools through Via that can help us do that type of scheduling. So we're looking at all of that right now. Part of the bus driver shortage has certainly pressured us into looking for efficiencies, while also serving people where they need to go at the times they need to be there, which is a lot of feedback we've gotten from the different transit groups we've been working with, including through Legislator Erner. So certainly looking at that.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Cahill, you hand your up before.

Legislator Cahill: Thank you. So last year, we we passed a couple of capital projects directly related to the increased capacity for electric buses. So this is above and beyond that in a satellite locations I'm assuming at or is it's part of that project.

Deputy Executive Kelly: So, so right now, this is just the purchase of additional buses and the discussion that I had with the director today was just, we're going to get to eight buses and that will serve an area that flows out of the Golden Hill bus garage location, which is our only charging station. So we are limited on how far out we can go from there without creating too much headway time or you do have to bring these back in for charge at times. So we do feel comfortable that we can certainly do the Kingston area, Saugerties we're doing and some of the other routes, but we have we were not going to be able to run down to Ellenville and back in an efficient way on these buses just yet. So I think there's going to have to be further analysis about the potential for. It's not set in stone, but the potential for ancillary charging stations or storage locations, in order to keep this going. It also gets really expensive. Over time, the charging installations are extremely expensive. So we have to be really thoughtful and strategic about how we go about it. We're certainly committed I think, you know, part of the Green New Deal, it's I can be corrected on this, but I believe it's a 30 or 40% goal of our fleet by 2025 or so. That, that means that we do have to make significant investments in that charging infrastructure. So it all has to go together. But this is really about buses and support vehicles right now to support what we have locally, and then we're going to be working towards the larger goal of the whole Green Fleet.

Legislator Cahill: So, so should we be looking at that Capital Project on Golden Hill, and maybe downsizing that project and creating new projects in a more diverse, geographically diverse part of the county so we can satisfy some of these far flung places with electric buses, right? I mean

Deputy Executive Kelly: Potentially. Yeah, sure. I, I think, you know, Dennis has put a lot of work into this and I think with the technology evolving, just even since we bought the new flyers, you're starting to

see buses that have in excess of 300 miles on, on a charge so this, as anyone knows what the electric and the battery capacity technology is, it's, it's expanding. But we do have to be thoughtful and, and like to your to your point, yeah, we are going to have to look at that. Doesn't mean that we won't need extra storage here, because the population centers still here. May end up being two smaller locations in the end but the discussion is ongoing, certainly,

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: As a representative of a far flung place, you know, to use Legislator Cahill's words, you know, perhaps, you know, a couple of these, you know, charging stations or whatnot, could be co located at our DPW substations, which are better distributed in through and throughout the county than any of our other buildings. Just a thought.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. And also just because what's the point of the buses if we don't have everybody using them? I brought this up in health, but I just would like some a little bit more clarity in the food insecurity assessment that we that our intern did identify that one barrier to using the bus for grocery shopping is the limit of only one bag per bus. So just wondering if you could make a commitment to allow more, you know, maybe up to three bags, and that the especially the vulnerable population gets made aware of that change. So I don't know if you've thought about it since that meeting, that I brought it up, but it seems a very [inaudible].

Deputy Executive Kelly: I wasn't at the Health and Human Services meeting.

Legislator Walter: Okay.

Deputy Executive Kelly: But I'd certainly, yeah, I hear the feedback and, and I'll certainly look into it and get back to you.

Legislator Walter: Great both changing the rules

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yes.

Legislator Walter: and making sure people know that, that they can use the, they can bring more bags on.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Absolutely. Thank you for that.

Chairman Gavaris: Deputy Executive Kelly, question. So you mentioned that the company name, I, I know, I brought this up to the previous deputy executive, but there's a company called Proterra.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yup.

Chairman Gavaris: I believe, so you're familiar with them?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, that's, so Proterra, on that they're running 300 plus miles.

Chairman Gavaris: Yes.

Deputy Executive Kelly: They're charging but, so yeah, I, I know about Proterra. It's I don't know what the cost is when we went out for I think it was, it was a competitive bid on this. We ended up with two of them on there that were closer, and it was new, New Flyer, and then there was one other company. But I'm, I'm certainly aware that's one of the companies I've been looking at for those longer range mileage, so.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah, not only do their busses to have longer range, but they also have their own charging systems that they have produced, which are apparently the highest

Deputy Executive Kelly: overheads

Chairman Gavaris: yeah, and, and that they're the fastest charging for the highest amount of energy. So they seem to be like the leader in this industry right now. They are West Coast based, but they are looking to come to the East. So this might be an opportunity and I think, Legislator Walters point about, somebody made the point I apologize, if I'm getting it wrong about you know, the routing and having the right amount of because as I noticed, like in Ellenville, for example, you have the same bus goes to Kingston on the same route multiple times a day yet the, the, the, the capacity of the bus is under utilized during the middle of the day, but we're still running this gigantic bus just for you know, two, three people, sometimes.

Deputy Executive Kelly: 100%, and that, and that was a lot of the discussion with it just happens that I was over there today and, and the scheduling was a big portion of our conversation and about how to jump back in and relook at it in a more intelligent way based on ridership and based on a need. So I do think that, I, I don't want to lose sight of the Via part of it because the Via is a it's a software company, they have a routing and scheduling software that is very robust and if we win this award, it, it'll feed us on both ends. It's, microtransit is not separate from transit it is going to complement and be part of our overall transit system for the county. So we are very hopeful about that. That but it doesn't mean that we're not going to look at scheduling regardless, that's, that's ongoing, so.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. Thank you.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yup.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other comments on this? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

397: Authorizing the Chair of the Legislature to execute an intermunicipal agreement for information sharing for short term rentals. Can I have a motion? Legislator Ronk. Second? Bartels. Discussion? All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

398: Authorizing the County of Ulster to increase allocation of sales tax distribution. Can I have a motion? Legislator Cahill. Second, Bartels. Discussion? Legislator Cahill first and then Walter.

Legislator Cahill: Thank you. So I read through the agreement, I read through the schedule, and the thing that I'm a little concerned about, or questioning, I should say, is that we're, we're using 2022 sales tax distribution collections for the 2022 year, the agreement expires on February in 2026. So how do we execute the 2026 aspect of this? If the agreement is expired, we're, we're using the full year collection to distribute the excess sales tax for 2022 at the end of the year, but we don't have the full year at the end of the agreement to use that. So I'm just looking for some explanation as to how the mechanics of this agreement will pan out at the end of the agreement.

Chairman Gavaris: I don't believe that's true but I'll let Deputy Executive Kelly respond, I, I read through it today.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Thank you, Chair. So this, this part of the agreement was triggered by us exceeding the 2020, budgeted amount of 128 million. So we've exceeded that amount, which triggers a conversation between the county and the municipalities about sharing additional revenues with them. So it's based on '21 collections which exceeded, it's not based on this year. It's and these will, this is all taken in as a single shot. So what we're asking as part of the agreement with the supervisors is that for this year, based on us exceeding on the 21, budget year to enact an additional 1% for the municipalities based on the existing formula. 4% is overall, they currently get 3%. So this is an additional percent on top of the 3.

Legislator Cahill: So real quick, I just want

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, yeah.

Legislator Cahill: clarification on, on the chart that we were provided,

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yup.

Legislator Cahill: the estimated distribution in that chart has 2022. Is that the distribution or the [inaudible]

Deputy Executive Kelly: That

Legislator Cahill: year?

Deputy Executive Kelly: That's the distribution, the collection year's '21, the distributions '22, and that's the approximately one and a half million overall from all the different towns.

Legislator Cahill: Yep, thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, thank you, Legislator Walter, then Ronk.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. So this follows on the same kind of questioning of the timing of when you're starting this distribution that I'm finding I'm a little confused about, because if it's for 2021, and the decision, the, the previous resolution said that you'd meet no later than May 1st the following year, so it'd be May 1st 2022, the allocation of any excess. It, it appears that the, the distribution doesn't really occur until 2023. Can you just explain when you see the municipalities actually getting this first amount?

Deputy Executive Kelly: So I, I guess I'll just walk through the [inaudible] a little bit of the why we set it up this way. So we typically don't certify all sales tax receipts and the books until the end of April. So that's why we trigger the meeting for May, to make sure that finance has everything accounted for. So we had that meeting, present the resolution to the legislature for the appropriation and the authority to execute upon that part. And then once we, if we do receive that permission here, then it's working with finance to cut the checks. It's, it's, that's, that's kind of it.

Legislator Walter: Okay, so, so it, because it just said that the last resolve says it's dispersed, dispersed in the last quarter of the year. So are you saying, because this is 2021 [inaudible]

Deputy Executive Kelly: Last quarter of the fiscal year. Yeah, this is yeah, 2021 money and will be dispersing it upon the agreement by the end of this year. So it'll hit their budgets as part of the '22 fiscal, last quarter of this year.

Legislator Walter: As opposed to after we approve it, it just gets distributed because the money has already been received.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, I, I, mean, I, I could maybe that's a no later than. I can follow up with Finance, if that's if that's the point. If it needed to be sooner, I could see if you like

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I think, I mean it could, it would be useful to know since it is 2021 money that we've obviously clearly will always know

Deputy Executive Kelly: Correct.

Legislator Walter: preceded it and what's what's the delay, but yeah, [inaudible]

Deputy Executive Kelly: Sure, that's reasonable. Okay.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. Thank you. Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, that's that's some of what I was gonna bring up. I didn't understand why, because it actually says, in, in the final resolved that we're gonna disperse the 1% of gross sales tax collected in fiscal year 2022. But we're actually talking about it being 2021 money. That's that's the part that I think is tripping up a lot of people because, you know, the, the deal was, if if the '21 sales tax exceeded the high watermark, then they would, you'd get the town's would get 2021 money.

Deputy Executive Kelly: [inaudible] yes.

Legislator Ronk: Okay, and then, and then. So in theory, you know, we could be having the same discussion the following year, if 2022 numbers increase by a certain amount with 2022 money, and we'll make sure that it's worded better, so it doesn't look like 2023 money. I, I do have one more comment, and, and again, I, I support the resolution. What does concern me is that, you know, I, I feel strongly that the county shouldn't be paying the the entire 100% of this extra 1%. The City of Kingston benefited from, you know, the same boon that the county did, and they receive 11 and a half percent of the sales tax. So I believe that they should be sharing in 11 [inaudible].

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk, you cut out. All right, we'll come back to, we'll come back to Legislator Ronk. Supervisor Quigley. Supervisor Quigley.

Town of Ulster Supervisor Quigley: Thank you Chairman Gavaris. The calculation was based upon the calendar year 2021 sales tax exceeding the 2020 budgeted revenues, I'm at a loss as to why we the town's are waiting till the last quarter of 2022 for the distribution on monies that were collected in 2021. I also want to highlight for the Ways and Means Committee members that the sales tax collection cycle,

the December receipts, which close out the county's fiscal year, are not finally accounted for by the state until February, which usually triggers a distribution by the Department of Finance in March. Now that March distribution is a combination distribution of a final true up for the prior fiscal year, and a portion of the January and February sales tax. I had a discussion with Commissioner Gulnick this afternoon and we read the resolved statement in here and he basically interpreted that he would be cutting the checks in 2023, after the final accounting for 2022 was made. And I find that based upon the understanding of the supervisors association that we're trying to distribute 2021 monies that are in the bank, now. There's no question as to the accounting. Why is it that we're the town's are going to wait until either December of 2022, or possibly as late as February March of 2023. Per my discussion with the Commissioner of Finance. That's my question.

Chairman Gavaris: I'll let Deputy Executive Kelly speak because I think he's got a response to that.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, I, I'm gonna work on that. I hear you guys loud and clear and my intention was that it would be distributed with this year. So I'm gonna follow up on that.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: Just had a question about all the all the different towns, these municipalities are going to get. I, I understand how it, it registered, we hit a certain point. So all that did was basically guarantee a meeting with I think, Mr. Quigley on behalf of the towns, and what they came out of it was a small share. How do we, what, do we have some kind of formula? How do we decide what towns get what? Do, does and specifically this population and where the taxes were generated come into play? Because to me, if it doesn't, I don't think it does. That doesn't make a heck of a lot of sense. And I would think that the Town of Ulster, Saugerties, and New Paltz probably get, you know, make out the least, and should probably get a bigger check. This goes to the original agreement as well, where the City of Kingston is getting an 11, a half, I think, 11 and a half for the 15%, the town's divvy up three and a half. And the Town of Ulster is probably producing the majority of those funds and all the costs that come along with entertaining all those businesses, and they don't get any of it and at some point, I think we have to have that conversation. I know my town that I represent, also does not get nearly their fair share.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Leg, unless Deputy Executive Kelly wants to respond to that I'll

Deputy Executive Kelly: So it's based on property valuation within the municipality, there's two ways of doing this under the I believe it's under the law. So you can either do it under population calculation, or you do it under property valuation. So Ulster County does it under the property valuation calculation. So that extra 1% is based on the 3% that they've already received. So it's just extending that calculation.

Legislator Maloney: It doesn't, we, we don't have to, I mean, Kingston getting it, you know, that goes back many years, and there was development that was going on down at the strand. I don't think it was ever

Deputy Executive Kelly: treated much differently under the law, because the City of Kingston can preempt county level,

[inaudible]

Deputy Executive Kelly: and they can collect their own. No, no, that doesn't really work well for the county or the rest of the towns and residents, so.

Legislator Maloney: It would for a lot, many of the municipalities, it would for the Town of Ulster, it would for Saugerties, it certainly would, we don't get nearly much, as much back as we could. Quick question, could we choose this this right here, could we choose the other formula to give this small percentage back in this one case? Or do we have to follow the same formula that we follow to begin with? Do we have that leverage because it seems we have a lot of leverage? We didn't have to do anything at all. Do you know what I'm asking?

Deputy Executive Kelly: I mean, are you asking me?

Legislator Maloney: I guess I'm asking you.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Sure. No, we believe the proposal and the agreement we worked out with the Supervisors Association is the right agreement for the county and it's based off existing precedent. So that's what we support and that's what we put forward.

Chairman Gavaris: Yes. Go ahead Deputy Executive Kelly.

Legislator Maloney: I was just asking a just a question on process. Where could we have chosen to give out using a different formula this 1%? Just a yes or no, it doesn't mean you have to, I was just asking if we could.

Deputy Executive Kelly: I'd have to do some research. I don't think it would be affected in the law since this is additional to the existing formula but I'd have to do some research on that.

Legislator Maloney: Just, just one, one more comment now that I do have quite a few, I, I, we in Saugerties we do have homeless shelters and, and we have a lot of costs there. Our population is almost identical to the City of Kingston. And we get crumbs. We have our own police, police policing as well, large Parks and Rec budget, we have our own safety net now. And we are getting nothing compared to

the City of Kingston and, and, and speaking for the Town of Ulster, they, they really don't get their fair share. I think it's something we need to revisit.

Legislator Heppner: Chair Gavaris, do you mind if I chime in?

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah, go ahead. I don't have you on the thing but go ahead.

Legislator Heppner: Through the chair, you know, to Supervisor Quigley. My understanding is that this agreement was approved by the Supervisors Association, based on the fact that the money does not have any independent strings attached to it and that's one of the biggest thing you [inaudible].

Chairman Gavaris: Supervisor Quigley.

Town of Ulster Supervisor Quigley: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Heppner. The Supervisors Association has echoed the concerns that Mr. Maloney has expressed on the allocation methods, but when debated, we always have come back to the existing methodology being the most rational. And given the fact that this methodology has been applied consistently since the start of the sales tax sharing agreement. It would if there is an, an initiative on behalf of the legislature to investigate this and to negotiate it it should be done at the period of time when the contract is renewed, not when we're in the middle of a contract. The supervisors have been briefed on the amounts, I have heard no objections. And as Legislator Heppner has stated, the biggest concerns expressed when this discussion started was the possibility of having strings or mandates attached to this distribution. At the present time, I will say that notwithstanding the discussion on the year and the calculation of the dollars, the Supervisors Association and its members are in agreement that the methodology and the payment should be made.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. All right, Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. I will say, this wasn't originally what I was going to say, but also that I also agree with Legislator Maloney that there is a better way to do this but I also agree with the Supervisor, that this isn't the right moment, because I don't want to, this is pretty groundbreaking, that we're even doing this. And I'm really happy and I don't want to delay it. So on that, what I would like to request is I could see some very easy changes, amendments this, which would mean, in the first resolved if you took out the 'in fiscal year 2022' so it just read that it approves that an additional 1% of the sales tax collected. And if in the last resolved instead of saying collected in fiscal year 2022, it would say 2021 and that it would be dispersed at the approval, you know, at the at the point of approval by the legislature. But it because it's currently definitely reading, especially that last result that had sales tax collected in 2022. When in fact this is about sales tax collected in 2021. Unless I'm misunderstanding what fiscal year means. It just, it sounds that way. So I would love to have perhaps consider those changes so that we can move it along or, or we'll postpone it for one week so that we can make those corrections to approve it next week. But I would like it to be clear that it's 2021 money to be distributed right away.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah, I see, I see no harm in postponing a week just to get the clarification. So I guess we'll go to the others got their hands up. Legislator Uchitelle.

Legislator Uchitelle: Thank you, Chair Gavaris. You know, I just wanted to say in, in response to kind of the direction that some of this conversation is going in, you know, I, I could go on at length about how Kingston doesn't have a single county road, and, and provides a lot of services that the county provides for all of the other municipalities and I could go on and length about that. But instead, I'll just share a story that on, as, as some of you know, a few of us, here in the City of Kingston, volunteer for a group called the Kingston emergency food collaborative, we do deliveries for food, that are all prepared at the Hodge Center, which is a industrial kitchen that is run by the city, and, and prepares meals for people in need. This Monday, I spent my Monday driving through Saugerties, that was the route that I was on driving all through Saugerties making deliveries of food. And I'm very happy to do it. And the City of Kingston is definitely excited for more folks who are interested in collaborating with us as we expand the services that we provide to help everybody in the county, I don't mean the city formally, I mean, those in the city, and using the resources of the city. And we're always looking for more resources. So if other municipalities in the county want to want to jump into this, we can definitely have those conversations. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Bartels.

Legislative Chair Bartels: Thank you. I was just going to echo that. Well, first of all, to say that I'm totally supportive of this. But I think that we should get the language right. So if there is no harm in waiting a week and fixing it, I think that's what we should do. Supervisor Quigley raised some concerns that he discussed with Commissioner of Finance. I do also want to note that it would, it would be nice to have the Commissioner of Finance at these meetings so that when these things come up, we can ask these questions directly and potentially get it sorted in real time. But, yeah, so I'd be amenable to one week, no longer, but just to get it right.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Cahill.

Legislator Cahill: Thank you. So going back to the reason why we have a sales tax agreement in the first place. Kingston is a city therefore they have the ability to raise their own sales tax. And the reason this agreement is in place in the first place is because they've agreed to not have a sales tax and defer to the county to share the county collections, right? And so that really is the root of why. The City of Kingston at any time, can say no, we don't want to play ball with the county, we will not take part in any sales tax collection distribution going forward. And that will be that then we'll be stuck on our own with what our sales tax allocation is. And then we will be dividing that probably none of it to the town's quite honestly because we need every penny of it. Right. So you know, that is really the the crux of where this

started and why we have to negotiate with the City of Kingston, and why they get the lion's share of what the county doesn't take, right.

Chairman Gavaris: Alright, Deputy Executive Kelly, then Legislator Fabiano, then Maloney.

Deputy Executive Kelly: I just wanted to highlight one portion. So the Mayor is, of City of Kingston, is an invited participant in the Town Supervisors Association, Association, and they actually changed their bylaws to have him be a present member. So in our discussions with the supervisors and the mayor, what we've done since this is coming out of county shares, we have exempted the City of Kingston from applying for ARPA funds from the county for the different programs that we've opened up to the town. So they are not eligible for the 500,000 in the water and sewer. And I know they have water and sewer projects. But in order to facilitate the agreement they did, they did agree to not be applying for any of those programs. So in that sense, they have given up that opportunity as well. And the other part was I was going to echo Legislator Cahill's point is it does get quite complicated when it comes to the preemption. And I know that was looked at. I don't know, maybe it's five, maybe it's six, seven years ago, during the last time this agreement was up, but it didn't look beneficial for many of the municipalities or the county as a whole. And from a county perspective, we have to be concerned about how it affects the whole and not, and not just the individual. So thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Fabiano.

Legislator Fabiano: Yes, I just also want to say that I also support the postponement of this, for the week. So when it comes back to us next week to vote on it, the proper changes will be made to make sure that it will go to the, the right way.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: Yep, real quick. I was a yes on this all the way. I'd actually spoken to a couple of supervisors in while these discussions were going on, and wasn't a guarantee that the county was going to do this. But they ended up doing it and I was happy they did. I mean, yes, on this The reason I was bringing those points up was food for thought and just letting everyone know, there is other ways of going about this. If I'm hearing from Mr. Cahill and Mr. Kelly, that the City of Kingston would do better if they went and collected their own 1% and exited the agreement with the county and that many towns in this county by just distrib, by coming up with a deal. Now first of all, the county doesn't even have to distribute. So all these numbers can be played with if you're telling me 11 and a half of the 15% that we give to the City of Kingston is the perfect fair amount. That I'm just saying that's a rather simplistic way without a lot of information to look at it. I'm saying that Saugerties getting 500,000, a million dollars and the City of Kingston getting 17 and a half million or whatever it is. I'm saying that's probably Saugerties, dare I say that if we got a fair deal from the, the county, and the City of Kingston did their own thing, a lot of towns in this county would lower their taxes if they were able to put that money to

get a fair share of the sales tax they produced. I would love to see those numbers that you're quoting that somehow the City of Kingston out of the goodness of their hearts are not doing their own thing and getting less money and all the towns are getting a bigger share of that's the I, I do not believe for one second that's what we play out. And that's we've had these discussions and through the years, there's been times where it's gotten pretty contentious between the county and the City of Kingston over this. So this is not the, the matter of fact way this is being discussed and almost inferring that the City of Kingston is is is losing money on it and the towns are making more money with this deal is ridiculous. Saugerties does not nearly get their fair share, and neither does the town of Ulster, for that matter.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, thanks. Um, you know, I think that the issue is that if the if the City of Kingston were, were to preempt us, they would receive less money than they do right now. That is, I believe, universally understood, because they would only be able to charge a 1% sales tax inside the city limits. Now here's the problem. The problem is that if they did preempt us, my understanding is that the county would then only be able to charge a 1% sales tax outside of the city of Kingston, and we would lose the other 3% of the sales tax that we charge. So, you know, I, I tend to agree with you, if we were able to charge our 4% sales tax outside of the City of Kingston, I would have no problem with them preempting. Because they'd lose, we'd win. But that's not my understanding of the way that the, the sales tax.

Legislator Maloney: I was under the impression that would be up to the state legislature that they could do that to us, but they wouldn't necessarily have to. I've never, I've never understood it that that we would lose there, there'd be no discussion to be had if that was the case.

Legislator Ronk: I think that's the reason there's never been a discussion to be had because I believe that they've, they've sort of got that proverbial, you know, you know, leverage over us.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, why don't we have the attorneys look in to get an answer instead of the speculation going on because, as may have been pointed out, in a different context, we're not all experts here.

Legislator Erner.

Legislator Erner: Thank you, as another representative of this City of Kingston, obviously, I want what's good for the City of Kingston, but I worry when I hear the body, pitting one place against another and saying, well, we'll lose, you'll win, sort of thing like that, and I, I'm new here still, and I'm still learning about how this all works. And so I do appreciate the discussion. I want to see if there's a win win for everybody in the county as well. And, and the information we get hopefully gets us to that. Thank you.

Legislator Ronk: I mean, you know, just to may I, Mr. Chairman?

To Legislator Erner's point. You know, your community has, what, 25,000 people or so in the City of Kingston? Is that about accurate? Anybody with a knowledge? Yeah. So your community has 25,000 people and receives somewhere in the area of \$17 million from the sales tax. My community has 14,000 people and receive somewhere in the area of \$200,000 from the sales tax. So that, that, that's where the conversation about winners and losers comes in. I understand that there's there's differences between this

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah, yeah, go ahead.

We lost you Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Maloney: and to finish up Ken's point of the same a \$250,000 house in the City of Kingston for a young family, their their taxes are going to end up being half of what you would pay for a \$250,000 residence in Saugerties. So when you talk about 17 something going to Kingston and my town happened 23,000 people in it. And and and paying twice the taxes that that that money that we're not getting for our sales tax that you are does affect my constituents. So it's not me versus you. It's about getting the number right and making it fair to have that conversation. There is a debate where I want something and you want something else.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. I think there's a great conversation. I I was very interested in it when the last agreement happened. I hope we keep the energy going when the next one happens not too many years ahead. But I'm putting in a motion to postpone this for a week. Since I don't think officially there has been one.

Chairman Gavaris: There has not been. Second?

Legislator Fabiano: I'll second that motion.

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

Opposed? So carried. Thank you.

Group: Aye.

Legislator Cahill: Majority Leader, Majority Leader Heppner did have his hand up, though, Chair.

Chairman Gavaris: I'm sorry, he's not on video, so I don't see him. Majority leader, go ahead.

Legislator Heppner: So I would just like to ask Supervisor Quigley, is the position of the Supervisors Association that we should postpone? How do you feel about that?

Town of Ulster Supervisor Quigley: I would agree to the postponement with the intention to clarify the language so there is no misunderstanding on anyone's part on how this is to be carried out.

Correct.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. All right. Everybody received the 2022

Legislator Heppner: If I could follow up?

Chairman Gavaris: Sure. Sure.

Legislator Heppner: So Supervisor Quigley, how do you feel about the number distribution? You're still good with that?

Town of Ulster Supervisor Quigley: The number distribution when I calculated when I calculated using Commissioner Gulnick's filed financial statements. The gross amount representing 1% of an additional distribution to the town's was about \$1,548,000, I believe. I'm certain that when Commissioner Gulnick sits down to look at the numbers and make the calculation, he will come up with a number very close to the number that I just articulated, because that's what he filed and

[inaudible]

Legislator Heppner: And so, have you talked to Mayor Noble about this?

Town of Ulster Supervisor Quigley: I spoke to Mayor Noble about a month ago when he informed me that the discussion between himself and the County Executive was going to be, there would be no sales tax distribution. We are a long way from that conversation at this point in time.

Legislator Heppner: Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. All right, everybody, Legislator Maloney.

Legislator Maloney: Can I just make a request for the resolution itself. If we, if we do postpone, can we

Okay. Can we have, can we get a list of every municipality and how much their share is? That's a pretty basic.

Chairman Gavaris: It's already postponed, we've already voted.

Legislator Walter: It's in [inaudible].

Deputy Executive Kelly: It's already on the resolution, we submitted it as part of the backup.

Legislator Maloney: Okay, I gotta take a look at

Deputy Executive Kelly: That plus the 1%. Yeah.

Legislator Maloney: Thank you.

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yup.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, they 20 the calendar for the budget has been sent out. Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: You could finish your sentence first. It's just for when you're done with your sentence.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. I don't know if anybody had chance to look at it yet. But if not, you know, let's do it next week. Let's approve the calendar. And just so if you have not already looked at it, please look at it between now and then.

Legislator Walter and then Ronk.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. So at the last budget, we were compelled to add a number of people into the Finance Department and have Innovation with the promise of a fantastic new budget that will have goal settings, I guess, five year goals and percentages and just be much more enhanced than any budget we've ever seen. So I just want to remind Deputy Executive Kelly of that promise, when we approved all those other people that were really expecting this highly innovative, prospective goal setting budget that will be unlike any that we've ever seen before. And that I'm really looking forward to that idea, which I know has been expressed of saying, things that we're hoping for, again, like within five years, and how these different expenditures will work towards those ultimate goals so that we really, and that they're set up with a clarity of what the vision is for the county, so that and it's set up in a way that our community members can really understand it. So I just wanted to say that I'm given the extra three to four people. I'm really excited about this brand-new budget that we're gonna see.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Legislator Ronk, do you have your hand up before? [inaudible].

Legislator Ronk: Yes. I did.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah. Go ahead.

Legislator Ronk: On the budget schedule, are we still planning a meeting and a public hearing on election day?

Chairman Gavaris: Yes.

Legislator Ronk: I respectfully suggest that we change that day, because I will not be there, able to be participating.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, well, we'll talk about it next week then when we're in person. Look at if another time works better. Deputy Executive Kelly, you had your hand up?

Deputy Executive Kelly: Yeah, I, I just want to clarify one point. We didn't add additional positions, we combined the unit of budget and innovation, and we actually lost a position within the unit. So that actually got smaller. And over the last two years, we have focused on the innovation, including a completely new budget program and online interactive site. So yeah, we're, we're going to continue to work towards there. I'm not in budget anymore, unfortunately but we, we got smaller. We, we lost a position in that unit. So I just wanted to clarify that point.

Chairman Gavaris: And to, to that point, Legislator Walter, in fairness, that whole plan of having this fantastic award winning budget presented was contingent on Deputy Executive Kelly being in that position now that he's been promoted, that promise went out the window.

Legislator Walter: Right. So [inaudible]

Chairman Gavaris: I'm joking when I say this,

Deputy Executive Kelly: [inaudible]

Chairman Gavaris: I want to be clear that I am joking when I say that.

Legislator Walter: Well, sorry, to be clear, I'm not I mean, again, and we can look at the minutes very clearly, we were asked about inc to approve increases in finance and improved this Innovation Department and told us the reason of the innovation department was because we were going to see innovations in the budget.

Legislator Walter: If changes happened after, not my problem. I I voted in favor of it because that was what we were told. And at the time, I expressed concerns and belief that it would happen. Expressed dis, disbelief that that was what it was going to take to have this type of innovative budget. But I, I will be extremely, extremely disappointed if we do not see it. And I certainly hope that if we don't see one, that you're not going to be asking for more people to further innovate a budget that you perhaps won't but you know, you have time. I hope it's there. You all seem very committed and again, if you forget your commitment, we can look back at the transcript.

Chairman Gavaris: Yes.

And I will confirm, Legislator Walter's correct. That was the commitment that was given that this budget would be very helpful for us to see. All right. All right, if nothing else, Comptroller Gallagher's not here, but Alicia, you were going to present on something.

Deputy Comptroller DeMarco: Yep, I just have two quick topics on behalf of the Comptroller. The first being our fund balance report, it was released last week out of our office. In summary, Ulster County closed out 2021, with about \$85 million in unassigned general fund balance, that's \$54 million in excess of your current upper threshold of 10% of general operating expenses. The report went into a few recommendations about how you could reduce the excess of that balance, including increasing the threshold, historically, we've been closer to 15% is what we're carrying as our fund balance. If we think that that's a good number to be at, you guys could amend the policy to 15% of general operating expenses, reallocate some of that fund balance to reserve funds, we do have a few reserve funds currently in use, that could be increased, capital reserves for capital projects, insurance reserves to mitigate insurance costs and tax stabilization funds. I know you guys move some funds in and out of those reserves in the most recent year. And there are a few other reserve funds that are allowable under general municipal law that we don't currently have, repair funds, snow and ice removal, solid waste management and some related to employee benefits and retirement contributions. Those could be used to mitigate future costs and bring us in alignment with the policy and then also consider other ways to cut taxes or offer rebates, you guys passed the gas tax holiday, which will probably result in about \$3 million less revenue there. So that'll help the excess fund balance, you guys consider other programs like that. And lastly, the report suggested taking a look at your fund balance policy to include some other governmental funds like the special revenue fund, the County Road Fund, the road machinery Fund and the debt service fund, we recently started allocating some of our real property tax revenues to those funds, your current policy doesn't speak to those funds. So as we start to use those funds, you might want to keep an eye on what level of fund balance you think is appropriate for those and maybe include them in the policy going forward. That's available on our website. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to me or March and then we're working on the real property tax audit. I know there's been a lot of discussion about 701 Grant Avenue, we have started working on the foreclosure process and real property tax collections as a whole. We're working through all of the properties for 2017 and

'18, right now. It's a lot of information to work through, it's going to take us a few months. And we plan to expand the audit as time allows and the process unfolds. There's a timeline, so '17 and '18 should be, you know, mostly completed at this point. So we hope to have an update, you know, again in a few months on, on those two tax years. So and that's all I have for you guys. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. All right. Anybody else have anything? All right, if not a motion to adjourn.

Legislator Ronk: I move we adjourn.

Chairman Gavaris: Second?

Legislator Fabiano: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Cahill. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed?. Thank you. As of right now, we're going to be at the college. This is a reminder at 530. We'll look it over again. But I think we're going to keep 530 I don't think we need to meet earlier but if there is some reason to do earlier, you'll get notified. So all right. Thank you all.

Legislator Fabiano: Good night.