

**Ways &  
Means Committee  
Regular Meeting Minutes**

**DATE & TIME:** August 18, 2020 – 5:30  
**LOCATION:** Powered by Zoom Meeting by dialing 1-646-558-8656, Meeting ID 998 7904 1106  
**PRESIDING OFFICER:** Lynn Archer, Chairwoman  
**LEGISLATIVE STAFF:** Natalie Kelder, Amber Feaster, and Jay Mahler  
**PRESENT:** Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr., Tracey Bartels, John Gavaris, Heidi Haynes; Mary Beth Maio, and Eve Walter, and Legislative Chairman David B. Donaldson (arrived at 5:32 PM)  
**ABSENT:** None  
**QUORUM PRESENT:** Yes  
**OTHER ATTENDEES:** Legislators Jonathan Heppner, and Laura Petit; Legislative Counsel Christopher Ragucci; Minority Counsel Nicholas Pascale; Deputy County Executive Evelyn Wright; Deputy Comptroller Chris Quirk; Tom Kadgen, League of Women Voters; Juan Figueroa, Sheriff

- **Chairwoman Archer called the meeting to order at 5:31 PM**

---

**Motion No. 1: To discuss Resolution No. 191** – Establishing A Policy For Funding Non-County Organizations – Ulster County Legislature

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution adopts a Policy for Appropriating Funding to Non-County Organizations, and resolves that any non-county organization with funding appropriated by the Ulster County Legislature shall adhere to accountability standards and procedures set by the Legislature and as required by law, including compliance with applicable financial, performance measurement, and any additional reporting requirements, deadlines, and deliverables stated in the County contract.

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Ronk  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Gavaris

**Discussion:** Chairwoman Archer recapped the amendments discussed at the prior meeting of the Ways & Means Committee. Legislator Ronk offered a definition for “Non-County Agency”. Discussion pursued on how the proposed policy exempts other Legislative contractual agreements. Committee members agreed to add a definition for the term “Non-County Agency”. Further discussion pursued on the policy’s wording pertaining to “start up” agencies,

the timing for awarded funding as it relates to the completion of a contractual agreement, and the deadline for submissions for the 2020 fiscal year.

**Motion No. 2: To approve Resolution No. 191** – Establishing A Policy For Funding Non-County Organizations – Ulster County Legislature

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution adopts a Policy for Appropriating Funding to Non-County Organizations, and resolves that any non-county organization with funding appropriated by the Ulster County Legislature shall adhere to accountability standards and procedures set by the Legislature and as required by law, including compliance with applicable financial, performance measurement, and any additional reporting requirements, deadlines, and deliverables stated in the County contract.

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Ronk

**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Gavaris

**Discussion:** None

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Archer, Ronk, Bartels, Gavaris, Haynes, Maio, and Walter

**Voting Against:** Legislative Chairman Donaldson

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 7

**No. of Votes Against:** 1

**Disposition:** Approved

---

**Motion No. 3: To approve Resolution No. 276** – Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Transfer Title Of An Ulster County Sheriff's Office Dive Van To The Greene County Sheriff's Office – Ulster County Sheriff's Office

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution authorizes the Chair of the Legislature to execute all documents necessary to transfer title of Ulster County Sheriff's Office's older dive van to Greene County Sheriff's Office in exchange for \$1.00.

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Ronk

**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Bartels

**Discussion:** None

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

**Voting Against:** None

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 8

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Disposition:** Approved

---

**Motion No. 4: To approve Resolution No. 286** – Approving The Execution Of A Contract In Excess Of \$50,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Clear Ballot Group, Inc. – Board Of Elections

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with Clear Ballot Group, Inc. from July 21, 2020 through July 21, 2024 for a software license agreement, installation, and training for elections software in the amount of \$83,580.00.

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Ronk  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Bartels

**Discussion:** None

**Voting In Favor:** Legislators Archer, Bartels, Gavaris, and Walter, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

**Voting Against:** None

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 8

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Disposition:** Approved

---

**Motion No. 5: To approve Resolution No. 293** – Approving The Execution Of A Contract In Excess Of \$50,000.00 Entered Into By The County – William E. Munson Co., Inc. D/B/A Munson Boats – Ulster County Sheriff

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with William E. Munson Co., Inc. D/B/A Munson Boats from July 1, 2020 through September 30, 2021 for construction of a new Sheriff's Dept. boat in the amount of \$470,702.00.

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

**Discussion:** None

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

**Voting Against:** None

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 8

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Disposition:** Approved

---

**Motion No. 6: To approve Resolution No. 296** – Amending The 2020 Ulster County Budget To Accept An Allocation Of Funds From The New York State Office Of Temporary And Disability Assistance To Support Activities Associated With Sheltering The Homeless During Inclement Winter Weather (Code Blue Plan) – Department Of Social Services

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution amends the 2020 Ulster County Budget in the amount of \$371,221.00 upon notification from the New York State Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance (OTDA) and Family Services (OCFS) of approval of the County’s plan to support activities associated with sheltering the homeless during inclement winter weather (Code Blue Plan).

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Ronk  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Bartels

**Discussion:** None

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

**Voting Against:** None

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 8

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Disposition:** Approved

---

**Motion No. 7: To approve Resolution No. 297** – Approving The Execution Of A Contract In Excess Of \$50,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Capital Market Advisors, LLC – Legislature

**Resolution Summary:** This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with Capital Market Advisors, LLC from September 1, 2020 through December 31, 2020 for an external analysis of the Ulster County Executive 2021 Recommended Budget in the amount of \$55,200.00.

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Ronk  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Bartels

**Discussion:** None

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

**Voting Against:** None

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 8

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Disposition:** Approved

---

**New Business:** Chairwoman Archer presented the 2020 Budget Schedule for the 2021 County Executive Recommended Budget. Legislator Bartels confirmed the reason for the two week period between the Ways & Means Committee Budgetary Appeals and Amendments meetings and the Legislature’s vote on the budget.

---

**Old Business:** None

---

Chairwoman Archer asked the members if there was any other business, and hearing none;

**Adjournment**

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Donaldson

**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Ronk

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 8

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Time:** 6:18 PM

**Respectfully submitted:** Amber Feaster

**Minutes Approved:** September 8, 2020

**Ways &  
Means Committee  
Regular Meeting Transcript**

**DATE & TIME:** August 18, 2020 – 5:30  
**LOCATION:** Powered by Zoom Meeting by dialing 1-646-558-8656,  
Meeting ID 998 7904 1106  
**PRESIDING OFFICER:** Lynn Archer, Chairwoman  
**LEGISLATIVE STAFF:** Natalie Kelder, Amber Feaster, and Jay Mahler  
**PRESENT:** Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr., Tracey Bartels, John  
Gavaris, Heidi Haynes; Mary Beth Maio, and Eve Walter,  
and Legislative Chairman David B. Donaldson (arrived at  
5:32 PM)  
**ABSENT:** None  
**QUORUM PRESENT:** Yes  
**OTHER ATTENDEES:** Legislators Jonathan Heppner, and Laura Petit; Legislative  
Counsel Christopher Ragucci; Minority Counsel Nicholas  
Pascale; Deputy County Executive Evelyn Wright; Deputy  
Comptroller Chris Quirk; Tom Kadgen, League of Women  
Voters; Juan Figueroa, Sheriff

---

**Chairwoman Archer:** Thank you everyone for joining today's Ways and Means meeting, the August 18<sup>th</sup> and it is 5:31. Amber would you call roll please?

**Natalie Kelder:** Okay, Archer.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Here.

**Natalie Kelder:** Ronk. Present.

Bartels.

**Legislator Bartels:** Here.

**Natalie Kelder:** Gavaris.

**Legislator Gavaris:** Present.

**Natalie Kelder:** Haynes.

**Legislator Haynes:** Here.

**Natalie Kelder:** Maio.

**Legislator Maio:** Here.

**Legislator Walter:** Walter.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Here.

**Natalie Kelder:** Present.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Right. Thank you, Natalie.

Okay. So, let's start off with Resolution 191. I'll take a motion.

**Legislator Ronk:** I'll move it.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Second? Legislator Gavaris. Okay. Discussion?

I know we had a couple of outstanding items as I see from our last meeting. One was the definition of legal, legislative contracts. The next one was a clarity on the 3.1 which is regarding not for profits. And 4.5, which was no later than 30 days. Did we want to change that to 90, is that what it was?

Legislator Ronk.

**Legislator Ronk:** Thank you. I will tell you this, you know, we'll start with the first one. I, I took a swing at coming up with a definition. Tracey, I don't know if you had, or if you had any ideas, but I'll just read what I came up with for a definition and we can decide if it's, you know, pinpoint enough while encompassing what we're trying to do. You know.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Legislator Ronk, where would this fall in your policy?

**Legislator Ronk:** I quite frankly, we would just, we would have to put it in somewhere. I would imagine, we would put it in, it would move everything down, one. So, instead of 1.0 Purpose, there'd be 2.0 would be Definitions, and then this definition would be in there, and then 2.0 would become three, etc.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Got it, okay, thank you.

**Legislator Ronk:** And the definition would read "Non-County Agency: Non-County Agency shall mean any organization that the County Legislature contracts with for agreed upon services during the budget, budget process subject to the requirements in this policy."

**Chairwoman Archer:** Natalie by chance, did you get that?

**Legislator Ronk:** I can type it and email to her.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Can you? So we can get it up on the screen and everybody could look at it.

Legislator Bartels.

**Legislator Bartels:** So, yeah, I tried to think it through, as well, Legislator Ronk. And I couldn't come up with something. But, but something did come up in our conversation yesterday, that even that definition wouldn't address. And that's because currently we don't allow for profit agencies. Even with the definition you just used, it would apply to our, our audit firm, which I think is a for profit firm, and our budget analysis firm, which, depending on which firms we've use, I think CGR is the only one that's a not for profit firm. And also, I think with that definition, it still technically would apply to agencies and organizations, that we as a county contract with,

**Legislator Ronk:** It wouldn't

**Legislator Bartels:** not that are only through the legislature. Why do you say would not? Can I ask?

**Legislator Ronk:** I, I specifically stated the County Legislature contracts with for agreed upon services during the budget process.

**Legislator Bartels:** Okay. So, that was a point of debate last night, for Legislator Petit, at one point talked about this being something that would be covered by all organizations that the county contracts with. So, for me, it created some confusion because I don't know what the intent is. But maybe you can answer the question about how the fact that it exempts, that we're not allowed to contract with for profit agencies, how we would contract with our audit firm or our,

**Legislator Ronk:** The audit firm is contracted through RFP. It is not contracted through, you know, agreed upon services during the budget process. And again, I'm, I'm, I'm trying to do two things at once. If you give me 45 seconds to type this to Natalie so she can get it up for everybody. So everyone can read it.

**Legislator Bartels:** That's fine. We can take 45, yeah, take whatever

**Chairwoman Archer:** Well, while we're waiting for that, do we want to address the issue of nonprofits. I think, Eve, that, that you had brought that up, I don't know if you have sound yet. Eve?

**Legislator Walter:** Yeah, you can hear me?

**Chairwoman Archer:** Yes, excellent, thank you.

**Legislator Walter:** So, yeah, so, I guess that there was a few things. One was whether we wanted to restrict this to only nonprofits and government, goes back to what Tracey was talking about. Because there are some, you know, sometimes very community based for profits that we might actually want to potentially have the capacity to, I mean, we always have the right to turn things down. But that, we allow that.

The other one was the amount of days, although I think that Legislator Ronk addressed it, he moved it to 90, on the phone, we had talked about 60, which is fine with me.



And then the other one was the, we had a conversation here in Ways and Means about whether the organization had to be in existence for over two years with this concern that there are some newer companies. Things are happening in the world that might change quickly.

And I believe Legislator Haynes was concerned about startups where this was their sole funding. And I think we agree that that's not what we want to be funding. But you could potentially not be a startup, with this being your own need funding, but still be a newer organization within two years. So, yeah, so that's, those are the issues.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay, Legislator Ronk.

**Legislator Ronk:** I intended to only apply to not, I intend us to be able to only contract, with taxpayer dollars, for not for profits and government entities. I don't think that we should be contracting during the budget process for services with for profit organizations. For profit organizations, I believe the contract with the county should go through an RFP process. Which is what we do with our budget analysts, which, you know, are the for profit entities that the legislature contracts with. I intended it to be that way, I intend it to be that way, and I'm unwilling to change it.

To this, to the 30/60/90, I would prefer 60 days to sign the contract. I think Amber and Natalie can back me up on this, as well as Vicky and Jay, and anybody else who's ever had to deal with any of these contract agencies. You know, there's a significant amount of October, November, December chasing around that goes on with these contract agencies.

When they, we pass these, you know, we pass these contracts in March and April of every year. And I want to say that consistently, at least a third of them have to be chased around by Amber and Natalie, and back when it was Mary Beichert to get them to, to do the few things that we require for them to be able to achieve taxpayer money for their programs. I do not want to make the longest time possible for them to, to sign these contracts.

I understand things take time and I understand 30 days might be too soon. But I feel strongly that we shouldn't let it go beyond 60 days. You know, by the time it gets there, their lawyers and our lawyers have already worked most of the things out. Believe me, if the Contract Agency, if the Contract Management Department and Purchasing have signed off on it, it's not going to be something that the organization is going to have trouble signing off on from a legal perspective it's just going to be based on either laziness or disorganization.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay, do we have the language for the definition? Can you get that up so everyone can take a look at it?

I'll read it for those for everyone: "Non-County Agency - Non-County Agency shall mean any organization that the County Legislature contracts with for agreed upon services during the budget process subject to the requirements in this policy."

I cannot see any hands. So, if someone has their hand up, could they just go ahead and.

**Legislator Walter:** I have a question about that. So I mean, I, I get the intent. But I guess I'm worried, back to Legislator Bartels' point, that contracting for agreed upon services, I mean, that does include RFPs. I mean, those, they contract with agreed upon services. I don't know if there

needs to be some language that specifies, and separate those out from this. And I just want to add that the 60 days is fine with me. I don't know where the 90 came in. I was happy with 60.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay, so we'll make the change on the 60. Legislator Bartels, do you have any comments?

**Legislator Bartels:** Yeah, I mean, I'm just trying to, to think through this definition. I guess maybe I can ask Legislator Ronk. So, so the contention is that it's, its organizations that we're contracting with during, specifically during the budget process. I'm just, so, so, the audit firm, even though that's in the budget, and the budget analysis firm, is not something that's agreed upon, during the budget process. Is that what you're saying?

**Legislator Ronk:** That was the best I could come up with Trace, and you nobody had any better ideas.

**Legislator Bartels:** No, no, I'm just trying to get clarity.

**Legislator Ronk:** Yeah.

**Legislator Bartels:** I'm not accusing you of anything, I'm trying to get it.

**Legislator Ronk:** I mean, I could even put in there, "for agreed upon services that were not sent out for RFP," and then that would, I mean, obscenely show that we're not talking about the budget analysis, or the, or the audit firm.

**Legislator Bartels:** Maybe, "during the budget process and not subject to an RFP process."

**Chairwoman Archer:** During the budget process, okay. Did you get that Nat, can you make that and "during the budget process and not subject to

**Legislator Bartels:** an RFP,

**Chairwoman Archer:** and RFP process?" Are you okay with that, Ken?

**Legislator Ronk:** Yep.

**Legislator Bartels:** I know the language is wonky, but.

**Chairwoman Archer:** But it provides clarity.

**Legislator Ronk:** Subject to the requirements and this, it also has to, you know, and yeah, not subject to an RFP, subject to the requirements in this policy. Because there are further requirements in this policy that are not included in that definition.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Right. So, during the budget process and not subject to an RFP process that's subject to the requirements in this policy.

**Legislator Bartels:** Well, then I, I got to read it again.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay.

**Amber Feaster:** Lynn may I?

**Chairwoman Archer:** Please, I can't see.

**Amber Feaster:** During this prior budget process, the legislature chose an organization that did require an RFP.

**Legislator Ronk:** So, then that, so then that organization would not be subject to the policy, that's all.

**Chairwoman Archer:** That's correct. And, and, and we never did it, the RFP anyway, because it was, their services were RFPed through the county, through the County Exec. Okay. And then this would hold true for audit and the budget. Because they would be subject to the RFP process, even though they're in the budget.

**Legislator Ronk:** Correct. It was the best I could do. It's not the, it's, it's, it's not ideal, but it's.

**Legislator Bartels:** I, I don't know if that last "but," which I know is in there because of my addition. But I don't know if that last "but" is right. But I think it's important to include the, the fact that it's accepting those organizations that are subject to an RFP process. Because now it's, now it's much more clear to me. And I think it would be clear to anyone that this isn't about every county contract. It isn't about a, a demographic, you know, outside of Ulster County. It's just about those organizations that the County Legislature contracts with. So, even though the language is a little weird, I, I think we're much, getting much closer. I just, I'm wondering about that "but" does anybody.

**Chairwoman Archer:** How about, how about if we move "during the budget process subject to the requirements in this policy, unless the organization is going through the RFP process."

Does that make it any better?

**Legislator Haynes:** You need the "requires", because like that one agency that did come to us, it was the, it was the amount that was, they were above the threshold, for you know, I think they wanted \$60,000.

**Christopher Ragucci, Esq.:** Lynn, if I could just make a very quick suggestion.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Oh, yes, please. I can't see if your hand is up. So please just chime in. Thank you.

**Christopher Ragucci, Esq.:** Sure. It's Chris. Right where the, right where it says, "and not" perhaps if the "and" is switched to "which," which is "which is not subject to an RFP process but subject to the requirements of this policy."

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay, can you make that edit Amber, or Natalie, who's ever at the computer there? Can, can you give it to us one more time, Chris?

**Christopher Ragucci, Esq.:** I would, I would redact the "and." And then just insert, "which is not subject to an RFP process but subject to the requirements in this policy." So it would just be instead of "a RFP" would be in a "an RFP," and then I think that makes a little better sense, to me at least.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Which is not subject to an RFP but, okay, but subject to the requirements in this policy.

All right, is everybody okay with that language?

Okay, so then and 3.1, or actually, it's now 4.1 because the numbers all moved.

We're, we're, you're, you're, you're saying Legislator Ronk that you, can, you feel strongly that it is a nonprofit and not for profit? If it's a for profit, they would go through an RFP process. Correct?

**Legislator Ronk:** I believe so, yeah. Because then I, I feel like we're giving an illegal gift to for profit businesses, if we're not requiring them to do an RFP, when almost every other contractor with the county, that's a for profit entity, has to do an RFP.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay. Is everybody okay with that change? We're keeping it as is. I cannot see hands up. So, if you have a concern, please speak. Okay.

**Legislator Bartels:** I can live with that but can I ask a question? In that, in the same section, in 4, the, because it's probably the next thing we're going to bring up. What's now 4.3, "all agencies that apply for funding that one must be..."

**Chairwoman Archer:** Yes.

**Legislator Bartels:** "...at least two years." We've just, we've spoken about it a couple times. That last sentence, "The county does not fund startup agencies." if it's staying, can we just, can we delete that sentence? It's just,

**Legislator Ronk:** Fine.

**Legislator Bartels:** It rings weird to me that we, we're making a statement like that.

**Legislator Ronk:** It's Fine.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** Are we, uh

**Legislator Ronk:** We make statements in policies all the time. I've got no problem deleting it.

**Legislator Bartels:** I know. But, I just something's, yeah,

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** Are we, have we looked at the two-year, are we agreeing with that or not?

**Legislator Bartels:** That's our next point of discussion probably.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** Alright.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Is there, Legislator Ronk.

**Legislator Ronk:** I would just put, at the end of that, "certain exceptions may be entertained." If, if everyone has a problem in two years. I think that two years is important. I think that we've had the most problem with agencies that have had less than a, you know, two-year track record to work on. We are also more likely to be the sole source, or the largest source of funding for these agencies, if they have been in existence for less than two years. So, I would like to keep it in there as a best practice and leave an exemption at the end in case, you know, you know, Warren Buffett or somebody wants to give \$50 million to feed children.

**Chairwoman Archer:** So if I may, your concern is not having us fund a startup, or a organization that doesn't have a track record when it's looking for funding. If, if they're less than two years, they have funding, that they're bringing to the table, and this is augmenting that. Would you be comfortable with that?

**Legislator Ronk:** Can you repeat that question?

**Chairwoman Archer:** So let's say that they have not been in existence, let's say for a year. But they have funding, other sources of funding, and they're, this is just adding to their pot of money, not basically, funding them to exist.

**Legislator Ronk:** I would have less of a problem with that. Which is why I said, to try and you know pacify those who have a problem with this section, we could just say certain exceptions to this may be entertained. It's a good catch all.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** I have a, yeah, I, I don't like the idea of putting it in there at all, actually, to be honest you. I mean, I think maybe suggesting that longevity, you know, as is important. But the idea, you don't know what's going to come down. And you know, just by saying that there's going to be an exception, I don't know, I don't, I don't really like the two-years in there. Unless it has something that says that, it is recommended, that you know, they have at least two years. But it was recommended, so not that it's, you know, in stone, and while we can etch a little bit of stone out if we want, I mean, I don't know, I just don't like it in there.

**Legislator Ronk:** It's exactly why

**Legislator Walter:** Can I, sorry.

**Legislator Ronk:** certain exceptions may be entertained means, Dave.

**Legislator Walter:** Can I make a

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** It doesn't, It's not the same.

**Legislator Ronk:** Yeah it is.

**Legislator Walter:** My hand's up, I'm sorry.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay Eve I'm sorry, I can't see it. So go ahead.

**Legislator Walter:** I know, that's why I'm just saying it. So, what if this was changed to be really very more specific that says something that this cannot be the sole source of funding for this agency. Then by default, this agency has had to have some kind of, you know, other source of existence, but that that sounded like that was more of the issue. And so why, and nowhere do we say anywhere, yet, that it, that this should not be their sole source of funding. So, perhaps we could just focus on that part?

**Legislator Ronk:** Well.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** I mean, there's the other situation where sometimes, you do a, you may want to fund a startup to create the seed money which brings in other money. I mean, there could be a situation that that's, you know, that happens. I mean, we've seen, like for instance, it's not quite the same, but like the Festival of the Voice. They were given seed money. And they never, they had no money at first when they first started, they got seed money through the arts, our, you know, one of our arts grants, and the next thing you know, you know, they, now this year they didn't have it because of the pandemic but they were getting a massive amount of people that came into that Festival of the Voice. And it all started with a \$5,000 seed money.

**Legislator Haynes:** Chairman Donaldson if I might, it's Heidi.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Yes, Heidi, go ahead.

**Legislator Haynes:** But they did that through the arts though, correct? How we fund the mid

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** They did, they did, but it was seed money that came through, the Arts gave them that, a grant. You know through

**Legislator Haynes:** Yeah

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** money we give the Arts but it was sort of like a seed money. Now what if they came directly to us?

**Legislator Haynes:** Yeah, that there is the issue because in the first, in one of the first sentences here, it says that, you know, how do we know if the contract agencies are serving an important role in improving the quality of life? If they haven't even been around for a year? I just, I'm just confused with that. How do we, how can we tell that they're performing a vital function? Can somebody give me a hypothetical example?

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** No we can't.

**Legislator Walter:** I can. Well, I can.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay. Eve.

**Legislator Walter:** That, it's based on their mission. We would know from their mission and who they're, you know, that, even, even new programs would need to, just to be a nonprofit, if we're sticking with nonprofit and government entities, they have to have a mission, they have to have a board, they have to have objectives, they have to talk about who their target audiences is. So, we would still be able to ascertain what their contribution, even if they have not, or barely have done that contribution.

**Legislator Ronk:** So it's a theory, just, Lynn, may I just jump in on that?

**Chairwoman Archer:** Yes. Go ahead, please.

**Legislator Ronk:** So just following up on what Heidi said and what Eve just said. So, now we're going to be funding organizations based on a theoretical contribution to the, to Ulster County. Because everything's theoretical until you've got a track record. I think that's Heidi's point.

**Legislator Bartels:** Lynn, can I weigh-in, please?

**Chairwoman Archer:** Yes, please, Tracey.

**Legislator Bartels:** You know, but we are contracting for services, they actually have to deliver services. It's not like we just write a grant. We're not allowed to give grants. So, we're contracting for services that have to be delivered.

I'm just speaking for myself, I have more of a concern of us being the sole source for a new organization, then the fact that it's new. You know, I mean, I weigh both of them as something that I would, you know, expect that we would debate and consider closely. But the idea that someone would come to us with a plan and a contractual arrangement, but no other money, that it's just, it's our money, and they're new, would make it a lot harder for me.

You know, I could imagine, especially in today's environment, that there could be some pretty significant startups with outside funding that we might want to contract with offering pretty amazing services. You know, again, we're thinking a lot of the tenor of this conversation is discussing our contract agencies as if we were providing grants, which is not really, I don't think should be the bulk of the conversation. The bulk of this this conversation is a contract for services that we think are important.

So, I can imagine there being a circumstance where someone, an agency, would be relatively new, a startup with outside funding, and looking to contract with us for providing services for our citizens that we would find valuable. And that would be less of a concern to me than if we were their only money?

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** Well, I mean, I think they're both concerns of mine. And I think they both concerns of everybody's. It doesn't mean that, in other words, when we look at these things, and we go to, kind of you know, going to have a contract with them, but then obviously, every one of us are going to have concerns if it's a new startup or and we're funding it. It's a natural tendency, we're going to do that anyway. I don't, but, but to shut it out, to say, oh, no,

you can't do it. That's, you know, that's a concern of mine. And because like, I don't know what may come down the road in the future. I really don't. I mean, I have to admit, so, I try to figure out how we're going to deal with it when it does come. And if somebody has an idea that's going help us with, you know, fix something or deliver a service. I don't know. I mean, I think we have to be open, you know, to that. I mean, that's the way I'm kind of looking at it. But I mean, I think it should be put in there possibly the idea, that these things should be considered. But you know.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Legislator Bartels.

**Legislator Bartels:** I, I this may not make everyone happy. And it seems simple, but might be radical. Can we change the "must" to "should?"

"All agencies that apply for funding should have been in operation for at least two years by December 31st?"

**Legislator Ronk:** Sold.

**Legislator Bartels:** Sold, did you say?

**Chairwoman Archer:** Sold.

**Legislator Ronk:** Sold.

**Legislator Bartels:** Okay because I feel like that answers it. It leaves that, it leaves that ability to say no, but, okay.

**Chairwoman Archer:** All right. Is everybody happy with that change? Okay.

**Legislator Bartels:** And we're going to lose that last sentence. The county does not

**Chairwoman Archer:** Right. And we're striking the last sentence.

**Legislator Bartels:** Okay.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay, on 4.2, which is now 5.2 because we moved the numbers. The, the date for applications is July 15. But because we're implementing it this year, we've got to do, we've got a different date, or an alternative date for the current year, and going forward on the 15th?

Legislator Bartels.

**Legislator Bartels:** Can we just add, "or as directed by the Clerk of the Legislature," or something that leaves the ability for the, the Clerk to direct the date? I don't know if, Ken, you're happy with that something? We can, we can keep no later than July 15th, or as.

**Chairwoman Archer:** "or as directed by the Clerk of the Legislature." Can we add that piece, Ken?

**Legislator Ronk:** I, I'm comfortable with it, if Vicky is, but if she's not, we could do the, the Chair and Deputy Chair of Ways and Means.



**Legislator Bartels:** That's fine too. Chair and Deputy Chair. Actually, since it's going to Ways and Means, that might be better.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay, "as directed by Chair and Deputy Chair of Ways and Means."

**Legislator Bartels:** But, but keep the first date, you know.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Yeah, keep the, yeah, because that'll be going forward. Okay. And now the last one, we got the 60 days and 5.3. So, I think we've covered everything we've made all the changes. Is everybody comfortable with everything?

**Amber Feaster:** Can you please review the change for after July 15th?

**Chairwoman Archer:** Oh, "or as directed by the Chair and Deputy Chair of Ways and Means."

**Amber Feaster:** Thank you.

**Chairwoman Archer:** And then 4.5, which is now 5.5 because the numbers changed, it because we added the 2.0 definition piece, is "60 days."

And then you have for old 5.3, now 6.3, the changes that we had from the last meeting.

Okay, so is everybody comfortable moving forward on voting on this?

**Legislator Walter:** Can I ask something?

**Chairwoman Archer:** Sure.

**Legislator Walter:** So, it came up in the caucus, and maybe I, I don't understand exactly how this is going to work. Is this, there was concern in the caucus that because of all these changes, they don't, some people don't feel comfortable voting on it today. So, if that, was the expectation that this would still be presented to the full legislature today, without everyone else seeing these changes, or is this going to be postponed until the next one?

**Legislator Ronk:** I would prefer it to move forward today. I think everyone's had a chance to see the, the product itself for several months. You know they've had several.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Can we get a redline? Can we get a red line to everyone? Amber, Natalie?

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** I don't know, I'm not comfortable with voting on it today.

**Legislator Ronk:** Yeah, because it, never mind. I'm not going to, I'm not going to there, it's fine.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** I mean, it could go next, next month.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Legislator Bartels.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** It's still got plenty of time for next month then we'll still

**Legislator Ronk:** You know what Dave, a lot of things have had plenty of time this year. And anytime I've had an objection with changes being made, on the meeting day, and asked for a little bit more time, I've been denied. But if you want it, I'll give it to you.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** You stop the political crap, Ken, and just lets like try to work as a team.

**Legislator Ronk:** I'll stop it, I'll stop the political crap when you stop the political crap, Dave.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** Oh, God Almighty.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay, enough please.

Legislator Bartels.

**Legislator Bartels:** I just, for that change that, that we just made after July 15th. I was just have a different suggestion

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay.

**Legislator Bartels:** before we move on from it. Just to, to have it conform with the new 6.3 to after July 15th, to say, "or as the Chair and Deputy Chair of Ways and Means may specify." Because it uses the same language as in, the now 6.3., if everyone's okay with that.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Did you guys get that?

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** Yeah.

**Chairwoman Archer:** I don't know who's capturing it? Natalie or Amber?

**Legislator Bartels:** Amber. Yes? Okay. Thank you.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay.

**Legislator Bartels:** Thank you.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** Right. I don't agree with it.

**Legislator Bartels:** You don't agree with what?

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** I don't agree with that, or the Chair, and the Deputy Chair.

**Chairwoman Archer:** It's just a date about when it's going to be submitted because of the timing of this, at this juncture, Dave. It is

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** I, I understand that. I know what you're saying, but I really don't, I don't, I don't think that the Chair and the Deputy Chair of Ways and Means should make that decision, that's all. I'm just thinking it should, it should be coming, you know from, you know, you have a date right now that's in there. Why would that be changed?

**Chairwoman Archer:** We're passed the date.

**Legislator Bartels:** The budget schedule might change it and we're currently past that date. So, now nobody could apply this year.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** I understand that. But I mean, that's an exception for this year. But I, I don't want it to continue on and on and on, because then all of a sudden, you know, if the Chair and Deputy Chair decide, ah we're not, well, we'll put it out or make it earlier and make it difficult. They could do that.

**Legislator Ronk:** How about July 15, period.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** I agree with the July 15th, period, you know, except for the exception for this year.

**Legislator Ronk:** Right. So if you'd, if you'd just let me finish my, you know, my statement, Dave "July 15<sup>th</sup>, Period. For the year 2020, on a date specified by the Chair and Deputy Chair of Ways and Means."

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** That's fine with me.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Did Amber, Natalie did you get that?

**Legislator Ronk:** They're typing.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Ah, there it goes. Perfect. Okay, and we got 5.5, the 60 days, correct? They're still changing. I, I see we're still changing.

**Legislator Walter:** Can I ask a question as a point of operations?

**Chairwoman Archer:** Go ahead.

**Legislator Walter:** So, I just heard that it's too late now, and now people can't apply. But I mean until this is goes into law, can't people just have already been applying and you know, like what's stopping people from applying right now?

**Chairwoman Archer:** Well, it's a new process. They normally don't apply till September. So, this is

**Legislator Walter:** I see, so it's moving it up.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Legislator Ronk.

**Legislator Walter:** Okay thank you, I just didn't

**Legislator Ronk:** Yeah, I was just going to refresh Legislator Walters memory on, on, on my statements previously about why I thought this policy was necessary. And quite frankly, the legislature doesn't usually make these decisions until, you know, two weeks before it's time to pass the budget. And they do so in Ways and Means. And you know, it's two afternoons, from one o'clock until five o'clock, and we spend, you know, \$600,000 to \$800,000 of taxpayer money. You know, which is I think part of the purpose of having this is, yeah, they could be applying right now. But on a typical year, they wouldn't be applying until probably September, when they'd go before the Legislative Programs Committee, and then November when they'd come before Ways and Means, and then the legislature. So, I think that's where the date specified by the Chair and Deputy Chair of Ways and Means comes from because I think it's going to be important that we start this process in this budget cycle, if it's abbreviated.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Right. Legislator Bartels.

**Legislator Bartels:** And also, having, having this evaluation happen earlier also would allow us, if organizations came to us that were appropriate, to actually be forwarded to the Executive for consideration in the executive budget. And in departmental budgets, which is what we've been struggling with all along. We have the time to actually do that versus hearing them as a separate one-off, as Legislator Ronk just said in the, in the final hours before finalizing the budget, so.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Legislator Walters.

**Legislator Walter:** So, yeah, and just thank you for the clarification. I just, I, I the timeline wasn't clear in my head. And just also, to be clear, I'm totally supportive of this. And this is why I put time into giving my suggestions. The point I made about postponing it really was not coming from me because I have been a part of this, and so have all of sitting here. I've just pointing out that at our caucus, there were people who haven't been a part of this who expressed some concerns. I'm not arguing that we hear that or not, but I just wanted to make sure that was referenced here. That, that other people feel concerned about voting tonight. I'm not advocating one way or another.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Legislator Ronk.

**Legislator Ronk:** Thanks. I respect that. I mean, these are open meetings. They've been going on for, I want to say, three months, at least, with this policy before this committee. Anybody who wanted to has had the opportunity to weigh in on it, To come in and view these meetings that happen twice a month. You know I, and I again, I feel strongly that if it was a member of our caucus or members of our caucus that had a concern about voting on this tonight, it would still be voted on tonight. That having been said, if, if, if that's, you know, if that's the will of this committee, to postpone it for a month, there's nothing I can do about it, and I'm just going to not consent to the postponement as a sponsor.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay, Legislator Bartels.

**Legislator Bartels:** I mean, one, one issue, and I don't know It's something I mean, I guess we could make a lot of phone calls. The problem is that we don't have a democratic caucus tonight. So, we go straight from this, we as a caucus, go straight from this into session. So, we don't have,

normally we'd be able to meet with our caucus and just have a quick conversation and download what all these changes are. And unfortunately, we're not going to be able to do that.

I mean, I, I can tell you that I feel a lot more comfortable having gone through this and I appreciate Legislator Ronk for coming up with something to start the conversation in terms of that definition, because that for me, really started to move the whole conversation.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Legislator Ronk.

**Legislator Ronk:** Thanks with, without belaboring the point, I was under the same, in, in my caucus was under the same, you know, concern when it came to the IDA appointments. I did not have caucus that evening and the Democratic caucus did have caucus that evening. And I asked for postponement on the floor of those appointments because our caucus had concerns and we were denied.

So, you know, when Dave shakes his head and says that, you know, it's not the case. I can come up with concrete examples from a few months ago. That mirror the same, the same, you know, issues that, that you folks have tonight. That like I said, that having been said, you've got the votes on this committee if you, if you want to postpone it, postpone it, there's nothing I can do about it.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay, on the resolution as amended. Do we want to move forward and vote tonight? Or do we, are we looking to postpone to give folks a chance to.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Legislator Bartels.

**Legislator Bartels:** I was just going to say, I mean, I have mixed feelings about it, because I'd like to, I'd like to have everyone have the time to feel comfortable. But I also feel like this is an issue of timeliness to some degree. Since we do want to get a policy, if it's a policy we're going to put in place, we'd like it to be in place sooner than later. As we just had a discussion about how we're already past July 15th time. So, I'm interested to, to hear what everybody else has to say.

**Chairwoman Archer:** I would just say that, you know, you will see in the OneDrive, we have put together the budget calendar. And if the whole intent here is to be able to get these requests in front of everyone, prior to being knee deep in the budget cycle. If we wait another full month, then we are losing important critical time to getting this out there and having people understand.

Chairman Donaldson.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** Well, I don't think it precludes us to send out to the nonprofits that are looking for funding, that we want their request in by whatever date we want. With or without this policy, we still have to gonna, we still got to give them a deadline. And, and we can easily give them a deadline right now. The Clerk can send something out and say, hey, I want, you know, you have to get your stuff back by whatever day. You and Ken Ronk, as the Chair and Vice Chair of Ways and Means can say that, you know, you just want to, we'll only entertain those that come in by a specific time.

You know, the policy is different and I, I'm, I'm more comfortable, much more comfortable, with it now than I was before. But I, I really want to digest it better. And I think other people want to take

a look at it. And I, I don't see the rush on this. I think it can be done next month. And I think we can still you know, still have the policy in line in time, because we'll still be using that for consideration.

**Legislator Walter:** Lynn, my hand's up.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

**Legislator Walter:** That's okay. So I'm, I'm also very torn about this. I, I, I don't, I, I can't ignore that there were people in our, well there was really probably one person who articulated this particularly. But you know, I guess I could make the argument that if that person is not comfortable, they can vote against this. And so, you know, I guess it's, I don't think it's an ideal circumstance. But again, given the timeframe for this, I don't, I'm not believer in quid pro quo or balancing, you know, but I think given the time period for this particular one, I'd be willing to move it forward. And again, it's just a risk that if some legislators feel like they don't know what's going on, they don't have to vote for it, I guess.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Legislative Gavaris.

**Legislator Gavaris:** Thanks, yeah, I think timing wise we need to move forward. And last night at caucus Leader Heppner did tell everyone that they should come to this meeting tonight. I think it was encouraged. I think those who were interested in it would, should have been on this call now if they want to be. So, I'm in favor of moving forward. I think that this is an important thing that we've spent a lot of time on it. It's just time to move it.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay, so, on the resolution as we've amended it tonight, can I get a motion?

**Legislator Ronk:** It's been moved and seconded already.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Not with the changes we just made.

**Legislator Ronk:** Okay. We have to make them on the floor, anyway. I'll, I'll, I'll move it with the changes we just made.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay. And second, Legislator Gavaris.

All in favor.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Opposed?

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** I'm a no for now.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay.

**Legislator Ronk:** Thank you everybody for your hard work.

**Chairwoman Archer:** The resolution moves forward.

**Legislator Ronk:** Thank you everyone for, you know sticking it through and, and coming up with changes. I think it's really good.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Great. Thank you.

Resolution 276: Authorizing The Chair Of The Ulster County Legislature To Transfer Title of the dive van to Greene County's Sheriff's office.

Move?

**Legislator Ronk:** Moved by Ronk.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Second?

**Legislator Bartels:** Second, Bartels.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** Seconded.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Bartels. Legislator Gavaris, you had some concerns. Are you okay now? Everything's good.

All in favor?

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Opposed? Unanimous.

Resolution 286: Approving The Execution Of A Contract In Excess Of \$50,000.00 Entered Into By The County for Clear Ballot Group, Inc. – Board Of Elections

**Chairwoman Archer:** Move?

**Legislator Ronk:** Moved by Ronk.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Second?

**Legislator Bartels:** Second by Bartels.

**Chairwoman Archer:** All in favor?

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Opposed? Unanimous.

Okay. Resolution 293: Approving The Execution Of A Contract In Excess Of \$50,000.00 for the county, William E. Munson the, doing business as Munson Boats. There was additional backup that had surfaced last week in the OneDrive. So, can I get a motion to move it?

**Legislator Ronk:** Moved by Ronk.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Second? Maio.

Okay, all in favor?

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Opposed? It's unanimous.

Resolution 296: Amending The 2020 Ulster Budget To Accept An Allocation Of Funds From The New York State Office Of Temporary And Disability Assistance To Support Activities Associated With Sheltering The Homeless During Inclement Winter Weather (Code Blue Plan).

**Legislator Ronk:** Moved by Ronk.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Second?

**Legislator Bartels:** Seconded by Bartels.

**Chairwoman Archer:** All in favor?

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Opposed? Unanimous.

Resolution 297: Approving The Execution Of A Contract In Excess Of \$50,000.00 Entered Into By The County – Capital Market Advisors, LLC.

Move?

**Legislator Ronk:** Moved by Ronk.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Second?

**Legislator Bartels:** Second by Bartels.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay. All in favor?

**Group:** Aye.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Opposed? Unanimous.



Just for everyone's, we have put in the OneDrive, the 2020 budget schedule for 2021 proposed budget. So, take a look at that. If there's any questions or concerns, please let us know.

Is there any other new or old business? Legislator Bartels.

**Legislator Bartels:** Can I just ask a question on the schedule. I don't have last year's schedule in front of us, did we have that two week period between the review and the vote?

You know, we have Ways & Means, to review the appeals, that's on November 16th to the 18th. And then, essentially two weeks later, we vote on the budget.

**Amber Feaster:** It's because of the Thanksgiving holiday.

**Legislator Bartels:** Which, what day does that fall on next year? I got to pull it up.

**Chairwoman Archer:** This year.

**Legislator Bartels:** This year. Yeah, that's what I mean. Sorry.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Do you have that Amber?

**Legislator Bartels:** 26<sup>th</sup>, 26<sup>th</sup>. Yeah.

**Amber Feaster:** I'm pulling it up right now. The 26th.

**Legislator Bartels:** Okay. Okay.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Okay. Any other questions or concerns? Okay, I'll take a motion to adjourn.

**Legislative Chairman Donaldson:** Motion to adjourn.

**Legislator Ronk:** Motion.

**Chairwoman Archer:** Thank you. Thank you, everyone.

So, did you guys get that? It was Donaldson and Ronk. Okay. Thank you.